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Summary

Description of the Proposed Action
The project area is located in the northeast quadrant of Spokane County and the City of Spokane (see Vicinity Map, Figure 1.1). The proposed action is to improve transportation safety and mobility through the City of Spokane and Spokane County between Interstate 90 (I-90), northeastern Washington, and Canada. The action will ultimately provide a four- to eight-lane, fully controlled access highway between I-90 on the south terminus, kilometer post (KP) 456.15 (MP 283.44) and US 395 at Wandermere on the northern terminus. The length of the North Spokane Corridor (NSC) is approximately 16.1 kilometers (10.0 miles), and includes up to seven interchanges. In addition, about 5.6 km (3.5 mi) of I-90, centered around the NSC/I-90 interchange connection, will require new construction. The project will provide a transportation facility that will accommodate high volume traffic movements, including high capacity transportation systems, between I-90 and areas north. This will help reduce the congestion and related operational problems on city street and county roads such as Division Street and Market Street, and will remove regional trips from local streets.

Under State and Federal environmental and transportation guidelines, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) is charged with the responsibility of establishing this new limited access corridor from Interstate 90 to US 395 in the Wandermere vicinity with the least amount of environmental impact possible, while maintaining the overall operational integrity of the facility. A large part of this responsibility includes the continued evaluation of the proposed action as outlined in the FEIS. As the development of this corridor has proceeded with specific design, right-of-way, and construction details, WSDOT evaluated modifications which would potentially reduce adverse impacts associated with the proposal.

A Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is required when (1) changes to the proposed action would result in significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the EIS; or (2) new information or circumstances relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts would result in significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the EIS. A Supplemental EIS is developed using the same process as the original EIS, except that scoping is not required. (23 CFR Sec. 771.130.)

This Final Supplemental EIS has been prepared to document the changes to the proposed action presented in the 1997 North Spokane Freeway Final Environmental Impact Statement, and the impacts resulting from those changes. There are no changes in the termini of the NSC project. The Final Supplemental EIS covers portions of the corridor between the Spokane River and US 395 at Wandermere in which changes have been made since the 1997 FEIS. The FSEIS refers to the 1997 FEIS where there are no changes in affected environment or impacts.
It is important to note that this document does not represent a direct comparison of the FEIS Alignment to the proposed Preferred Alternative. It is a documentation of the environmental impacts of the Preferred Alternative. The 1997 FEIS for the NSC was a corridor level study of several alternatives. The development of the design and right-of-way needs was limited, since there was no funding at the time for continued design work. In May 1998, the NSC project progressed from the environmental phase into the design phase, and WSDOT focused on areas where reductions in adverse environmental impacts, improvements in operations, and reduction in costs could be achieved. Through this effort and the Value Engineering studies, the current Preferred Alternative as presented in this Supplement evolved.

In order to evaluate the impacts of the proposed alignment changes, certain discipline analyses were prepared. The following technical reports are available for review at the WSDOT NSC Project Office:

- **Air Quality**
- **Noise**
- **Biological Assessment**
  “North Spokane Corridor Biological Assessment.” Erv Koller, WSDOT Eastern Region Environmental Office; April 21, 1999.
- **Real Estate Proximity Study**
- **Historical and Archaeological**
- **Hazardous Waste**
  “Supplement to Final EIS, Limited Initial Site Assessment of Known and Suspected Contaminated Sites on the Proposed North Spokane Limited Access Corridor, Spokane River to SR 395.” Dean Smith, WSDOT Eastern Region Environmental Office; February 2000.
Public and Agency Coordination

Since the publication of the FEIS, continued agency coordination has taken place primarily through the Value Engineering (VE) process. A VE Study is required for any federally funded National Highway System project with an estimated cost of $25 million or more (CFR 23 Part 627). Value Engineering is a systematic process designed to focus on the major issues of a complex project. The primary objective of a VE study is value improvement. The VE process incorporates, to the extent possible, the values of the design engineer, construction engineer, maintenance engineer, contractor, state and federal approval agencies, local agencies, other stakeholders, and the public. Design decisions are formulated from the recommendations of the VE team. (WSDOT Design Manual, Sec. 315.)

The Team for the first VE Study (focused on the area between the Spokane River and Lincoln Road) included participants from Spokane County and the City of Spokane. Guest speakers included the Traffic Engineer for the City of Spokane, and the roadmaster for Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (via conference phone call).

The second VE Study, in March 1999, focused on the proposed project between Lincoln Road and US 395 at Wandermere. The study team included representatives from, Mead School District, Spokane County, Federal Highway Administration, and local neighborhoods. Three residents from the Garden City Addition neighborhood and one from the southeast side of the proposed US 2 interchange participated in the study.
WSDOT will continue to coordinate with the City of Spokane, Spokane County and emergency services regarding access issues. Within the City of Spokane, the NSC proposes to eliminate east-west traffic on three city streets (Cleveland, Fairview and Bridgeport). East-west traffic will be maintained on Euclid, Wellesley, and Francis Avenues. Within Spokane County, the NSC proposes to cul-de-sac Fairview Road and Piper Road. Local agency approval is required for any planned frontage roads, county road or city street connections, or cul-de-sacs. The local agency must also agree in writing to accept and maintain the connecting section as a county road or city street. Upon WSDOT approval, the Access Report Plan will be submitted to city and county officials for review and meetings will be held to discuss the report.

**Cooperating Agencies**

The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are serving as cooperating agencies for this project. The BPA has jurisdiction over a large amount of land on the north end of the project, and the corridor crosses several BPA power transmission lines. The EPA is a cooperating agency based on its jurisdiction over the Spokane Valley-Rathdrum Aquifer.

**General Coordination**

The NSC project continues to be coordinated with other affected agencies and major property owners along the corridor, including: Spokane Regional Transportation Council, Spokane County, City of Spokane, area emergency services, Spokane Transit Authority, Avista Utilities, Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation, Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company, Community Colleges of Spokane, and Mead School District. The following civic organizations have indicated their support for the NSC project:

- Spokane Area Chamber of Commerce
- Bemiss Neighborhood Council
- Hillyard Neighborhood Council

**Public Involvement**

The public involvement plan for the revisions to the NSC used the following approaches to ensure inclusion of business, private citizens, federal, state, and local agencies, and other interested groups in the EIS process:

- Disseminating information to the general public, businesses, citizen groups, and public agencies and officials.

  The dissemination of information was enhanced with two new modes. A page devoted to the NSC was established on WSDOT Eastern Region’s web site. This page was created and posted in January 1999, and has been updated as changes and development occur. It also provides another opportunity for feedback. A NSC newsletter was created to keep the public updated on the project. Three issues were distributed; Fall 1998, Winter 1998/1999, and Fall 1999. Over 15,000 copies of the Winter issue were mailed out along with the Open House announcements in February, to residents and businesses in the vicinity of the corridor, property owners, and to those on the general mailing list.
• Holding Open Houses.
  Ten open houses were held between February 1999 and June 2000. All open
  houses were informal, with displays and staff to present the latest information on
  the project, and to receive verbal and written comment.

• Holding community meetings.
  Additional information meetings were held at the request of individuals and
  community groups. Nine meetings were held with various neighborhood
  organizations between January 1999 and June 2000. In addition, WSDOT staff
  attended the monthly meetings of one neighborhood council at the council’s
  request.

Related Actions

County Urban Connectors
Spokane County’s transportation division is currently developing an Urban Connector
plan, consisting of a network of arterials providing critical connections around the
metropolitan area. The NSC is included in the plan as a major link in the network. Two
of the proposed connectors intersect with the NSC. The Northeast Urban Connector
would intersect with US 395 at Farwell Road, connecting US 395, US 2, and Bruce Road
to the east. Another proposed connector, aligned with Bigelow Gulch Road, would
intersect with the NSC at Francis Avenue. The ultimate configuration of the County
Urban Connectors are not included in the Regional Transportation Plan at this time, and
therefore were not included in the modeling for the NSC Preferred Alternative.

Northside Arterial
Spokane County has decided against building the previously proposed Northside Arterial,
between US 395 and Market Street. The project is not currently identified in the
Regional Transportation Plan, and was not included in the modeling for the NSC
Preferred Alternative.

City of Spokane Road Projects
The City of Spokane has one current project within the limits of the NSC:
• Euclid Avenue improvements from Market Street to Freya Street. This project has no
  impacts on the NSC and is not impacted by the NSC project.

Project Alternatives Considered
This supplement covers only the additional build alternatives that have been considered
since the publication of the FEIS.

From the Spokane River to Hawthorne Road:
1. FEIS Market/Greene Alternative (see Figure 2.1)
2. Revised Market/Greene Alternative (see Figure 2.2)
From Hawthorne Rd to US 395 at Wandermere:

1. FEIS North Option with interchange at Stoneman Road (see Figure 2.3).
2. FEIS Modified North Option with interchange at Parksmith Drive (see Figure 2.4)
3. VE South Alternative with interchange at Parksmith Drive (see Figure 2.5)
4. VE North Alternative with interchange at Parksmith Drive (see Figure 2.6)

All of the above alternatives were compared and evaluated through the Value Engineering process. The Revised Market/Greene Alternative and the VE North Alternative were carried forward for detailed impact analysis, and are compared with the FEIS Market/Greene and North Option in this document.

New Facility Construction Cost

Table S-1 shows construction cost estimates in millions of (2000) dollars. These figures cover the full facility for each alternative, including the I-90 Collector Distributor System.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEIS Alignment</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1065 (see note)</td>
<td>$1091</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Cost was increased from the 1997 FEIS by 3% annual inflation rate and adjustments in land values determined for industrial property. The inflation rate was derived from the WSDOT Program Management 1998 Construction Cost Index Table.

Project Schedule

Construction is anticipated to take approximately 20 years, based on estimated funding availability of $53 to $56 million per year. The earliest anticipated construction start is approximately mid-2001, with a corresponding full build-out completion date of around 2021. Because of the time required to complete the entire project, construction would be staged to provide public use portions of the roadway as early as possible.
## Major Environmental Impacts

### Table S-2  Alternative Route Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FEIS Alignment: Market/Greene with North Option connection</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative: Revised Market/Greene with VE North connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional and Community Growth</td>
<td>Cuts across Urban Growth Area in County.</td>
<td>Aligned with edge of Urban Growth Area in County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement and Relocations</td>
<td>123 homes¹ (90 single-family homes, 33 multi-family units), and 1 church</td>
<td>112 homes (97 single-family, 15 multi-family units)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>total 244 hectares² (602 acres)</td>
<td>total 255 hectares (629 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>no exceedance of NAAQS</td>
<td>no exceedance of NAAQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>Approx. 220 homes impacted; approx. 40 remain unmitigated by noise walls (FEIS, p. 4-28)</td>
<td>Approx. 286 homes impacted; approx. 42-95 remain unmitigated by noise walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>40 businesses and approximately 795 employees displaced³</td>
<td>35 businesses and approximately 345 employees displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Quality</td>
<td>impacts over large residential area between US 2 and US 395 at Wandermere, Northwood Middle and Farwell Elementary Schools</td>
<td>impact reduced with depressed section north of Hawthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(f) and 6(f) Sites; Historic, Parks and Recreation Sites</td>
<td>No properties taken or used</td>
<td>No properties taken or used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>no significant impact</td>
<td>involves designated geologically hazardous soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Habitat</td>
<td>no impact to unique habitat, threatened or endangered species</td>
<td>no impact to unique habitat, threatened or endangered species; increased impact to common habitat and species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>Estimated remediation south of Lincoln Rd: $1,752,000</td>
<td>Estimated remediation south of Lincoln Rd.: $1,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated remediation north of Lincoln Rd.: $445,000 (this figure not based on investigation.)</td>
<td>Estimated remediation north of Lincoln Rd.: $118,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No difference in impact in: Overall Economic Activity, Water & Hydrological Systems, Flood Plains, Wetlands, Prime Farmland.

---

¹ See “Residential Land” section, Chapter 4.
² See “Land Use” section, Chapter 4.
³ See “Industrial Land/Business and Employment” section, Chapter 4.
**Air Quality**

The approved Transportation Plan for the Spokane Metropolitan Area meets the Clean Air Act State Implementation Plan (SIP) and includes the NSC. Each phase or segment of the NSC will need to be programmed into a Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).

**Noise**

Several areas along the proposed corridor will experience noise levels exceeding FHWA noise abatement criteria. Mitigation was examined for all areas to determine whether it was reasonable and feasible at each location. Table S-3 displays the proposed locations of noise walls for the Preferred Alternative which were found to be feasible and reasonable by WSDOT criteria. It is WSDOT’s policy to make final decisions on the construction of noise barriers after final horizontal and vertical alignments are determined and a detailed engineering analysis of the feasibility and reasonability of noise abatement can be made.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NSC segment</th>
<th>Side of Road</th>
<th>Wall Length (meters)</th>
<th>Wall Height (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Spokane River to Grace Ave.</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>500 (1,640)</td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>550 (1,800)</td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grace Ave. to Wellesley Ave. I/C</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>671 (2,200)</td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Parksmith Dr. to Mead Royale</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>854 (2,800)</td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The minimum noise abatement will be constructed as shown in Table S-3. Additional abatement is being evaluated between Freya Avenue and Lincoln Road (Morgan Acres neighborhood) and between Farwell Road and Perry Street (Garden City Addition neighborhood). The abatement shown in Table S-3 would leave 95 households with unmitigated noise impacts. Further analysis is being pursued which may show additional abatement is justified, potentially lowering the remaining impacted homes to approximately 42.

**Energy**

Operation of any new build alternative would save between 3,997,395 liters (1,056,000 gallons) and 6,389,775 liters (1,688,000 gallons) of gasoline annually.

**Geology and Soils**

Topography will be altered through cut and fill slopes, embankment material, excavation, disposal of waste materials, retaining walls, ditching, and trenching. Best Management Practices (BMPs)\(^\text{Note}\) will be used to prevent long-term erosion on any embankment, roadway shoulder, drainage channel segment, or graded section. The most current and

\(^{\text{Note}}\) Best Management Practices (BMPs) are defined in the Glossary.
most appropriate BMPs will be detailed in the Stormwater Site Plan (SSP). The SSP includes the hydraulic report, Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, BMP selection, and the project-specific maintenance schedule. This plan is then included in the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) for construction. This process and the catalog of BMPs are found in the WSDOT Highway Runoff Manual. Stormwater controls will be in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer protection guidelines.

**Waterways and Hydrological Systems**

Rivers, streams, creeks, wetlands, etc., will be avoided or spanned by bridge structures. BMPs will be employed during construction and operation of the facility to ensure compliance with federal, state, and local water quality requirements.

**Flood Plains**

The Spokane River banks vicinity are artificially stabilized both up-and downstream of the proposed NSC crossing. The proposed Spokane River bridge will have bridge abutments and approach fill outside of the wetlands and 100-year flood plain.

**Water Quality**

With the use of storm water quality/quantity treatment BMPs, no adverse water quality impacts are projected. The most current and appropriate BMPs will be detailed in the Stormwater Site Plan (SSP). The SSP includes the hydraulic report, Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, BMP selection, and the project-specific maintenance schedule. This plan is then included in the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) for construction. This process and the catalog of BMPs are found in the WSDOT Highway Runoff Manual. Stormwater controls will be in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer protection guidelines.

**Wetlands**

No impact to any wetland within, or in the vicinity of, the NSC is expected, due to the following measures:

- Storm water discharge to surface water bodies will be avoided by the use of properly maintained, permanent water quality/quantity treatment BMPs (see Water Quality, above).
- Permanent erosion and sediment control measures (BMPs) will be maintained to ensure that wetland filling and river/creek sediment contamination do no occur.

**Wildlife, Fisheries, and Vegetation**

The overall development generated by this project will have minimal impact on the area’s wildlife. A majority of this project is within an area where human activities and urbanization have already displaced sensitive wildlife species. No endangered or threatened wildlife or fish species, and no wildlife migratory routes, were found (known, recorded, or observed) within the corridor. The northern end of the project will have increased impact on common habitat and species.
Vegetation types present in the affected areas are common or introduced species. Any plant losses are considered to be insubstantial. Vegetation planted in the right-of-way will be sustainable native species that are fast-growing, provide optimum erosion control, and are aesthetically pleasing.

**Farmland**
No prime farmland or farmland of state importance is impacted by this project.

**Recreation**
While there are no direct impacts to recreational properties from the project, the route will pass numerous facilities which will experience indirect impacts. The resulting visual, noise, and access impacts are not expected to substantially impair any of the facilities’ attributes, features, or uses.

**Regional and Community Growth**
Due to the minor difference in location between the alignment alternatives from the Spokane River to Hawthorne Road, there are no differences from the FEIS in terms of regional and community growth. Both alignments are held within or adjacent to the existing BNSF railway alignment north to the Francis Avenue/Freya Street interchange. This existing transportation corridor has established a general division between the east and west side.

From Hawthorne Road to Farwell Road, the Preferred Alternative roughly follows existing boundaries between residential and industrial land uses. Between Farwell Road and US 395 at Wandermere, the FEIS Alignment cuts through a rapidly developing residential area which is within the county’s Urban Growth Area. It results in the relocation of approximately 42 homes, as well as the 14 residents of a senior care home. It also has a major impact on proposed development in the area. The Preferred Alternative is aligned closer to the Urban Growth Area boundary in this area, minimizing impact to recent development as well as proposed development, and avoiding impact to the senior care home.

**Community Cohesion**
Between Francis Avenue and Lincoln Road, the Preferred Alternative intrudes into the Morgan Acres Neighborhood, while the FEIS Alignment widens, but maintains the division between the industrial activity on the west side of Freya Avenue and the residential use on the east side. More households will be relocated and more homes will be in proximity to the NSC with the Preferred Alternative than with the FEIS Alignment. The elevated Preferred Alternative will create a physical barrier through this neighborhood. While this neighborhood is outside of the IUGA, the remaining residential land left between Freya Avenue and the NSC, as well as along Lyons Road, would be expected to transition into industrial and commercial use.


**Services**
Temporary disruptions in services within the corridor are expected during construction of the facility. No adverse impact to services is expected once the NSC is operational.

**Pedestrian/Bicyclist Facilities**
Between the Spokane River and US 395 at Wandermere, the FEIS proposed only a pedestrian/bicycle crossing of the NSC and BNSF Railway at the J.J. Hill/Wild Horse Park in the Hillyard area. Continued study and development of the NSC has resulted in the inclusion of a separated, paved pedestrian/bicycle trail along the full-length of this part of the corridor. This provides an alternative transportation mode route connecting the northern metropolitan area of Spokane with the Centennial Trail and downtown.

**Employment**
Table S-2 shows the approximate number of businesses and employees affected by each alternative. Overall, development of the North Spokane Corridor is not expected to have a significant impact on employment.

**Tax Revenue**
Land required for right-of-way would displace some businesses and residences; however, since it is expected that those businesses and residences would relocate to sites within the metropolitan area, no net loss of taxable land is projected.

**Property Values**
Values of residential properties adjacent to the NSC are expected to be impacted to varying degrees. The actual impact will depend upon factors such as housing availability and noise impacts. The marketability of vacant industrial and commercial properties in some areas, such as east of Hillyard, will be enhanced by construction of the NSC and the improved access that will result.

**Residential Relocation**
See Table S-2 for comparison of residential displacements. All qualified displaced residences will be relocated and compensated for under the “Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as Amended.”

**Hazardous Waste**
Between the Spokane River and Lincoln Road, no new or different confirmed or suspected contaminated sites are involved in the Preferred Alternative as compared to the FEIS Alignment. This portion of the corridor has undergone an intrusive investigation performed by an environmental consulting firm and WSDOT personnel. The sites of greatest impact in this part of the corridor are the same for the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative: Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railroad/Hillyard Rail Corridor, Koch Materials, and The Plant. All soils within the Preferred Alternative right-of-way where hazardous materials were suspected were specifically investigated. The remainder of the former rail-corridor was investigated using a planned grid method.
Between Lincoln Road and US 395 at Wandermere, the proposed alignment revisions result in the avoidance of some previously identified contaminated sites; however, some new sites are encountered: Swanson Hay Trucking, Costich Fertilizer Plant, and the Devlin Property. The methodology used in the investigation of the sites within the Preferred Alignment has progressed beyond that used in the FEIS. Following potential hazardous site identification, the field investigations consisted of soil sampling for each parcel.

Table S-2 shows the estimated costs due to hazardous waste remediation. The difference in projected costs due to hazardous waste sites in the NSC corridor is due in part to the further investigation performed since the publication of the FEIS.

**Cultural Resources**

The identification of cultural sites within the proposed corridor included extensive involvement of the Spokane Tribe of Indians (STI). One site in the vicinity was determined to be of cultural significance. The Preferred Alternative was designed to avoid direct impact to this property. Excavation for the roadway adjacent to this site will be monitored by an archaeologist as an extended precaution. Another site of interest will also be monitored by an archaeologist during clearing and excavation for the roadway.

FHWA has concurred with WSDOT’s documented process of compliance with the tribal consultation requirements of CFR 36, prior to the November 1999 revisions to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. WSDOT is now initiating formal consultation with all tribes in the region in order to comply with the new regulations.

**4(f) Properties**

No portion of the recreational 4(f) properties is proposed to be taken or used for this project. None of these properties were found to be impacted by the project’s proximity such that the protected activities, attributes, or features of the property are substantially impaired. Consequently, no take, use, nor constructive use is projected for any of the recreational properties in the project study area.

Eastern Washington University Archaeological and Historical Services determined that no sites investigated within the proposed corridor are likely to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

**Visual Quality**

The main visual quality difference between the alternative alignments is due to the roadway elevation on the northern portion. The FEIS Alignment has a major impact between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere due to the full cloverleaf interchange which is elevated up to 9m (30 ft) above the existing grade. In the Preferred Alternative, the NSC is in a cut as it passes below US 2 and through the Garden City Addition neighborhood.
Important Issues (areas of controversy)

**Air Quality**

Portions of Spokane County continue to be in non-attainment status for carbon monoxide (CO) and particulates 10 microns or less in diameter (PM$_{10}$). The NSC passes through the non-attainment area. It is expected that air quality in Spokane will continue to be a serious issue; however, the NSC does not have adverse CO impacts because it relieves existing traffic congestion.

**Noise**

There are two particular neighborhoods in which noise impacts are increased with the Preferred Alternative as compared with the FEIS Alignment, and in which abatement criteria is not met. Between US 2 and US 395 at Wandermere, the Preferred Alternative passes into a relatively quiet, wooded, low-density suburban neighborhood. Between the Freya Avenue Interchange and Lincoln Road, the Preferred Alternative intrudes further into a semi-rural residential neighborhood. In both of these areas, the relatively low-density of homes raises the cost per resident of noise abatement, and therefore does not meet the standard cost/benefit ("reasonableness") guidelines. WSDOT is committed to investigating all options to provide abatement in these areas, such as the use of lower-cost earthen berms, and/or exceeding the allowable cost per household for mitigation. It is WSDOT’s policy to make final decisions on the construction of noise barriers after final horizontal and vertical alignments are determined and a detailed engineering analysis of the feasibility and reasonability of noise abatement can be made. Additional abatement is being evaluated between Freya Avenue and Lincoln Road (Morgan Acres neighborhood) and between Farwell Road and Perry Street (Garden City Addition neighborhood).

**Property Values**

Residents throughout the corridor expressed concerns about the effect of the project on their property values. WSDOT performed a study to help assess, in a general manner, the potential damage in value to single-family residential properties. The study ("Proximity Study; North Spokane Limited Access Corridor, Spokane, Washington") used a direct market comparison technique to match properties similar in all aspects except for the property’s proximity to a heavily traveled corridor. The findings of the comparison are that housing located adjacent to or near a heavily traveled roadway suffer a loss in value which varies with the value, quality, and condition of the home. Properties selling for $90,000 or less, of fair to average quality, typically could experience a loss in market value from 0% to 5.5%. Homes selling in the range of $90,000 - $185,000, in good condition, have the potential of experiencing a loss in value from 8% to 13%. These variances in selling prices also reflect the typical negotiation range in real estate transactions in general.
Community Cohesion

Between Francis Avenue and Lincoln Road, the Preferred Alternative intrudes into the Morgan Acres Neighborhood, while the FEIS Alignment widens, but maintains the division between the industrial activity on the west side of Freya Avenue and the residential use on the east side. More households will be relocated and more homes will be in proximity to the NSC with the Preferred Alternative than with the FEIS Alignment. Morgan Acres is a unique community, having a semi-rural character adjacent to the city limits, and possessing relatively clear boundaries and strong community identity. The elevated Preferred Alternative will create a physical barrier through this neighborhood. While this neighborhood is outside of the IUGA, the remaining residential land left between Freya Avenue and the NSC, as well as along Lyons Road, would be expected to transition into industrial and commercial use.

Public comment received regarding the selection of the VE North Alignment as the new Preferred Alternative reflect the fact that the published FEIS set up a level of expectation of the eventual location of the NSC. The neighborhoods to the north and east of the Northwood Middle and Farwell Elementary Schools were not included in the alternatives considered in the original EIS process. The FEIS influenced decisions of residents both within and outside of the published route regarding property purchases, sales, and improvements. While the FEIS went through full public process, residents of the Garden City neighborhood and vicinity were outside of the published preferred route. The Garden City residents also point out that the development that is now being avoided by the northern portion of the Preferred Alternative is recent development and even proposed development; activity which had the warning of being within the corridor due to the published FEIS. Comments from residents in these areas express that the neighborhoods impacted by the Preferred Alternative are more established and cohesive, having been in existence approximately thirty years, and therefore will experience greater impact than will the newer homes built within the FEIS Alignment.

Commitment List

The General Commitments associated with this project remain unchanged from the FEIS, pages S-xxviii through S-xxx.

Commitments for the new Preferred Alternative (Spokane River to US 395 at Wandermere) are:

1. The minimum noise impact abatement will be constructed as shown in Table S-3. Additional abatement is being evaluated between Freya Avenue and Lincoln Road (Morgan Acres neighborhood) and between Farwell Road and Perry Street (Garden City Addition neighborhood).
2. WSDOT will construct a separated, paved, pedestrian/bicycle trail between the Spokane River and US 395 at Wandermere within the NSC right-of-way.
3. Per agreement with the Spokane Tribe of Indians, ground disturbing work in the specific areas of Tribal concern will be monitored by Tribal members trained in archaeological procedure, under the supervision of tribal Elders and the tribe’s consulting anthropologist.

Permits required for the NSC are unchanged from the FEIS, as shown on p. S-xxxii.

Preferred Alternative

Upon completion of the preliminary environmental studies and engineering analysis associated with the North, South, and Modified Alternative routes, the VE North alternative was selected for the following primary reasons:

- Fewest overall adverse environmental impacts
- Best overall traffic operations
- Least expensive construction

This Final Supplemental EIS documents the new or different impacts and mitigation associated with the following changes in the proposed alignment as compared to the alignment selected as preferred in the 1997 FEIS.

1. Between the Spokane River and Fairview Avenue, changes are due to further refinements of the location of the BNSF Railway.
2. Between Fairview Avenue and Wellesley Avenue, railroad and NSC mainline locations switched. Wellesley Interchange is redesigned.
3. Between Wellesley Avenue and Francis Avenue, mainline shifted up to 152m (500 ft) to the west.
4. Between Francis Avenue and Parksmith Drive, mainline shifted up to 122m (400 ft) east.
5. Interchange at Parksmith Drive rather than Stoneman Road.
6. Between Parksmith Drive Interchange and US 395 at Wandermere, alignment in entirely new location, and mostly below existing grade, passing under rather than over US 2.
7. Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail provided, generally parallel to roadway between Spokane River and US 395 at Wandermere.
Chapter 1  
**Purpose and Need for SEIS**

**Introduction**

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the North Spokane Freeway (now known as the North Spokane Corridor, NSC) was approved April 3, 1997. The Record of Decision, in which the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) adopted Washington State Department of Transportation’s (WSDOT) recommendation to select the Market/Greene Alternative with the North Option and the I-90 Collector-Distributor System, was signed on November 20, 1997.

The purpose and need for the project, summarized below, remain the same as stated in the FEIS Chapter 1.

The primary overall purpose of this project is to improve transportation safety and mobility through the City of Spokane and Spokane County between Interstate 90, Northeastern Washington, and Canada. The long-range plan for the Spokane region includes several projects intended to add to the development of a total transportation system. A more specific purpose for the action evaluated in this document is to improve the efficiency of the people- and freight-carrying capacity on and between city streets, county roads, and major northside transportation routes, particularly US 2 and US 395.

An evaluation of anticipated growth of the region, economic development objectives, transportation demand, transportation system capacity, transportation mode opportunities, and roadway safety was used to show the need for this project.

- The regional growth projection assumed the most rapid development will continue to occur in the northern suburban and Spokane Valley suburban areas (FEIS, p. 1-2).
- Economic Development elements of the City and County Comprehensive Plans pointed to the potential industrial and commercial development in and around Hillyard (FEIS, p. 1-4 through 1-5).
- The highest increase in traffic volume by the year 2020 is projected to be toward the east side of the city and the Spokane Valley (FEIS, p. 1-6).
- Focusing on the operation of arterial intersections within the study area, transportation system analysis found the existing system to be at or beyond capacity.
- Transportation facilities were found to be deficient in intermodal connections in both public transit and freight movement (interface between rail and truck).
- Existing transportation system capacity status and projected increases in traffic volumes were expected to result in increased accident rates and decreased roadway safety.
Purpose and Need for Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Under State and Federal environmental and transportation guidelines, WSDOT is charged with the responsibility of establishing this new limited access corridor from Interstate 90 to US 395 in the Wandermere vicinity with the least amount of environmental impact possible, while maintaining the overall operational integrity of the facility. A large part of this responsibility includes the continued evaluation of the proposed action as outlined in the FEIS. As the development of this corridor has proceeded with specific design, right-of-way, and construction details, WSDOT evaluated modifications which would potentially reduce adverse impacts associated with the proposal.

A Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) is required when (1) changes to the proposed action would result in significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the EIS; or (2) new information or circumstances relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed action or its impacts would result in significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the EIS. A Supplemental EIS is developed using the same process as the original EIS, except that scoping is not required. (23 CFR Sec. 771.130.)

A Value Engineering (VE) Study is required for any federally funded National Highway System project with an estimated cost of $25 million or more (CFR 23 Part 627). Value Engineering is a systematic process designed to focus on the major issues of a complex project. The primary objective of a VE study is value improvement. The VE process incorporates, to the extent possible, the values of the design engineer, construction engineer, maintenance engineer, contractor, state and federal approval agencies, local agencies, other stakeholders, and the public. Design decisions are formulated from the recommendations of the VE team. (WSDOT Design Manual, Sec. 315.)

Due to requirements of CFR 23 Part 627, WSDOT further examined the roadway alignment from the Spokane River to Hawthorne Road in a VE Study in July 1998. The Francis Avenue and Wellesley Avenue interchange areas were redesigned to minimize impacts on businesses, reduce costs, and improve functionality.

WSDOT then examined the North Option portion of the FEIS Preferred Alignment in light of changed conditions (additional residential development) within that area. In February 1999, a new alignment was presented to the public which was intended to move the facility beyond the recently developing residential community as well as to minimize the visual impact to the surrounding area. A VE Study followed in March 1999, which focused on the segment from Lincoln Road to US 395 at Wandermere. The study group developed and compared a northern alternative, “VE North,” and a southern alternative, “VE South.” The group’s recommendation was to proceed with the VE North Alternative. Public input led WSDOT to continue to compare the VE North, VE South, and a third alternative which was a refined design of the FEIS North Option, called the “Modified FEIS.” By June 1999, sufficient evaluation had been completed to select the VE North alternative.
This Supplemental EIS documents the evaluation of the changed conditions and the alignment and design revisions since the publication of the FEIS. Otherwise, the FEIS stands as the environmental impact evaluation of the selected corridor. The purpose and need for the NSC remains unchanged from the FEIS.

**Study Area Limits**

There are no changes in the termini of the NSC project. The Supplemental EIS covers all portions of the corridor in which changes have been made since the FEIS. The area discussed in this Supplemental EIS is between the Spokane River and US 395 at Wandermere. See **Vicinity Map, Figure 1.1**.

No changes have been proposed for the southernmost segment between I-90 and the Spokane River during this phase. VE studies and further review for refinements will be evaluated for the NSC south of the river and for the collector distributor system. Any changes to the project will be reevaluated for environmental impacts and documented appropriately at that time.
Vicinity Map
Figure 1.1
Chapter 2  Alternatives

This chapter describes the alternatives that have been evaluated since the publication of the FEIS, and explains the process which resulted in the selection of the Preferred Alternative.

Alternatives Considered

From the Spokane River to Francis Avenue:
1. FEIS Market/Greene Alternative (see Figure 2.1)
2. Revised Market/Greene Alternative: generally the same location, at or below existing grade, with interchange redesigns (see Figure 2.2)

From Francis Avenue to Gerlach Road:
1. FEIS Market/Greene Alternative (see Figure 2.1)
2. Revised Market/Greene Alternative: shifted to the east (see Figure 2.2) Parksmith Drive Interchange added, Stoneman Road Interchange deleted

From Hawthorne Rd to US 395 at Wandermere:
1. FEIS North Option with interchange at Stoneman Road (see Figure 2.3).
2. FEIS Modified North Option with interchange at Parksmith Drive. Same alignment as FEIS North Option except US 2 interchange reconfigured from full cloverleaf to diamond with directional ramps (see Figure 2.4)
3. VE South with interchange at Parksmith Drive: This alignment generally follows the FEIS Preferred Alignment to just north of the Kaiser Mead Aluminum plant. At this point, the VE South option proceeds in a more northerly direction, then curves westerly in a depressed section, south of Farwell Road. Paralleling Farwell Road, the alignment continues under US 2 and Pittsburg, Farwell, and Perry Roads in a depressed section, connecting up with the existing US 395 in the vicinity of Wandermere. US 2 is elevated over the new facility and Farwell Road. The intersection of US 2 and Farwell Road is improved to accommodate a single point interchange with US 2 elevated over Farwell Road, eliminating the signal on US 2. Shady Slope Road is elevated over US 2 and connects to Farwell Road at a new signalized intersection. Free-flowing ramps provide for heaviest movements: NSC-north to US 2-north, and US 2-south to NSC-south (see Figure 2.5).
4. VE North with interchange at Parksmith Drive: This alignment also generally follows the FEIS Preferred Alignment to a point just north of the Kaiser Mead Aluminum plant. At this point, VE North option proceeds nearly due north along a Bonneville Power Administration transmission line right-of-way to the vicinity of Farwell Road. Just south of Farwell Road, the alignment curves to the west, passing under both Farwell Road and US 2 in a depressed section. The corridor then follows a northwesterly path to a point that brings it between Winger and Garden Roads. Continuing in a depressed section, the route proceeds westerly to the north of the Wandermere Mall development where it curves northerly, joining the existing US 395
route at the Wandermere bridge over the Little Spokane River. The intersection of US 2 and Farwell Road is improved to accommodate a single point interchange with US 2 elevated over Farwell Road, eliminating the existing signal on US 2. Shady Slope Road is elevated over US 2 and connects to Farwell Road at a new signalized intersection. Free flowing ramps provide for heaviest movements: NSC-north to US 2-north, and US 2-south to NSC-south (see Figure 2.6).
FEIS Market/Greene Alignment
Figure 2.1
Revised Market/Greene Alignment
Figure 2.2
FEIS North Option
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VE North Alignment
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Studies and Coordination

The VE Studies provided the process for consideration and comparison of alternatives, and the selection of the Revised Market/Greene and the VE North as the new Preferred Alignment.

VE Study 1: Spokane River to Lincoln Road

The first Value Engineering (VE) Study for the NSC convened in July 1998, to optimize Francis and Wellesley Avenues access points by developing recommendations for a roadway alignment from the Spokane River to the north that are compatible with the surrounding environment, land uses, and regional transportation plans.

The VE Team generated 65 options that included 22 alignment variations, 17 interchange variations, 10 access variations, and 16 overall project alternatives. The evaluation phase narrowed the list down, with input on hazardous waste, City road plans, BNSF constraints and neighborhood concerns.

The following accepted recommendations of this study formed the “Revised Alignment” between the Spokane River and Lincoln Road

1. East Alignment with Partial Cloverleaf Interchange at Francis Avenue and a three-quarter Diamond Interchange at Freya Street. (Since the time of accepting this recommendation, further traffic analysis due to new land use updates and traffic demand modeling has shown that the single-quadrant partial cloverleaf interchange at Francis will not function at appropriate standards. A two-lane northbound off-ramp was added to the interchange at Freya Street to replace the inadequate partial cloverleaf loop ramp. The two-lane northbound off-ramp functions at an appropriate level of service. See Figure 2.2.)
2. Redesign the Wellesley Avenue Interchange to be a half urban diamond with single quadrant partial clover configuration.
3. Inclusion of proposed Park & Ride Lot locations in coordination with Spokane Transit Authority

VE Study 2: Lincoln Road to US 395 at Wandermere

A second VE Study, in March 1999, focused on the proposed project between Lincoln Road and US 395 at Wandermere. The objectives were to optimize access points and maximize operational flexibility by developing recommendations compatible with the surrounding environment, land uses, and regional transportation plans. The study team included WSDOT staff along with representatives of Mead Schools, Spokane County, Federal Highway Administration, and local neighborhoods. Three residents from the Garden City Addition neighborhood and one from the southeast side of the proposed US 2 interchange participated in the study.

Numerous alignment and interchange configurations were considered in light of the known constraints in the vicinity. Constraints were identified by the team as neighborhoods, schools, environmental mitigation areas, businesses, and public utilities.
A preliminary Noise Impact Analysis, preliminary Biological Assessment, Visual Quality Impact Analysis, information on hazardous waste sites, right-of-way acreage and property values, and contacts with area businesses and utilities, were used to evaluate the proposals. The evaluation phase narrowed down the alternatives, resulting in two alignment options with the greatest potential; the VE South and VE North options. At the conclusion of the VE Study, the VE North option was recommended as the preferred alignment north of Hawthorne Road.

Prior to accepting the VE Study recommendations, WSDOT further developed and evaluated a third option, called the Modified FEIS North Option. The alignment of this alternative followed the FEIS North Option, but reconfigured the interchange with US 2. While the FEIS North Option included a full cloverleaf interchange, the FEIS Modified Alternative used a partial cloverleaf interchange which minimized the interchange footprint. The Modified FEIS North Option, VE South and VE North options were each designed, evaluated, and compared to find the optimum alternative to the FEIS North Option.

The following accepted recommendations from this study formed the Preferred Alternative between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere.
1. Revise the FEIS proposed “future Stoneman Interchange” to a partial cloverleaf interchange in the vicinity of Parksmith Drive and Hawthorne Road.
2. Select the northern alignment as preferred alternative to the “FEIS North Option.”
3. Select a revised design for the US 395 at Wandermere Interchange.

**Public Participation**

Preliminary comparisons of the impacts of the proposed alignment change were made and presented at the following open houses. Public input was received during the open houses and by telephone and mail.
1. February 18, 1999: focusing on the Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermere segment, held at Northwood Middle School, 6-10 pm. with 525 people signing attendance sheets (estimated attendance: 700-1000).
2. February 25, 1999: focusing on the Spokane River to Hawthorne Road segment, held at the Northeast Community Center, 6-8 pm. with 337 people signing attendance sheets.
3. June 30, 1999: focusing on the Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermere segment, held at Mead Middle School, 4-8 pm. with 506 people signing attendance sheets.
4. January 12, 2000: meeting with Hillyard/Bemiss area business owners and operators; held at the Northeast Community Center, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 33 people signing attendance sheet.
5. February 8, 2000: meeting with Garden City and Mead area residents to develop preferred alignment of the pedestrian/bicycle trail in that neighborhood; held at Northwood Middle School, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 32 people signing attendance sheet.

6. February 15, 2000: meeting with Hillyard/Bemiss area residential landowners and occupants; held at the Northeast Community Center, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 84 people signing attendance sheet.

7. February 22, 2000: open house presenting the latest information on alignment and impacts of the Preferred Alternative between the Spokane River and Gerlach Road; held at the Northeast Community Center, 5:00-8:00 pm, with 177 people signing attendance sheet.

8. March 22, 2000: meeting for business owners and operators between Gerlach Road and Wandermere; held at Northwood Middle School, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 16 people signing attendance sheet.

9. April 19, 2000: meeting for residential landowners and occupants between Gerlach Road and Wandermere; held at Northwood Middle School, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 66 people signing attendance sheet.

10. May 24, 2000: open house presenting the latest information on the alignment between the Spokane River and Wandermere; held at Rogers High School, 5:00-8:00 pm, with 127 people signing attendance sheet.

Other opportunities for the public to obtain information and give input on the project are available. Interested individuals may visit the project office, contact the office by letter, phone and e-mail, and access the updated information on the Eastern Region’s web page on the Internet.

The VE Study on the portion of the project north of Lincoln Road included residents from certain neighborhoods in the area, which provided another opportunity for public participation. Three residents from the Garden City Addition neighborhood and one from the southeast side of the proposed US 2 interchange were on this VE Study Team.

WSDOT staff also met with neighborhood groups in order to provide more opportunity to focus on specific localized concerns. Specifics on community meetings and further information on public and agency coordination are found in Chapter 5 of this document.

Table 2.1 presents information, available as of June 10, 1999, which was used to compare the various alternatives following the VE process. The data in this table may be different from the data in Tables S-2 and 4.16, which reflect the further studies and analyses which continued following the selection of the “VE North” alternative.
Table 2.1 Lincoln Road to US 395 Evaluation Matrix, Alternatives to FEIS North Option

Alternative Route Comparison, Lincoln Road to US 395 using information available as of June 10, 1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Modified FEIS North Option</th>
<th>VE North</th>
<th>VE South</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENVIRONMENTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise impacts (&gt; 10 dBA increase after abatement)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Displacements</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Displacements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (displaced jobs)</td>
<td>32-47 jobs displaced</td>
<td>22-30 jobs displaced</td>
<td>26-41 jobs displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Displacements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>no exceedance of NAAQS projected</td>
<td>no exceedance of NAAQS projected</td>
<td>no exceedance of NAAQS projected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual, looking toward facility</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes and Disruptions to Community</td>
<td>divides neighborhood south of Hastings/ Farwell Rd and schools</td>
<td>divides neighborhood east of NSC from schools</td>
<td>divides neighborhood south of Hastings/ Farwell Rd and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools: Farwell Elementary and Northwood Middle School</td>
<td>approx. 700’ from outdoor recreation area; approx. 1300’ from buildings</td>
<td>approx. 1400’ from outdoor recreation area; approx. 900’ from buildings</td>
<td>approx. 400’ from outdoor recreation area; approx. 1100’ from buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural, Historic &amp; Archaeological Resource</td>
<td>none identified</td>
<td>none identified</td>
<td>none identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEOMETRICS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driveability</td>
<td>interchanges spread out over approx. 5000’; potential for wrong-way entrance at ramp terminal</td>
<td>interchange located in one vicinity</td>
<td>interchanges spread out over approx. 4800’; potential for wrong-way entrance at ramp terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Access (County roads affected)</td>
<td>Pittsburg, Shady Slope, Center, Perry, Mead, Farwell</td>
<td>Pittsburg, Shady Slope, Center</td>
<td>Pittsburg, Shady Slope, Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND USE (acres in right-of-way, Francis to US 395)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED COSTS (in millions)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>$30.8</td>
<td>$19.1</td>
<td>$23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering</td>
<td>$18.7</td>
<td>$16.4</td>
<td>$17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$108.9</td>
<td>$105.1</td>
<td>$107.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection of Alignment

Upon completion of the preliminary environmental studies and engineering analysis associated with the North, South, and Modified Alternative routes, the VE North alternative was selected for the following primary reasons:

- Fewest overall adverse environmental impacts
- Best overall traffic operations
- Least expensive construction

This document supplements the FEIS by providing updated information on the affected environment within the study area, and compares the VE North and Revised Market/Greene Alignments to the FEIS Market/Greene and North Option alignments. The VE North and Revised Market/Greene are hereafter referred to as the Preferred Alternative. See Preferred Alternative map, Figure 2.7.

Summary of Differences from FEIS

This Supplemental EIS documents the new or different impacts and mitigation associated with the following changes in the proposed alignment as compared to the FEIS Preferred Alternative.

1. Between the Spokane River and Fairview Avenue, changes are due to further refinements of the location of the BNSF Railway.
2. Between Fairview Avenue and Wellesley, railroad and NSC mainline locations switched. Wellesley Interchange is redesigned.
3. Between Wellesley Avenue and Francis Avenue, mainline shifted up to 152m (500 ft) to the west.
4. Between Francis Avenue and Parksmith Drive, mainline shifted up to 122m (400 ft) east.
5. Interchange at Parksmith Drive rather than Stoneman Road.
6. Between Parksmith Drive Interchange and US 395 at Wandermere, alignment in entirely new location, and mostly below existing grade, passing under rather than over US 2.
7. Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail within NSC right-of-way between Spokane River and US 395 at Wandermere
Preferred Alternative
Figure 2.7
**Access To, From, and Across the NSC**

**Table 2.2 Revised Market/Greene and VE North Alignment Access and/or Grade Separation Locations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Access To, From, and Across NSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upriver Drive crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle Street crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid Avenue crosses over NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Avenue access to/from, and crosses over NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Avenue Interchange eastbound to southbound access to, and under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freya Street Interchange access to/from, and under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Road crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerlach Road crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Street crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parksmith Dr. Interchange access to/from, and under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farwell Road access to/from, and over NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2 Interchange southbound access to, and northbound access from and over NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Slope Road southbound access from, and over NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Street crosses over NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandermere Road crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail Access Across NSC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail Access Across NSC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Garland Avenue Pedestrian/Bicycle bridge over NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Avenue crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Railroad Crossings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Railroad Crossings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BNSF Mainline, vic. Market St. crosses over NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNSF Mainline, vic. Francis Ave. crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNSF Mainline, vic. Hawthorne Rd. crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNSF Kaiser Aluminum spur line crosses under NSC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Costs and Scheduling**

**Proposed Construction Sequence**

**Phase 1 - Four Lanes from Wandermere Vicinity to I-90**

Sections 1 through 6 establish a four lane limited access facility between I-90 and US 395 at Wandermere, which is access controlled from Wandermere Vicinity to 2nd Avenue. In this phase, the northbound alignment will initially carry four lanes of two-way traffic from I-90 to the vicinity of Garland Avenue on the northbound side of the NSC roadway. From the vicinity of Garland Avenue to the vicinity of US 395 at Wandermere, the alignment will carry two northbound and two southbound lanes of divided traffic. City streets will be improved, as well as realignment of the BNSF railroad. Interchanges will be constructed at Wellesley, Francis/Freya, Parksmith, US 2, and Wandermere. A
pedestrian/bicycle trail will be constructed from the Spokane River to the Wandermere vicinity. Park and Ride lots are proposed in the vicinity of Farwell Road/Cherry Street, Freya Street interchange, and Market Street/Haven Street.

**Phase 2 - Full Build Out from I 90 to Wandermere Vic.**

Sections 7 through 9 complete the fully access controlled facility between I-90 and US 395 at Wandermere by constructing the collector-distributor system between the Liberty Park and Sprague Ave. interchanges, the I-90 access connection including the directional ramps to and from I-90, the southbound lanes from Garland Ave. to I-90, and the remaining lanes from Garland Ave. to US 2.

**Background For Sequencing Changes From the FEIS**

As described above, the basic sequence for the NSC is to start by constructing a four lane roadway from I-90 to US 395 at Wandermere that utilizes a partial build of the ultimate roadway. This is a change from the sequence listed in the FEIS which proposes to build completed freeway sections. It was decided that the expense of building complete freeway sections would limit the length of individual sections of roadway and therefore diminish the immediate mobility benefits. Longer limited access sections of roadway will result in greater mobility by allowing motorists to travel further within a limited access corridor for relatively the same amount of funds.

**Cost Summary**

Although the only funding received to date have been state funds, the North Spokane Corridor is eligible for Federal Funding. **Tables 2.3 and 2.4** show costs broken down by phase and section.

**Table 2.3  Phase 1 - Four Lane I-90 to US 395 at Wandermere Vicinity**

*Costs are shown in Year 2000 Millions of Dollars*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Description</th>
<th>Construction Schedule</th>
<th>Prelim. Eng. &amp; Right of Way</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Total Section Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Hawthorne Rd. to US 2</td>
<td>2003-05</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 US 2 to US 395 at Wandermere Vic.</td>
<td>2005-07</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Spokane River to Francis Ave. - City Street Improvements and Railroad Realignment</td>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Francis Ave. to Hawthorne Rd.</td>
<td>2008-10</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>150.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Trent Ave. to Francis Ave.</td>
<td>2010-13</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>136.3</td>
<td>169.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I 90 to Trent Ave.</td>
<td>2013-15</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>103.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Phase 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>158.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>486.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>644.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.4  Phase 2 - Full Build Out I-90 to US 395 at Wandermere Vicinity**

*Costs are shown in Year 2000 Millions of Dollars*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Description</th>
<th>Construction Schedule</th>
<th>Prelim. Eng. &amp; Right of Way</th>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Total Section Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Collector Distributor System</td>
<td>2015-17</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>144.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I-90 to Spokane River Access Connection</td>
<td>2017-22</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>259.9</td>
<td>285.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Spokane River to US 2</td>
<td>2023-24</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal - Phase 2</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>94.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>351.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>446.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total - I-90 to US 395 at Wandermere Vic.</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Preliminary Engineering calculated at 10% of Construction cost. Right of way for sections 8 and 9 acquired under other sections, cost shown is Preliminary Engineering only.
2. Construction cost includes: 6% for Mobilization, 8.1% for Sales Tax, 10% for Construction Engineering, and 5% for Contingencies.
Chapter 3  Affected Environment

This chapter describes the existing conditions within the alignment options.

Biological and Physical Environment

Air Quality

Spokane’s air quality problems are primarily a result of mobile sources, such as automobiles (Spokane Regional Transportation Commission (SRTC), Spokane Regional Transportation Plan Technical Review and Update, December 1998; p. 40). Spokane is in non-attainment for two of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Serious non-attainment for carbon monoxide (CO), and Moderate non-attainment for particulate matter (PM-10). New EPA standards for finer particulate matter (PM-2.5) have recently been established, although Spokane’s compliance status will not be determined until approximately 2002.

An air quality conformity determination analysis has been performed for the update of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The analysis took into account the latest planning assumptions with regard to design, scope, and concept of projects contained in the RTP, as well as population, employment, and land use considerations. The conformity determination finds the RTP conforms to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) by ensuring the projects contained in the plan reduce the mobile source emissions in the non-attainment area to stay below the regional emissions budget established in the SIP.

Since the publication of the FEIS, portions of the North Spokane Corridor have been included in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for project engineering and right-of-way acquisition. Service objectives for this corridor will be set by WSDOT and SRTC using standards for Highways of Statewide Significance. These service objectives will guide the WSDOT review process of proposed development which would use traffic capacity of the NSC.

Noise

The background on noise analysis and noise standards, typical noise levels, and local noise regulations and ordinances, is unchanged from the FEIS (pages 4-13 through 4-16). Land uses and noise sources in the project area are not substantially different from those described in the FEIS (pages 3-7 through 3-8, and pages 4-18 through 4-21). Since publication of the 1997 FEIS there has been some residential in-filling within and near the FEIS Alignment, especially in the area north of US 2 and south of Farwell Road. These land use changes are described in the Land Use section of this chapter.

Noise monitoring was conducted throughout the project area to quantify and update existing noise conditions at representative residential locations adjacent to the Preferred Alternative. Short-term (20-minute) noise monitoring was conducted at 44 locations throughout the project area. In addition to short-term monitoring, long-term monitoring
was conducted at 5 residential locations throughout the proposed alignment. Twelve- to 24-hour recordings were made at each of the five locations.

North of the Spokane River to approximately Francis Avenue, traffic on existing roadways is the predominant source of background noise. Major roadways in this portion of the alignment include Greene Street, Market Street, Euclid Avenue, Wellesley Avenue, and Francis Avenue. North of Francis Avenue the alignment shifts to the west, crossing Freya Street and continuing north. Between Lyons Avenue and Lincoln Road, existing noise levels are relatively low with background sound levels consisting of noise from several industrial facilities on Freya Street. North of Lincoln Road the alignment enters undeveloped open space with no residential receptors near the proposed alignment. Background sound levels in the segment of the alignment are also relatively low.

North of Parksmith Drive, the alignment parallels the west side of the Mead Royale Mobile Home Park. Existing sound levels in this segment of the alignment are relatively low with sounds from the Kaiser Aluminum facility audible in the background.

North of the Mead Royale Mobile Home Park the alignment turns to the west, crossing Farwell Road and US 2. Near the junction of US 2 and Shady Slope Road, residences are subject to traffic noise from US 2. West of Shady Slope Road the alignment enters an undeveloped area between Winger Street and Garden Avenue, characterized by relatively low sound levels. West of Pittsburgh Street the alignment enters undeveloped open space before connecting with US 395 at Wandermere.

**Energy**

The affected environment in terms of energy is unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-34.

**Geology and Soils**

The affected environment in terms of geology and soils, described in the FEIS, p. 4-36 through 4-43, is updated as follows.

As mandated by GMA, Spokane County identified critical areas for the protection of wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat, and geologically hazardous areas. Geologically hazardous areas include both erosion and landslide hazard, determined by slope, geologic formation, soil type, hydraulic factors, existence of uncompacted fill and/or instability due to stream dynamics. The Critical Areas Ordinance was adopted in 1996. Soils designated as geologic hazards are encountered within the Preferred Alternative alignment as follows.

- Between Lincoln Road and Hawthorne Road, east side: erodible soils, Latah Formation
- Between US 2 and US 395, north side: erodible soils, alluvium
- Along Deadman Creek, at US 2 Interchange: erodible soils

**See Geology and Soils Map, Figure 3.1 and Geologic Hazards Map, Figure 3.2.**
Waterways and Hydrological Systems
The affected environment in terms of waterways and hydrological systems is unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-44 through 4-50, and 4-52 with the following addition. Both alternatives propose widening of US 2 at the crossing of Deadman Creek. This was not described in the FEIS. Deadman Creek is a tributary of the Little Spokane River, draining an area of approximately 245.3 square kilometers (94.7 square miles) at US 2 crossing. The flow at this point is estimated at 0.3 cubic meters (9 cubic feet) per second, with approximately one half of this volume being contributed by the cooling water drain pipe from the Kaiser Mead plant.

See Waterways and Hydrological Systems Map, Figure 3.3.

Flood Plains
The affected environment in terms of flood plain is described in the FEIS, p. 4-54 through 4-55, with the following addition. Additional flood plain is encountered in both the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative at Deadman Creek. See Flood Plain and Shorelines Map, Figure 3.4.

Shorelines
The affected environment in terms of shorelines is described in the FEIS, p. 4-93, with the following addition.
The FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative encounter the shoreline of Deadman Creek in the vicinity of US 2. The Preferred Alternative affects this area due to the dual lane ramps connecting the NSC to US 2. The FEIS Alignment proposes relocation and widening of US 2 due to the full cloverleaf interchange. Deadman Creek is designated “Pastoral” in the Spokane County Shoreline Master Plan.

Water Quality
The affected environment in terms of water quality is unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-59 through 4-61. See Storm Water Zones Map, Figure 3.5.

Wetlands
The affected environment in terms of wetlands is described in the FEIS, p. 4-75 through 4-76, with the following additions. Three additional wetlands have been identified within the proposed right-of-way for both the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative. The first two are a result of two independent springs in the Wandermere area. They are not hydrologically connected to each other. All three of these wetlands are over the Spokane-Rathdrum Aquifer. Due to the distance from these wetlands, the Preferred Alternative will not influence the hydrology nor measurably affect the development or continued existence of these wetlands.
1. An approximately 0.2 hectare (.5 acre) wetland adjacent to US 395 on the east side is described as Palustrine, Forested, Broad-leaved Deciduous, Permanently Flooded wetland (PFO1H). The source spring is within this wetland. This wetland is a Category II wetland as defined by the Washington Department of Ecology Rating System for Eastern Washington. Emerging from the wetland is a small Type 5
stream, as defined by the Spokane County Critical Areas Ordinance, which flows into the Little Spokane River.

2. An approximately 0.2 hectare (0.5 acre) wetland adjacent to Wandermere Road is described as Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Permanently Flooded wetland (PEM1H). This wetland is a Category III wetland as defined by the Washington Department of Ecology Rating System for Eastern Washington. The spring is within the wetlands. This wetland has developed since the construction of the present Wandermere Road in 1993. It is isolated from other wetlands or riparian areas, and is not connected by surface waters at any time during the year. There is no surface outlet from this wetland.

3. An approximately 4.5 hectare (10 acre) wetland is associated with Deadman Creek where US 2 crosses at MP 296.5. It is described as Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded wetland (PSS1C). This wetland is a Category II wetland as defined by the Washington Department of Ecology Rating System for Eastern Washington.

All three of these wetland areas have been investigated several times during the growing season for Ute ladies’-tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*) and Water Howellia (*Howellia aquartilis*). These species have not been found in or near any of these wetlands. Habitat for either species is lacking or marginal at best in these wetlands.

See Wetlands Map, Figure 3.6.
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**Wildlife, Fisheries, and Vegetation**

Neither the City of Spokane nor Spokane County have identified sensitive wildlife habitat or migratory routes under the Growth Management Act within the Preferred Alternative alignment. No fisheries exist in the vicinity of the study area.

The affected environment of the FEIS Preferred Alignment in terms of wildlife, fisheries, and vegetation is described in the FEIS, pages 4-78 through 4-81, although the Deadman Creek area is not included. The design of the full cloverleaf interchange shown in the FEIS Alignment has not been well defined. As the alternative alignments were developed, the Deadman Creek area and associated wetlands are identified as part of the affected environment for both the FEIS Alignment and Preferred Alternative. Deadman Creek in the vicinity of US 2 includes wetlands, riparian habitat and open water habitat. The affected environment for the Preferred Alternative is summarized below.

**Wildlife**

Wildlife found within the corridor of the proposed alignment is more numerous than might be expected. Development on the north side of Spokane has accelerated with the good economy in the last few years. The loss of forested areas displaces the animals that use and depend on this type of habitat.

Coyotes (*Canis latrans*) are found thriving in suburban environments. Their predation of mice, voles, ground squirrels, and other rodents keeps these populations in balance. Raccoons (*Procyon lotor*) occur along the streams in this area and their habitat will not be measurably affected by the construction of the NSC. Other large mammals often seen in this area include White-tail deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) and an occasional Mule deer (*O. Hemionus*). Rarely seen are Black bear (*Ursus americanus*) and Moose (*Alces alces*). The Bobcat (*Lynx rufus*) frequents the riparian zones along the streams and around the wetlands of this portion of Spokane County. These creatures are secretive and not often observed. Their presence is reaffirmed most often after a snow fall and their tracks are easily discerned. The appearance of bears and moose are often the result of traveling adolescent individuals that have been expelled from their home range by the adults of the species.

Many bird species inhabit this portion of Spokane County. Evergreen forested areas attract birds because of the often dense vegetation and cover available in the canopy as well as on the ground. Perching birds of the Order *Passeriformes* far outnumber the other birds found in this region. A sampling of these species includes larks, swallows, jays, magpies, crows, chickadees, nuthatches, wrens, bluebirds, orioles, grosbeaks, and sparrows.

Woodpeckers, swifts, hummingbirds, pigeons, doves, quail, pheasants, and grouse which are included in other bird Orders also are found along the NSC. Vultures, hawks, and falcons of the Order *Falconiformes* may also be observed occasionally in or near this area. Wintering Bald eagles are annual visitors to this portion of the Inland Northwest.
Migratory waterfowl use the streams and wetlands in the area for pairing, nesting, and brooding. The alignment of the NSC will not impact the migratory waterfowl to a degree that would cause harm or a loss in habitat. These species readily adapt to suburban and even city life, especially where humans feed them.

The riparian zone associated with Deadman Creek is valuable to wildlife, including some of those listed under the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife’s Priority Species List. Great Blue Herons are often observed on Deadman Creek near the US 2 crossing. The small (< 0.2 hectare [½ acre]) spring-fed wetland on the right side of the old highway at Wandermere contains many aquatic plant species although not in large concentrations. A population of fish which appear to be Redside shiners (*Richardsonius balteatus*) is present in this wetland and appear to be thriving. Frogs occupy this wetland and are an indication that the water and area around the wetland has not been contaminated. Impacts to this wetland can be avoided during the design process.

The stream running through the riparian zone across the highway to the west and south of this wetland feeds the lake at the Wandermere Golf Course. It runs the year around and provides habitat for birds and small mammals and acts as a corridor for travel.

The construction of the NSC through the forested suburban area of this portion of Spokane County will reduce the available habitat for the wildlife presently occupying this portion of the NSC. It will not eliminate or threaten the existence or viability of any of these species.

**Vegetation**

The dominant tree species occurring within the prospective alignment is (*Pinus ponderosa*) Ponderosa Pine. Other trees found in the area in varying numbers and density are (*Ulmus pumila*) Chinese Elm, (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*) Douglas Fir, (*Populous spp.*) poplars, (*Salix spp.*) willows, (*Populous tremuloides*) Black Cottonwood, and others.

Dominant shrubs found in the area are (*Cornus stolonifera*) Red-Osier Dogwood, (*Crataegus douglasii*) Douglas Hawthorn, (*Physocarpus malvaceus*) Mallow Ninebark, (*Philadelphus lewisii*) Mock Orange, and within the developed areas many different exotic ornamentals.

A native grass found in limited areas is (*Agropyron spicatum*) Bluebunch Wheatgrass. Most of the entire area is infested with (*Centura diffusa*) Diffuse Knapweed, and (*Centura repens*) Russian Knapweed. Ground cover is sparse over most of the terrain due to the sandy dry soil. The forested areas have a “duff” thickness of from three to six inches made up of the pine needles accumulating under the canopy. Small sections of forested areas have very dense stands of young stunted trees. There are no “old growth” stands of pine in this area.
Reed Canarygrass is found along the riparian zones and in some of the upland areas as well. This invasive plant thrives in many diverse habitats and provides nesting and cover for many species of mammals and birds. Cheatgrass is also found most everywhere to some degree within the NSC.

Slopes within the riparian zone of Deadman Creek are dominated by pine, fir, and cottonwood. The flood plain and stream banks are vegetated with hawthorne, willow, snowberry, and red osier dogwood.

The small (≤ 0.2 hectare [ ½ acre]) spring-fed wetland on the right side of the old highway at Wandermere contains Broadleaf cattail as the dominant plant within the waterline. Black Cottonwood and several species of willow are the dominant woody plants within the wetted perimeter. The water in this wetland is very clean and many aquatic plant species are present though not in large concentrations. The riparian zone across the highway to the west and south of this wetland contains most of the previously mentioned plant species.

Social/Economic Environment

Land Use

The Board of County Commissioners adopted the current Spokane County Comprehensive Plan in December 1990. Due to population size and growth rate, Spokane County became subject to the Growth Management Act (GMA) in 1993. Both the City and County are in the process of developing land use plans and comprehensive plans under the requirements of the GMA. At the time the FEIS was written, the projected date for completion of the City and County Comprehensive Plans was 1998; the current projection for the completion is Winter 2000/Spring 2001. (Comprehensive Plan Maps, or Generalized Land Use Maps, are unchanged from the FEIS, pages 4-89 through 4-91.) Meanwhile, the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) is close to completion of an updated Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The RTP serves as the 6-year transportation plan for WSDOT as well as the City and County. The jurisdictions will be required to make their land use and transportation elements consistent with the RTP.

The Washington State Growth Management Act requires Spokane County to establish an Urban Growth Area which contains sufficient land and densities to accommodate the Governor’s Office of Financial Management (OFM) 20-year population projection. Spokane County adopted an Interim Urban Growth Area (IUGA) on April 7, 1997. The purpose of the IUGA is to contain the higher density residential development and commercial uses within an area well supported with public facilities and services. Both the FEIS Alternative and the Preferred Alternative are within the IUGA. Planning for population accommodation requires land capacity calculation. Estimates of land capacity
done by the county reflect the amount of land necessarily dedicated to public facilities. The County has accounted for the NSC land area in its land capacity estimates within the IUGA. See IUGA Map, Figure 3.7.

Zoning

Specific changes in zoning and land use have taken place since the publication of the FEIS within the northern portion of the FEIS Alignment. These changes resulted in increased impacts in residential relocations. There have been approximately 20 additional homes and a 14-unit senior care residential facility built within the FEIS Preferred alignment, between US 2 and Farwell Road. The resulting impacts are specifically described in Chapter 4, “Industrial Land Businesses,” “Residential,” and “Relocation” sections.

Interim zoning regulations have been established in conjunction with the IUGA. Zoning designations outside of the IUGA are now overridden by a restriction of 2 hectare (5 acre) minimum lot size. A majority of the study area is outside of the IUGA and therefore subject to this restriction. The area between SR 2 and US 395 is within the IUGA, and maintains its zoning designations.

The following individual parcel zoning changes have occurred within the study area since the publication of the FEIS. See Zoning Map, Figure 3.8.

1. Parcel on east side of Freya Avenue between Wilding and Lincoln Roads. Approximately one acre rezoned from SRR-5 to I-2, and developed with roof truss manufacturing business. The FEIS Alignment passes through this parcel; the Preferred Alternative Alignment passes approximately 91.4m (300 ft) to the east, avoiding this parcel and direct impact to the business.

2. Parcel on south side of Hastings Road, north of Mead Road and west of Pittsburg Street. Approximately 1.5 hectare (3.8 acre) site rezoned from UR-3.5 to UR-22, including preliminary site plan approval for “Aspen Meadows” 82-unit assisted living facility. The FEIS Alignment impacts this parcel; the Preferred Alternative Alignment is approximately 0.8 km (½ mile) to the north and avoids impact to this parcel.
**Industrial Land/ Businesses and Employment**

General conditions within the study area have not changed since the FEIS in terms of industrial land, business, and employment.

There are three new businesses within the FEIS Alignment since the FEIS was published:
1. Puget Sound Casket Company, Greene Street
2. Building America, wood roof truss manufacturer, Freya Street
3. Willow Grove, 14-unit senior care home, Mead Street

One business has moved out of the FEIS Alignment since the FEIS was published; Wismer-Martin headquarters. This building, located at US 2 and Farwell Road, has been purchased by the Mead School District and is now used as the District Administration Office. Direct impact to this building is avoided by the Preferred Alternative.

**Employment**

Total employment in Spokane grew by 42.5% between 1980 and 1998, from 139,400 to 198,600. In the non-agricultural sector, growth totaled 49%, from 127,700 to 190,300. The leading employment sector is services (31%), followed by wholesale/retail (25%) (WA State Employment Security Department, Labor Market & Economic Analysis).

Table 3.1 shows the top 10 employers in Spokane County. Only one, Kaiser Aluminum, is within the study area. The impact to this business is reduced by the Preferred Alternative compared to the FEIS Alignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Employers</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairchild Air Force Base</td>
<td>Military</td>
<td>5,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane School District 81</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart Hospital</td>
<td>Health Care Services</td>
<td>2,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Aluminum</td>
<td>Aluminum products</td>
<td>2,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Washington</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Spokane</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>2,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Health Services</td>
<td>Health Care Services</td>
<td>1,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Federal Government</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodale &amp; Barbieri</td>
<td>Hospitality Services</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Residential**

An apartment complex, opened in the spring of 1997 on the north bank of the Spokane River along Greene Street, changes the affected environment for both the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative. It was built within the approved, published FEIS alignment, and the Preferred Alternative is not different in this area. Spokane Neighborhood Action Program manages the 11-unit apartment complex, which was built
with State Housing Trust Funds and Federal Home Funds. The apartments house families with household incomes less than 50% of the county median income.

Between Francis and Lincoln Road, the NSC passes through a neighborhood known as Morgan Acres. It is zoned Semi-Rural Residential, which contains single-family homes and mobile homes on lots of about 0.4 hectare (one acre). This zoning category allows three large animals per acre, and several lots include horses, along with barns or stables. One lot within this neighborhood, located on Freya Street, has recently been rezoned to Light Industrial and has been developed with a roof truss manufacturing business. The residential neighborhood is confined between Freya Street on the west and the slopes of foothills on the east. In this area, Freya Street is a division between the residential land use to the east and the railroads, business, and industry to the west.

From Lincoln Road to Fairview Road is rural land, zoned for general agriculture, with very sparse residences. There is no residential use between Fairview Road and Hawthorne Road.

The residential area within the northern portion of the FEIS Alignment has continued to develop since the FEIS was published, with the addition of approximately 20 single family homes and three duplexes. While this area, known generally as Forest Glen, is zoned UR 3.5 (Urban Residential, permitting up to 1.4 units per hectare [3.5 units per acre]), it has been developed at roughly half of the allowed density. A unique aspect of this growth is the relative concentration of senior care housing. Since the FEIS was produced, a 14-unit senior care residence has been opened and a 82-unit retirement community has received preliminary approval, both within the FEIS Alignment. Construction of the 14-unit senior care residence, located on Mead Road between US 2 and Hastings Road, was complete in July 1995. The facility opened in September 1995, and currently has 14 residents. The proposed 82-unit facility is located at the corner of Perry Road and Hastings Road.

Between Farwell Road and US 395 at Wandermere, the Preferred Alternative is up to 0.8 km (½ mile) to the north of the FEIS Alignment. Therefore, entirely different neighborhoods are in the affected environment of the proposed alignment. The Garden City and Garden City Addition neighborhoods as well as other homes near Shady Slope Road and US 2 are within the proposed revised project area, while the FEIS document showed these homes were outside of the project impact area. The Garden City neighborhood is located north of US 2 and east of Shady Slope Road. This area is developed at approximately the maximum density of 1.4 units per hectare (3.5 units per acre). The neighborhood on the west side of Shady Slope Road is known as Garden City Addition. Although the zoning here also permits 1.4 units per hectare (3.5 units per acre), this area features single family homes on mostly wooded lots of one to three acres. The residential areas within the Preferred Alternative contain little recent construction.
Neighborhoods

The neighborhoods recognized by the City Neighborhood Council program which the alignments pass through are Bemiss, East Central, Chief Garry Park, and Hillyard. Some Neighborhood Council boundaries within the City of Spokane have been revised since the information was provided in the FEIS. The area on the west side of Market/Greene Streets from the Spokane River to Francis Avenue is now Bemiss Neighborhood. The area on the east side of Market/Greene Streets in this segment is not part of a neighborhood council.

See Neighborhood Councils Map, Figure 3.9.

Existing Neighborhood Specific Plans, as described in the FEIS, p. 4-92, are currently not in effect while the City is undergoing the Comprehensive Plan Update process. Once the City’s Comprehensive Plan is completed, the neighborhood plans will be rewritten.

The following Neighborhood Associations, outside of the City, are in the study area:
Citizens for Neighborhood Preservation (Hawthorne Road to Farwell/Hastings Road)
Friends of Little Spokane River (Little Spokane watershed)
Garden City/Mead Coalition (north of Farwell Road, US 2 vicinity)

See Chapter 5 of this document for a complete discussion of public involvement.
Regional and Community Growth

Regional and community growth background is unchanged from FEIS, pages 4-104 through 4-105, excepting the following updated information.

Population

The population information in the FEIS is updated, as taken from the Spokane Regional Transportation Plan Technical Review and Update (SRTC, December 1998).

The Spokane Metropolitan Area is the second largest in Washington State with a 1998 population estimate of 410,900 people (US Census, WA State Office of Financial Management). This represents a 16 percent increase during the past ten year period and nearly reaches the Office of Financial Management’s (OFM) forecasts prepared in 1995 for the year 2010. The City of Spokane is also the second largest city in Washington State with a 1998 estimated population of 188,300. The majority of growth in the metropolitan area has occurred in the unincorporated areas of Spokane County, such as north Spokane (Mead/Colbert) and the Spokane Valley east of the City of Spokane (shown in Table 3.2). According to population forecast estimates from OFM that are being used by local jurisdictions for comprehensive planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) (Table 3.3), Spokane County is expected to have 558,044 people by the year 2020 (Table 3.4).

### Table 3.2 Spokane County Population Growth 1994-1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Other Incorporated</th>
<th>Unincorporated County</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>185,600</td>
<td>205,946</td>
<td>186,054</td>
<td>392,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>188,800</td>
<td>209,794</td>
<td>191,406</td>
<td>401,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>187,700</td>
<td>209,456</td>
<td>197,044</td>
<td>406,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>188,300</td>
<td>210,812</td>
<td>199,088</td>
<td>409,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>188,300</td>
<td>211,413</td>
<td>199,487</td>
<td>410,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>414,500 est.*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 3.3 Total Population Projections For Spokane County 2000-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>431,569</td>
<td>423,347</td>
<td>415,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>466,681</td>
<td>449,063</td>
<td>433,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>504,723</td>
<td>476,419</td>
<td>451,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>551,851</td>
<td>510,971</td>
<td>475,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>603,298</td>
<td>547,959</td>
<td>500,442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 3.4 Population Allocation Forecasts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Cohesion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The affected environment in terms of community cohesion is described in the FEIS, pages 4-105 through 4-109.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups and Transportation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>According to the 1990 Census information, which is the most recent demographic data, the median age in Spokane is 33 years, with the largest group in the 25 to 44 year old age range. This group is typically the most likely to use alternative transportation for commuting and environmental reasons. The second largest age group is the 5 to 17 years old. This group represents an increase in potential for using alternative modes of transportation because of awareness of public education and outreach programs related to recycling, air quality, and water quality issues facing the Spokane area. The third group is the aging population, which is continuing to grow at a higher than average rate. It is this group that has the highest potential for needing transportation assistance, as their ability to drive or use regular transit service diminishes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the 1st quarter of 1999, the relative cost of housing in the City was 113.4% of the national average on a weighted scale. The Median selling price for a single family home during this period was $104,900; the average selling price was over $116,450. The overall apartment vacancy rate has shown signs of decline from recent peaks. The March 1999 rate was 7.68%, while it was 9.00% for the two previous years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td>246,661</td>
<td>264,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
<td>4,783</td>
<td>5,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
<td>11,235</td>
<td>12,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>5,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latah</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
<td>3,943</td>
<td>4,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwood</td>
<td>1,826</td>
<td>1,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockford</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spangle</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>243,694</td>
<td>261,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waverly</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>520,378</td>
<td>558,044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GMA population Allocation Committee, Final Report Approved April 19, 1996
Parks and Recreation

There are no new or different parks from the FEIS (pages 4-109 through 4-117) within the affected environment. Changes in impacts to these parks due to the proposed alignment change are described in Chapter 4 of this document. See Recreational Facilities Map, Figure 3.10.

Farmland

Under the Growth Management Act, which became effective in Spokane County in 1993, Spokane County was required to identify agricultural resource land. No agricultural resource land was identified within any alternative alignment of the project corridor.

Approximately 4.5 hectares (11 acres) of land within the proposed corridor is zoned General Agriculture, although this land does not contain designated prime farmland soils. Roughly 4.5 hectares (11 acres) of prime farmland soil also exists within the corridor, along Market Street just south of Gerlach Road, although this area is zoned Heavy Industrial (I-3) and Semi-Rural Residential (SRR-5). The current land use conforms with zoning and with the Spokane County Comprehensive Plan. Natural Resources Conservation Service, which implements the Farmland Protection Policy Act, has made the interpretation that this area is exempt from the regulation due to current zoning and land use.

Farmland Protection Policy Act (FFPA), 7 USC 4202, Rules, 7 CFR Part 658, Sec. 403.4, Exempted Conversion and Farmland Exclusions:
(c) Lands that are already in or committed to urban development

See Prime Farmland Soils Map, Figure 3.11.
**Services**

The affected environment in terms of services is unchanged from the FEIS (pages 4-120 through 4-133) with the following additions.

**Religious and Social Institutions**

One new religious institution has been identified within the study area since the FEIS was published. The Solid Rock Christian Center is located on the southeast corner of Bridgeport Avenue and Haven Street. It is not within the proposed right-of-way for either alternative. **See Religious and Social Services Map, Figure 3.12.**

**Water and Sewer**

Since the FEIS was published, an additional water supply well has been located near Helena Street and Hastings Road, which falls within the FEIS Alignment. This well was established by the Spokane County Water District No. 3 in 1996, at a cost of $700,000. The wellhead protection zone is a 30.5m (100 ft) radius from the well, which precludes road construction and stormwater disposal. **See Water Well Map, Figure 3.13.**

A new sewer interceptor was placed in Hastings Road in 1995, and an extension from the sewer in Wandermere Road was built, both with area developer connection agreements.

**Major Utilities**

There are no changes from the FEIS, except that Washington Water Power (WWP) has changed its name to Avista Utilities. **See Utilities Map, Figure 3.14.**
**Transportation**

**Pedestrian and Bicyclist Facilities**

The full background and existing conditions of pedestrian and bicyclist facilities are contained in the FEIS, p. 4-131 through 4-133. While the FEIS proposed specific enhancements of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, this aspect of the project has expanded considerably to incorporate a separate paved pathway the full length of the corridor.

**County Urban Connectors**

Spokane County’s transportation division is currently developing an Urban Connector plan, consisting of a network of arterials providing critical connections around the metropolitan area. The NSC is included in the plan as a major link in the network. Two of the proposed connectors intersect with the NSC. The Northeast Urban Connector would intersect with the Preferred Alternative at Farwell Road, connecting US 395, US 2, and Bruce Road to the east. Another proposed connector, aligned with Bigelow Gulch Road, would intersect with the NSC at Francis Avenue. (See County Urban Connectors Map, Figure 3.15.)

**Northside Arterial**

Spokane County has decided against building the previously proposed Northside Arterial, between US 395 and Market Street. The project is not currently identified in the Regional Transportation Plan, and was not included in the modeling for the NSC Preferred Alternative.

**City of Spokane Road Projects**

The City of Spokane has one current project within the limits of the NSC:
- Euclid Avenue improvements from Market Street to the vicinity of Freya Street. This project has no impacts on the NSC and is not impacted by the NSC project.

**Public Transit**

The only existing form of public or mass transit in the Spokane Metropolitan area is bus service provided by the Spokane Transit Authority (STA). Service area and routes of the STA have changed since the FEIS was published. Fixed and flexible route bus service was expanded in September 1998 into the Mead area in response to petition by area residents. Prior to the expansion, the northern limit of service in this area was Lincoln Road. Wandermere was served by a route to the west of US 395. The new bus route follows Market Street north and then Farwell/Hastings Road west to Wandermere, on an hourly basis from 6 am to 6 pm. There are additional areas along this route that are served by request ("flex service"). A Park & Ride lot is located at the intersection of Hastings Road and Mayfair Road. See STA Service Map, Figure 3.16.
WSDOT continues to coordinate with STA on the proposed park and ride sites within or affected by the NSC corridor:

1. US 395/ Hatch Road: as a possible replacement site for the existing Hastings Road Park and Ride lot located at Hastings and Mayfair Roads.
2. NSC/ US 2: on the south side of Farwell Road east of Cherry Street.
3. NSC/ Francis Avenue: on the east side of Freya Street, on the northeast corner of Freya Street and Wilding Road.
4. NSC/ Wellesley Avenue: on the east side of Market Street, adjacent to the junction of Haven and Market Street.
Historic and Archaeological Sites

Prior to the recent revisions of CFR 36 Part 800 (Protection of Historic Properties), WSDOT had undertaken formal consultation with the Spokane Tribe of Indians (STI). As the alternative alignments were being evaluated, further consultation with Native American tribes of the area revealed two sites of possible interest: one located on a promontory between Lincoln Road and Hawthorne Road, and the other in a sloping field bounded by Fairview and Piper Roads. The first site has been identified as a significant spiritual site associated with the Spokane and Coeur d’Alene Tribes. WSDOT has responded by revising the location of the NSC at this location to avoid direct impact to this site. The second site was investigated, and no evidence of archaeological or cultural value was found. This process is described in Chapter 4.

Hazardous Waste Sites

There are four additional properties within the Preferred Alternative which are either confirmed or suspected to have hazardous materials impacts. Previous uses of these sites necessitated an intrusive investigation of these parcels. These sites are introduced in Table 3.5, and an overview of the investigation results is presented in Chapter 4 of this SEIS.

Table 3.5 Additional Confirmed or Suspected Hazardous Sites in Preferred Alternative corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Affected Media</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wilson Landfill (owner: Raines)</td>
<td>Lot 25 S15 T26N R43E SW ¼</td>
<td>Soil: constr./demo. landfill</td>
<td>closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Swanson Hay Co. Trucking</td>
<td>Lot 38 S15 T26N R43E NW ¼</td>
<td>Soil: petroleum, metals</td>
<td>operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>former fertilizer mfg. Plant (owner: Costich)</td>
<td>Lots 60A&amp;B S15 T26N R43E NW ¼</td>
<td>Soil: fertilizer</td>
<td>closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Devlin Property</td>
<td>Lots 113-122 except 119 S4 T26N R43E S ½</td>
<td>Soil: alleged dumping</td>
<td>operational</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Preferred Alternative also avoids eight confirmed or suspected sites in the area between Lincoln Road and US 395 at Wandermere. The comparison of impacts is in Chapter 4 of this SEIS.
Chapter 4  Environmental Consequences

This chapter presents the environmental impacts and associated mitigation of the proposed Preferred Alternative as compared to the impacts and mitigation of the FEIS Alignment.

Construction Activity Impacts and Mitigation

The impacts and mitigation associated with the construction activities for this project are covered in, and are unchanged from, the FEIS. For this information please refer to the FEIS, p. 4-248 through 4-276.

All impacts and mitigation described in this chapter refer to operational impacts of the project.

Biological and Physical Impacts

Air Quality

As a Serious Non-Attainment area for carbon monoxide (CO) pollution, Spokane must ensure that it can meet, or exceed, the NAAQS by December 31, 2000. This commitment is demonstrated through the development of a Serious CO State Implementation Plan (SIP). Transportation plans, programs, and projects, such as the NSC, must conform to the air quality goals of the SIP by not preventing the attainment of the NAAQS. From a regional perspective, SRTC has reviewed the NSC for consistency with the SIP and has found the project to be conforming to the SIP for attaining the NAAQS in the Spokane Non-Attainment Area.

The NSC, because of its scope and cost, has a relatively long timeline for construction, with phases opening at various times during an indeterminate construction period due to the uncertainty of funding. WSDOT recognizes that as phases are implemented additional project-level air quality analysis will be required to ensure that each phase of the NSC will not create a new exceedance nor exacerbate an existing exceedance of the NAAQS CO pollution levels at intersections impacted by the NSC. Future air quality analysis will include any refinements in methodologies, additional requirements in the State Implementation Plan, improved data on changing land use patterns evolving from the development of local comprehensive plans, and better definition of projects based on actual funding.

An air quality analysis of the NSC Preferred Alternative was conducted to ensure that construction of the facility would not be detrimental to the achievement of air quality standards. The methodology used to evaluate CO conformity for the NSC was developed in consultation with EPA, FHWA, and SRTC. The methodology developed provides a
The screening and ranking of intersections by 2020 total intersection approach volume resulted in a hotspot air quality analysis being conducted for the following three locations:
(1) Francis Ave./Market St., (2) US2/SR206, and (3) Wellesley Ave./Market St.
All three locations are existing intersections which experience significant traffic impacts as a result of construction of the NSC. Therefore, air quality analysis for each location was done for 1999, 2010, and 2020.

In addition to ranking intersections by approach volume, they were also ranked by 2020 level of service (LOS). The three intersections exhibiting the poorest LOS were:
(1) US2/SR206, (2) Illinois Ave./Market St., and (3) Francis Ave./Market St.

**Impacts**

The following table presents the results of air quality modeling for the three heaviest volume intersections. CAL3QHC analysis indicates that none of the locations exceeds the NAAQS threshold in the forecast years of 2010 and 2020 for either build or no-build conditions. The analysis shows that the Francis Ave./Market St. intersection exceeds the 9 ppm standard in the base year (1999). The 2010 and 2020 analyses for that location demonstrate that the construction of the NSC does not exacerbate the modeled exceedance of the NAAQS at that location. Therefore, this project conforms to the SIP.

**Table 4.1 Modeled Carbon Monoxide Levels, 1999, 2010, 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>CO Concentrations (ppm)</th>
<th>1999 Base</th>
<th>2010 Build</th>
<th>2020 Build</th>
<th>2020 No-Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francis Ave./Market St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.80</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2/SR 206</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave./Market St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to concern expressed by the Garden City area community regarding the specific air quality impact to Farwell Elementary and Northwood Middle School, WSDOT Air Quality specialists performed an additional, site-specific analysis. The CO
emissions were modeled at the school sites, at the outdoor recreation area closest to US 2, which would give the worst case scenario. The results are listed below, and show CO values well below the NAAQS threshold.

**Table 4.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>One Hour Average (ppm)</th>
<th>Eight Hour Average (ppm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mitigation**

No air quality impact mitigation is required or proposed. There is no change from the FEIS, p. 4-13.

**Noise**

This section of the SEIS updates information contained in the North Spokane Freeway Final EIS for the FEIS Alignment and summarizes the supplemental noise impact analysis for the Preferred Alternative. Background information on the nature and measurement of noise, local noise regulations and ordinances, and the method of analysis are unchanged from the FEIS (pages 4-13 through 4-15).

**Impacts**

A revised noise impact analysis has been prepared for this SEIS, reflecting alignment changes in the FEIS corridor and new or different impacts resulting from the Preferred Alternative. A traffic noise impact occurs when a predicted traffic noise level approaches or exceeds the noise abatement criteria (67 dBA for residences, schools, churches, recreations areas, playgrounds, parks, motels, hotels, libraries, and hospitals), or when the predicted traffic noise level substantially exceeds the existing noise level. As defined by WSDOT, a noise level within 1 dBA of the noise abatement criteria (NAC) is considered to approach the NAC, and a 10 dBA increase over existing noise levels is considered a substantial increase.

**FEIS Alignment, updated:**

The noise impact analysis for the FEIS Alignment contained in the 1997 FEIS was based on 1993 traffic volumes provided by the Spokane Regional Transportation Council. Since publication of the 1997 FEIS, traffic volumes throughout the transportation corridor have been updated by WSDOT to reflect 1999 conditions. Noise impacts reported in the 1997 FEIS were updated by comparing 1993 volumes to 1999 volumes and determining the sound level increase resulting from the increased traffic volumes.

As noted in the introductory text of the 1997 FEIS, a doubling of traffic volumes results in a 3 dBA increase in sound levels, which is generally considered the limit at which sound level differences are discernible to average individuals.
Traffic volumes (p.m. peak) used in the modeling analysis for the 1997 FEIS ranged from approximately 10,000 vehicles (both directions) in the south end of the alignment to approximately 2,400 vehicles in the north end of the alignment near US 395 at Wandermere. Based on updated traffic volumes provided by SRTC, between 1993 and 1999, traffic volumes increased by 5% to 22%, depending on location within the alignment corridor. Sound level changes resulting from such increases in traffic volumes would range from less than 1 dBA to approximately 1.4 dBA and would not be detectable. As a result, the impact analysis for the FEIS Alignment discussed in the 1997 FEIS would remain essentially unchanged. Between the Spokane River and US 395 at Wandermere, the FEIS Alignment would result in approximately 220 impacts; 210 from noise levels that approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria, and 10 from noise levels that would substantially increase over existing conditions.

**Preferred Alternative:**

The focus of the impact analysis is on the design year 2020 when the entire project would be completed. Under this approach, noise abatement measures, if needed, can be justified based on the conditions that would occur with completion of the entire project.

To determine if predicted noise levels associated with the project would result in a substantial increase, both modeled noise levels and noise monitoring results (short- and long-term) are used to characterize existing noise levels throughout the project corridor. For example, along Market Street from the Spokane River to near the vicinity of Francis Avenue, much of the area adjacent to the proposed alignment is urbanized and existing noise levels are generally higher than 56 dBA and there are few impacts attributed to substantial increases. However, north of Francis Avenue the alignment shifts to the east, away from Market Street into areas of less development and less urbanization. In these portions of the alignment more residents are identified as impacted by a substantial increase in noise levels.

Table 4.3 summarizes the results of the noise impact analysis for the Preferred Alternative. The analysis covers individual segments within the alignment, the type of roadway, and the distance to the 67-dBA impact limits for both sides of the roadway. Table 4.3 also summarizes the number of residences impacted by either predicted traffic noise levels approaching or exceeding the noise abatement criteria, or by a substantial increase in traffic noise resulting from the proposed project.

The Preferred Alternative would result in a total of approximately 286 impacts; 234 from noise levels that approach or exceed the 67-dBA noise abatement criteria and 52 from noise levels that increase substantially over existing conditions.
Table 4.3  Summary of Noise Analysis Results for Design Year (2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freeway Segment</th>
<th>Roadway Type</th>
<th>Distance to 67-dBA L&lt;sub&gt;eq&lt;/sub&gt; Contour Line Meters (Feet)&lt;sup&gt;1,2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Impacted Residences (West/East)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Spokane River to Grace St.</td>
<td>Elevated Viaduct</td>
<td>107 (350)</td>
<td>91 (300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Grace Street to Wellesley Ave. I/C</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>95 (310)</td>
<td>95 (310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wellesley Ave. I/C to Columbia Ave.</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>76 (250)</td>
<td>76 (250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Columbia Ave. to Freya St.</td>
<td>Elevated Fill</td>
<td>183 (600)</td>
<td>183 (600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Freya St. to Parksmith Dr.</td>
<td>Elevated Fill</td>
<td>149 (490)</td>
<td>162 (530)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parksmith Dr. to Mead Royale Mobile Home Park</td>
<td>Elevated Fill</td>
<td>137 (450)</td>
<td>137 (450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Mead Royale Mobile Home Park to Farwell Rd.</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>40 (130)</td>
<td>40 (130)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Farwell Rd. to Perry St.</td>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>76 (250)</td>
<td>76 (250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Perry St. to US 395 at Wandermere</td>
<td>Elevated Fill</td>
<td>122 (400)</td>
<td>122 (400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. All distances are measured from centerline of the roadway.
2. Effects of local shielding included where appropriate.
3. Approach or Exceed 67-dBA L<sub>eq</sub>.
4. Significant Increase; 10 dBA increase over existing conditions.
Mitigation

Noise Abatement Criteria. The following is a discussion of methods to abate operational traffic noise impacts. According to the Code of Federal Regulation (23 CFR Chapter 1, Part 772), the following noise abatement measures may be incorporated into this project to reduce traffic noise impacts:

- Traffic management measures
- Alteration of horizontal and vertical alignments
- Construction of noise barriers
- Acquisition of real property or interests therein to serve as a buffer zone to preempt development which would be adversely impacted by traffic
- Noise insulation of public use or nonprofit institutional structures

This section focuses on the consideration of noise barriers as a primary means of abating project-related noise impacts. A number of factors go into the determination of whether noise abatement measures are reasonable and feasible including:

- Noise abatement benefits
- Cost of abatement
- Views of impacted residents
- Absolute sound levels
- Changes in noise levels
- Development along the highway
- Environmental effects of abatement construction

Feasibility. For a noise barrier to be considered feasible, it must be constructable and provide a minimum of 5 dBA reduction for the first row of receivers with at least one receiver having a 7 dBA reduction (reasonable efforts must also be made to attain a 10 dBA or greater reduction in sound levels at the first row of receivers).

Reasonableness. Once the construction of a noise barrier has been determined feasible, WSDOT will then determine whether construction of the barrier is reasonable by thoroughly considering a wide range of criteria such as:

- whether noise levels in the design year approach or exceed the applicable noise abatement criteria or qualify as a substantial (10 dBA) exceedance over existing levels
- determining if a majority of the first row of receivers obtain a minimum 5 dBA benefit from the sound wall with at least one receiver attaining a 7 decibel reduction
- determining if the noise mitigation cost per residence is at or less than that indicated in Table 4.4. This is determined by counting all residences benefited by the noise barrier and dividing that number into the total cost of the noise abatement measure.
- determining the most suitable material for construction of noise barriers (including the type of material to be used for construction of the barrier) after final horizontal and vertical alignments are determined and a detailed engineering analysis of the feasibility and reasonability of noise abatement measures can be made.
### Table 4.4 Allowance for Impacts Caused by Total Traffic Noise Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Year Traffic Noise Decibel Level</th>
<th>Allowed Cost Per Household ($)&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Equivalent Wall Surface Area Per Household - Square Meters (Square Feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66 dBA</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>65.0 (700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 dBA</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>71.5 (770)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 dBA</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>77.7 (837)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 dBA</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>84.0 (905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 dBA</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>90.5 (973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 dBA</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>96.7 (104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 dBA</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>103.0 (1,109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 dBA</td>
<td>26,000</td>
<td>109.2 (1,176)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74 dBA</td>
<td>27,500</td>
<td>115.5 (1,244)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> Reevaluated in January of each year. Based on $22.1 per square foot constructed cost of a concrete wall. Source: Washington State Department of Transportation 1999.

It is WSDOT's policy to make final decisions on the construction of noise barriers after final horizontal and vertical alignments are determined and a detailed engineering analysis of the feasibility and reasonability of noise abatement can be made.

**Noise Abatement for the NSC Preferred Alternative.** This section summarizes the noise abatement analysis for all areas potentially impacted by project-related noise. For each segment of the proposed freeway, noise barriers were evaluated for various heights between 3 meters (10 feet) and 5 meters (16 feet). Within each segment, each barrier height was evaluated against WSDOT's feasibility criteria to determine if it provided the minimum 5 dBA benefit with at least one receiver attaining a 7 dBA reduction. For those barrier heights that met the WSDOT feasibility criteria, a reasonableness determination was then made based on the estimated cost of the sound wall using cost criteria provided by WSDOT and the number of benefiting residences (the number of residences within 152 meters (500 feet) of the right-of-way receiving at least a 3 dBA reduction in noise levels as a result of the barrier). If a sound wall was determined to be both feasible and reasonable, then additional barrier heights were evaluated up to a maximum height of 5 meters (16 feet) to determine if a 10 dBA insertion loss could be attained at the first row of receivers.

**Table 4.5** summarizes noise abatement measures for the proposed project. The number of residences receiving beneficial noise reduction from a concrete sound wall is listed for each segment. The cost per residence receiving benefit is then calculated and shown.
using cost criteria provided by WSDOT. It is possible that equivalent noise reduction could be attained using less expensive materials than those used in the following estimates. Such cost considerations would be evaluated by WSDOT at the time of final project design. All noise abatement measures under consideration were evaluated to reduce to the extent possible all impacts in the respective areas (i.e., within 152 meters [500 feet] of the right-of-way). Table 4.5 shows the number of impacted residences remaining after abatement is provided by concrete sound walls which meet both the WSDOT criteria for feasibility and reasonableness.

Although the estimated cost and benefit of the noise abatement measure is shown in Table 4.5 and discussed below, other factors would be considered by WSDOT before recommending specific abatement measures. For example, public opinion may greatly affect the final decision on whether to construct a particular abatement measure.

**Segment 1: Spokane River to Grace Street**

On the east side of the alignment from the Spokane River to Grace Street, 3-, 3.7-, and 4.3-meter (10-, 12-, and 14-foot, respectively) sound barriers extending approximately 500 meters (1,640 feet) from the river to the vicinity of Grace Street would meet the WSDOT feasibility and reasonableness criteria. All residences within 152 meters (500 feet) of the right-of-way would benefit from a sound wall (i.e., receive at least a 3 dBA noise reduction from the barrier). Approximately 71 residences on the east side of the alignment would benefit from a sound barrier in this segment. Extending the height of the barrier to 4.3 meters (14 feet) would achieve the additional benefit of attaining a 10 dBA reduction in sound levels at the first row of receivers. No impacted residences would remain after implementation of this abatement measure.

On the west side of the alignment, 3-, 3.7-, and 4.3-meter (10-, 12-, and 14-foot, respectively) sound barriers approximately 550 meters (1,800 feet) long would meet the WSDOT feasibility and reasonableness criteria. Approximately 100 single- and multi-family residences (including all residences within 152 meters [500 feet] of the right-of-way) between the Spokane River and the point where the alignment enters a below-ground depression would benefit from a sound barrier on the west side of the alignment in this section. As described for the east side of the alignment, extending the height of the barrier to 4.3 meters (14 feet) would achieve a 10 dBA reduction in sound levels at the first row of receivers. No impacted residences would remain after implementation of this abatement measure.

**Segment 2: Grace Street to Wellesley Avenue Interchange**

On the east side of the alignment from the beginning of the depression near Grace Street, 3-, 3.7-, 4.3-, and 4.9-meter (10-, 12-, 14-, and 16-foot, respectively) sound barriers extending approximately 671 meters (2,200 feet) into the undeveloped open space north of the JJ Hill Park would all meet the WSDOT feasibility and reasonableness criteria; however, none would provide a 10 dBA reduction at the first row of residential receivers.
A 4.9-meter (16-foot) barrier would provide a nearly 9 dBA benefit at the first row of residential receptors. All residents within 152 meters (500 feet) of the right-of-way would receive at least a 3 dBA benefit from any of the sound barriers evaluated. Approximately 141 residences between Grace Street and JJ Hill Park would benefit from a sound wall on the east side of the alignment. After abatement, approximately 4 single-family residences would remain impacted if the sound wall were constructed to a height of 3 or 3.7 meters (10 or 12 feet). Extending the height of the sound wall to 4.3 meters (14 feet) would abate impacts at all residential locations.

On the west side of the alignment 3-, 3.7-, 4.3-, and 4.9-meter (10-, 12-, 14-, and 16-foot, respectively) sound barriers do not meet the WSDOT feasibility criteria of providing a 5 dBA benefit at the first row of receivers. Also, the nearest residences on the west side of the alignment in this segment are more than 152 meters (500 feet) from the center line of the proposed roadway. At this distance, a sound barrier would provide very little acoustic benefit.

**Segment 3: Wellesley Avenue Interchange to Columbia Avenue**

On the east side of the alignment in this segment there is approximately 305 meters (1,000 feet) of open space between the alignment and approximately 20 scattered residences along Ferrall Street between Broad Avenue and Rowan Avenue. At this distance, 3-, 3.7-, 4.3-, and 4.9-meter (10-, 12-, 14-, and 16-foot, respectively) sound barriers do not meet WSDOT feasibility or reasonableness criteria because of the limited number of residences.

On the west side of the alignment there are approximately 4 single-family residences west of Market Street within 152 meters (500 feet) of the right-of-way. Due to the high existing background sound levels near Market Street, shielding provided by commercial establishments on the east side of Market Street, and the small number of residences, a sound wall on the west side of the alignment in this segment would not meet WSDOT feasibility criteria.

**Segment 4: Columbia Avenue to Freya Street**

On the east side of the alignment there are approximately 10 single-family residences within 152 meters (500 feet) of the right-of-way. Nearly all of these residences are located north of Lyons Avenue and east of Freya Street. A 4.3-meter (14-foot) sound wall approximately 427 meters (1,400 feet) long would meet the WSDOT feasibility criteria, but would not meet the reasonableness criteria because of the small number of residences benefited by the barrier.

Because sound walls do not meet the reasonableness criteria in this segment of the alignment, approximately 9 residences would remain impacted after construction of the project (Table 4.5).
Segment 5: Freya Street to Parksmith Drive

Between Freya Street and Lincoln Road the roadway is proposed to be elevated on fill. On the east side of the alignment between Freya Street and Lincoln Road a 1,037-meter (3,400-foot) sound barrier 3 meters (10 feet) high would not meet WSDOT's feasibility criteria. A sound barrier 3.7 meters (12 feet) high would meet the feasibility requirements, but because of the limited number of benefiting residences (approximately 26), it would not meet WSDOT's reasonableness criteria.

On the west side of the alignment an 854-meter (2,800-foot) sound wall 3 and 3.7 meters (10 and 12 feet, respectively) high would not meet WSDOT's feasibility criteria. A sound wall 4.3 meters (14 feet) high would meet the feasibility requirements, but because of the limited number of benefiting residences (approximately 12), this barrier would not meet WSDOT's reasonableness criteria.

Because a sound wall for this segment of the alignment does not meet the feasibility and reasonableness criteria, an earth berm located within the right-of-way was considered for this segment. As noted above, the alignment between Freya Street and Lincoln Road would be located on fill approximately 4.6 meters (15 feet) to 7.6 meters (25 feet) above ground level. According to plan view aerial photographs of the alignment, the available right-of-way in this segment varies from 12.2 meters (40 feet) at Wilding Avenue to a maximum of 22.9 meters (75 feet) at Lincoln Road. Assuming a 2:1 slope for an earth berm, up to 42.6 meters (140 feet) of right-of-way would be required to construct an earth berm 10.7 meters (35 feet) high. As presently designed there is not enough right-of-way available to construct an earth berm of sufficient height to provide acoustic benefits to nearby residents.

Because sound walls are not feasible or reasonable in this segment of the alignment, approximately 42 residences would remain impacted after construction of the project (Table 4.5).

Segment 6: Parksmith Drive to Mead Royale Mobile Home Park

On the east side of the alignment all sound barriers from 3 meters (10 feet) to 4.9 meters (16 feet) in height extending approximately 854 meters (2,800 feet) parallel to the west side of the mobile home park would meet WSDOT's feasibility and reasonableness criteria. However, none of the barriers would provide a 10 dBA benefit at the first row of receivers inside the mobile home park. Approximately 70 residences in the mobile home park would benefit from construction of a sound barrier on the east side of the alignment.

Construction of 3- or 3.7-meter (10- or 12-foot) sound walls would abate approximately 27 residential impacts, leaving approximately 35 residences impacted after construction of the project. If 4.3- or 4.9-meter (14- or 16-foot) sound walls were constructed, approximately 23 residences would remain impacted after construction of the project.
Sound walls on the west side of the alignment are not warranted because the area west of the alignment is undeveloped with no residential receivers.

**Segment 7: Mead Royale Mobile Home Park to Farwell Road**

From the Mead Royale Mobile Home Park north to Farwell Road, there is undeveloped open space on both sides of the alignment. No sound barriers in this segment are warranted because there are no residential receivers within 152 meters (500 feet) of the alignment.

**Segment 8: Farwell Road to Perry Street**

After crossing Farwell Road the alignment turns west and enters relatively undeveloped open space west of Shady Slope Road and south of Winger Street. Due to the sloping topography, this segment is approximately 3 meters (10 feet) below existing ground level on the north side, but approximately at existing grade on the south side of the NSC.

On the north side of the alignment a 457-meter (1,500-foot) sound barrier 3 meters (10 feet) or 3.7 meters (12 feet) high would not meet WSDOT’s feasibility criteria. A sound wall 4.3 meters (14 feet) high would meet the feasibility requirements, but because of the limited number of benefiting residences (approximately 9), the barrier would not meet WSDOT’s reasonableness criteria.

On the south side of the alignment a 488-meter (1,600-foot) sound wall 3 meters (10 feet) or 3.7 meters (12 feet) high would not meet WSDOT’s feasibility criteria. A sound barrier 4.3 meters (14 feet) high would meet WSDOT’s feasibility requirements, but because of the limited number of benefiting residences (approximately 8), the barrier would not meet reasonableness criteria.

**Segment 9: Perry Street to US 395 at Wandermere**

Beyond Perry Street the alignment enters undeveloped open space. Sound barriers would not be warranted in this section because of the lack of residential receivers.

**IMPACTS REMAINING AFTER CONSIDERATION OF NOISE ABATEMENT**

Based on the noise impact analysis for the Preferred Alternative, approximately 268 residences would be impacted by the proposed project prior to consideration of noise abatement measures. According to WSDOT criteria, sound walls in the following segments of the alignment are both feasible and reasonable:

- Segment 1 (east and west): Spokane River to Grace Street
- Segment 2 (east): Grace Street to Wellesley Avenue I/C
- Segment 6 (east): Parksmith Drive to Mead Royale Mobile Home Park
Approximately 382 residences would benefit (i.e., receive at least a 3 dBA reduction in estimated sound levels) from construction of sound walls in these segments of the proposed alignment. After providing the minimum abatement - building sound walls only in those segments where they were found to be both feasible and reasonable - approximately 95 residences would remain impacted after completion of the proposed project. Mitigation beyond this is possible, and is being investigated. Final determination of noise abatement is not made until after the Design and Access Hearing. WSDOT has committed to evaluate the possibility of mitigative effort beyond that required by noise abatement criteria (FEIS, p. S-xxx). Where sufficient right-of-way is available, such as in Segment 8 (Farwell Road to Perry Street), an earthen berm is an option. The lower cost of a berm built with material from excavation compared to a concrete wall is likely to make this option reasonable. In Segments 4 and 5, where additional right-of-way is not available, other types of wall construction will be evaluated in the effort to provide some level of noise abatement. If all noise impacts could be abated in these segments, the remaining unmitigatable noise impacts overall could be reduced to approximately 42.
Table 4.5  Summary of Noise Mitigation for North Spokane Corridor

Proposed Wall Meters (Feet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Side of Road</th>
<th>Height (ft)</th>
<th>Length (ft)</th>
<th>Est. Cost ($1,000)</th>
<th>Benefiting Residences</th>
<th>Cost per Residence ($)</th>
<th>Mitigation Feasible?</th>
<th>10-dBA Insertion Loss? (dB)</th>
<th>Mitigation Reasonable? (see note)</th>
<th>AOE or SI* after Abatement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>3.0 (10)</td>
<td>500 (1,640)</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 (10)</td>
<td>500 (1,640)</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
<td>500 (1,640)</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>3.0 (10)</td>
<td>550 (1,800)</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 (10)</td>
<td>550 (1,800)</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4,700</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
<td>550 (1,800)</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>3.0 (10)</td>
<td>671 (2,200)</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 (12)</td>
<td>671 (2,200)</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4,138</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
<td>671 (2,200)</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>4.9 (16)</td>
<td>671 (2,200)</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sound walls on west side of alignment not feasible or reasonable because of limited number of residences receiving benefit (approximately 21).

3 Sound walls on east and west side of alignment not feasible or reasonable because of distance to nearest residences and small number of benefited residences.

4 East 3.0 (10) 427 (1,400) 309 10 31,000 No No No 9
|         | 3.7 (12)    | 427 (1,400) | 371 | 10 | 37,000 | No | No | No | 9 |
|         | 4.3 (14)    | 427 (1,400) | 433 | 10 | 43,000 | Yes| No | No | 9 |

West Sound wall on west side of alignment is not feasible or reasonable because of limited benefiting residences (approximately 4) located more than 500 feet from proposed right-of-way.

5 East 3.0 (10) 1,037 (3,400) 751 26 28,900 No No No 29
<p>|         | 3.7 (12)    | 1,037 (3,400) | 902 | 26 | 35,000 | Yes| No | No | 29 |
|         | West        | 3.0 (10)    | 854 (2,800) | 619 | 12 | 51,500 | No | No | No | 13 |
|         | 3.7 (12)    | 854 (2,800) | 743 | 12 | 61,900 | No | No | No | 13 |
|         | 4.3 (14)    | 854 (2,800) | 866 | 12 | 72,200 | Yes| No | No | 13 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Side of Road</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Est. Cost ($1,000)</th>
<th>Benefiting Residences</th>
<th>Cost per Residence ($)</th>
<th>Mitigation Feasible?</th>
<th>10-dBA Insertion Loss?</th>
<th>Mitigation Reasonable? (see note)</th>
<th>AOE or SI * after Abatement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>East</td>
<td>3.0 (10)</td>
<td>854 (2,800)</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>8,840</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35 (SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 (12)</td>
<td>854 (2,800)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10,600</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35 (SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
<td>854 (2,800)</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>12,375</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23 (SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9 (16)</td>
<td>854 (2,800)</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23 (SI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Sound wall on west side of alignment not warranted because of open space west of the alignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No sound walls warranted because of open space/undeveloped land on both sides of the alignment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>3.0 (10)</td>
<td>457 (1,500)</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36,800</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 (12)</td>
<td>457 (1,500)</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
<td>457 (1,500)</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51,500</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0 (10)</td>
<td>488 (1,600)</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44,200</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7 (12)</td>
<td>488 (1,600)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 (14)</td>
<td>488 (1,600)</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62,000</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: It is possible that equivalent noise reduction could be attained using less expensive materials than those used in the cost estimates. Such cost considerations and material specifications would be evaluated by WSDOT at the time of final project design.
**Energy**

The FEIS compared the energy consumption and supply conditions and impacts of all build alternatives to the no-build alternative, mass transit, nonstructural measures, and improvements to existing facilities (FEIS, p. 4-34 through 4-35).

**Impacts**

The FEIS showed that any build alternative consumed less energy in operation than the No-Build Alternative. The congestion on existing north-south arterials is the main factor in the purpose and need for the NSC. With the current types of engines in vehicles, congestion directly translates into higher fuel consumption and higher air pollution emissions. With the current models and assumptions used to make projections, added capacity reduces congestion.

**Mitigation**

The proposed mitigation for energy impacts is unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-35.

**Geology and Soils**

**Impacts**

The Preferred Alternative between Lincoln Road and Hawthorne Road is located further east of the FEIS Alignment. In this location, the Preferred Alternative cuts further into Geologically Hazardous Critical Areas as identified by Spokane County than does the FEIS Alignment. These west-facing slopes are composed of Latah Formation soils. The revised alignment in this area is due to the need to avoid the TOSCO Superfund Site near Francis Avenue and a cultural site near Gerlach Road (see Cultural Resources, this chapter).

The Preferred Alternative also crosses a landfill just south of Hawthorne Road. This site was investigated for contamination due to the historical usage, but it was not found to be a hazardous site. The excavations did reveal large quantities of woody debris that will not be suitable base material for road building and will require excavation. Estimates are for the relocation of 123,093 m$^3$ (161,000 yd$^3$) of debris. The disposition of this material will be determined by reaching an agreement with the Washington State Department of Ecology to relocate and encapsulate the debris to another portion of the same parcel, outside of the NSC right-of-way. Should an agreement not be reached, this site may be considered a dump site and the excavated materials will require special disposal.

Between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere, the Preferred Alternative involves the same soil types as the FEIS Alignment, but differs in topography. (See Geology and Soils Map, Figure 3.1.) In addition, both alternatives encounter erodible soils, which are designated as Geologically Hazardous by the Spokane County Critical Areas Ordinance, along Deadman Creek at the US 2 interchange. The Preferred Alternative also involves
up to 9m (30 ft) vertical cut sections as compared to the FEIS Alignment, which was proposed to be constructed on approximately 9m (30 ft) vertical fill in this area. Based on water well records indicating the depth of the water table, these cuts are not expected to encounter or impact the water table.

Mitigation

A geotechnical investigation is conducted on all projects that involve significant grading quantities, unstable ground, or foundations for structures in a manner that preserves the safety of the public who use the facility, as well as preserving the economic investment by the state of Washington.

Geotechnical data necessary to allow completion of the investigation is compiled during the design phase. This includes soils borings, testing, and final geometric data. Detailed design of cut and fill slopes can be done once the roadway geometry is established and geotechnical data is available. The purpose of this design effort is to determine the maximum stable cut or fill slope and, for fills, potential for short and long term settlement. Recommendations resulting from the Geotechnical Report will direct slope and roadway construction techniques to minimize erosion and to protect public health, safety, and property.

Waterways and Hydrological Systems

Impacts

The impacts of the proposed revised alignment in terms of waterways or hydrological systems are unchanged from the FEIS. Both the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative are within the Aquifer Protection Area. Hydrological features and impacts are described in the FEIS (pages 4-50 through 4-53) with the following addition. Both alignment alternatives include widening US 2 at the crossing of Deadman Creek. More information is available on impacts of the Preferred Alternative since design has proceeded on this alignment. The proposed widening, on either side of US 2, will include the building of retaining walls and fill on the existing slope. Construction will not impact the creek or creek banks, other than the removal of trees.

See Waterways and Hydrological Systems Map, Figure 3.3.

Mitigation

No mitigation is required or proposed. There is no change from the FEIS, p. 4-53.

Flood Plains

Impacts

The flood plain impacts of the FEIS Alignment remain as described in the FEIS, p. 4-55 through 4-59, with the following addition. Both the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative are adjacent to the Deadman Creek flood plain. The Preferred Alternative does not further encroach on the flood plain. See Flood Plain and Shorelines Map, Figure 3.4.
**Mitigation**

Mitigation is not changed from the FEIS, p. 4-59, except that construction work within the Deadman Creek flood plain will require permit approval from Spokane County. In order to obtain the required County Flood Plain Permit, WSDOT will need to show that there is no greater than one foot increase in base flood elevation, or have obtained an easement to allow inundation of the increased flood plain.

**Water Quality**

**Impacts**

Water Quality impacts are not changed from the FEIS, p. 4-61 through 4-68. Stormwater management will be fully detailed in the Hydraulic Report, which will be in conformance with WSDOT’s Highway Runoff Manual and Hydraulic Manual. Area of Influence Studies would be necessary if infiltration ponds are to be used for stormwater management near Federal Superfund Sites and other contaminated areas along the corridor. At this time, evaporation ponds are proposed.

**Mitigation**

The mitigation for possible water quality impacts is unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-68.

**Shorelines**

**Impacts**

The impacts in terms of shorelines are as described in the FEIS, p. 4-93, with the following addition. Both the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative have the additional impact of involving road construction within the setback of the state shoreline of Deadman Creek. Deadman Creek is designated “Pastoral” in the Spokane County Shoreline Master Plan. Road construction is prohibited within 61m (200 ft) of the shoreline of this stream. A Substantial Development Permit will be required, which typically involves a three month process. Any construction work within the stream requires a Hydraulic Permit from Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The present design does not necessitate lengthening of the existing culvert or widening of the existing fill. The impacts to Deadman Creek are also subject to the County Critical Areas Ordinance as a shoreline of the state, riparian habitat, and wetland. The present design does not propose construction beyond toe of the slope of the existing highway.

In the event that design changes result in impacts to the shoreline, additional fill and lengthening of the culvert, and involve work within the stream, the appropriate documentation, permitting, and mitigation of impacts will be performed.

**See Flood Plain and Shorelines Map, Figure 3.4.**
Mitigation
No mitigation is anticipated beyond compliance with Shorelines permit.

**Wetlands**

**Impacts**

The impacts to wetlands are as described in the FEIS, p. 4-76 through 4-77, with the following addition. Three additional wetlands have been identified within the proposed right-of-way for both the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative. The first two are a result of two independent springs in the Wandermere area. They are not hydrologically connected to each other. Due to the distance from these wetlands, the Preferred Alternative will not influence the hydrology or measurably affect the development or continued existence of these wetland.

1. An approximately 0.2 hectare (.5 acre) wetland adjacent to US 395 on the east side is described as Palustrine, Forested, Broad-leaved Deciduous, Permanently Flooded wetland (PFO1H). This wetland is a Category II wetland as defined by the Washington Department of Ecology Rating System for Eastern Washington. This wetland is associated with a Type 5 stream as defined by the Spokane County Critical Areas Ordinance. The buffer for this type of stream is 7.62 meters (25 feet), which is within the 45.72-meter (150-foot) buffer required for a Category II wetland. This project will avoid this area by at least 60.96 meters (200 feet). The wetland will not be affected by this project.

2. An approximately 0.2 hectare (0.5 acre) wetland adjacent to Wandermere Road is described as Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Permanently Flooded wetland (PEM1H). This wetland is a Category III wetland as defined by the Washington Department of Ecology Rating System for Eastern Washington. This wetland has developed since the construction of the present Wandermere Road in 1993. It is isolated from other wetlands or riparian areas, and is not connected by surface waters at any time during the year. Work will occur outside the 22.86-meter (75-foot) buffer for this type of wetland. Both #1 and #2 wetlands will receive full protection during construction of the new facility.  

3. An approximately 4.5 hectare (10 acre) wetland is associated with Deadman Creek where US 2 crosses at MP 296.5. It is described as Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded wetland (PSS1C). This wetland is a Category II wetland as defined by the Washington Department of Ecology Rating System for Eastern Washington. No impacts to this wetland are expected with the proposed design.

All three of these wetland areas have been investigated several times during the growing season for Ute ladies'-tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*) and Water Howellia (*Howellia aquartilis*). These species have not been found in or near any of these wetlands. Habitat for either species is lacking or marginal at best in these wetlands. Wetland investigation has determined that the Preferred Alternative will not influence the hydrology, nor measurably affect the development or continued existence of these wetlands. Any construction impacting the Deadman Creek wetland would require a permit from the
Army Corps of Engineers and the Washington State Department of Ecology. Construction will be designed to avoid impact to all of these wetlands with the following measures taken:

- Storm water discharge to surface water bodies will be avoided by the use of properly maintained, permanent water quality/quantity treatment BMPs.
- Permanent erosion and sediment control measures will be maintained to ensure that wetland filling and river/creek sediment contamination do not occur.

**See Wetlands Map, Figure 3.6.**

**Mitigation**

No mitigation is required or proposed. The most current and appropriate BMPs will be detailed in the Stormwater Site Plan (SSP). The SSP includes the hydraulic report, Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, BMP selection, and the project-specific maintenance schedule. This plan is then included in the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) for construction. This process and the catalog of BMPs are found in the WSDOT Highway Runoff Manual.

**Wildlife, Fisheries, and Vegetation**

**Impacts**

Between the Spokane River and Hawthorne Road, the wildlife, fisheries, and vegetation impacts are unchanged from FEIS (pages 4-82 through 4-83).

An updated Biological Assessment has been completed for the area between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere within the Preferred Alternative. The finding of the Biological Assessment is that the Preferred Alternative passes through more forested undeveloped and suburban land than the FEIS Alignment, and therefore will have higher impact on the wildlife presently occupying this portion of Spokane County by reducing available habitat. Threatened and Endangered Species information will be updated within six months of the beginning of construction.

**Mitigation**

No mitigation is required or proposed. The portion of the County impacted by the proposed Preferred Alternative is within the IUGA, and other than the Deadman Creek Critical Area, is slated for urban growth. The proposed roadway will be designed to avoid impact to the Deadman Creek shorelines, riparian habitat, and associated wetlands.
Social/Economic Impacts

Land Use

Impacts

The estimated amount of land required for the Preferred Alternative compared to the FEIS Alignment is updated in the table below. The area required to build the FEIS Alignment, however, is based on the information in the FEIS which was derived from limited design development. The required area determined for the Preferred Alternative reflects a more developed design and higher level of accuracy in right-of-way needs.

Table 4.6  Route Length and Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEIS Alignment</td>
<td>13.3 km (8.3 miles)</td>
<td>244 hectares (602 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>14.1 km (8.7 miles)</td>
<td>255 hectares (629 acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zoning

The FEIS Alignment through the City of Spokane does not involve any different zones as compared with the Preferred Alternative, and is described in the FEIS. In Spokane County, both the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative pass through General Agriculture, Urban Residential allowing 1.4 units per hectare (3.5 units per acre) (UR 3.5), Heavy Industrial (I-3), and Mining (MZ) zones. Within the City limits, under the existing Comprehensive Plan, the majority of the land impacted is designated Industrial. The following table presents the comparison of land area by zoning for alternative alignments using the most recent zoning available. (See Zoning Map, Figure 3.8.)
Table 4.7  Land Use by Zoning Category, Spokane River to US 395 at Wandermere

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Zoning Category</th>
<th>City Area by Zone hectares (acres)</th>
<th>County Area by Zone hectares (acres)</th>
<th>Total Area hectares (acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEIS Alignment</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>19.6 (48.4)</td>
<td>109.5 (270.5)</td>
<td>129.1 (319.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>33.18 (81.99)</td>
<td>68.8 (169.9)</td>
<td>102.0 (251.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 (3.5)</td>
<td>1.4 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.6 (23.7)</td>
<td>9.6 (23.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7 (4.1)</td>
<td>1.7 (4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIS Alignment</td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>52.8 (130.4)</td>
<td>190.9 (471.8)</td>
<td>243.7 (602.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4.8 (12.0)</td>
<td>120.9 (298.8)</td>
<td>125.8 (310.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>43.6 (107.8)</td>
<td>39.5 (97.4)</td>
<td>83.0 (205.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>6.8 (16.9)</td>
<td>1.9 (4.8)</td>
<td>8.8 (21.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.9 (29.5)</td>
<td>11.9 (29.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0 (61.7)</td>
<td>25.0 (61.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>Total Acres</td>
<td>55.3 (136.7)</td>
<td>199.2 (492.2)</td>
<td>254.5 (628.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FEIS Alignment passes through a rapidly growing residential area between US 2 and US 395 at Wandermere. This is an area with the highest concentration of residential building permits within the study area. These neighborhoods are adjacent to schools and expanding shopping areas. The County has also proposed an Urban Activity area around the Wandermere Mall under its “Focused Growth” scenario. (This scenario is one of three options for the basis of the County Comprehensive Plan.) Aerial and ground surveys, as well as county building permit data, show a high rate of development and proposed development in this location. The FEIS Alignment was also found to have heavy impacts on local business and industry.

In comparison to the FEIS Alignment, the proposed Preferred Alternative aligns closer to the edges of developing areas rather than bisecting them. It keeps the corridor closer to the northern edge of the IUGA, rather than cutting through the rapidly developing neighborhoods between US 395 and US 2. The revision allows this area within the IUGA to develop in a more cohesive manner. The proposed new alignment also avoids displacement or disruption to a majority of the businesses in the area.
Mitigation
No mitigation is required or proposed.

**Industrial Land/ Businesses and Employment**

From the Spokane River to Francis Avenue, the Preferred Alternative reduces the impact to industrial land and businesses as compared with the FEIS Alignment. The difference is due to the mainline shifting to the west and the redesign of the Wellesley Avenue and Francis Avenue interchanges. With the alignment shifted west and the major interchanges reconfigured, two large food warehouse and distributor businesses are avoided, and impact to a large asphalt manufacturing business is minimized with the Preferred Alternative.

Just north of Francis Avenue, the FEIS Alignment displaces a wood roof truss manufacturer, which is also new since the FEIS was published. The Preferred Alternative is shifted approximately 30.5m (100 ft) east in this area, and avoids displacement of this business.

From Francis Avenue to Hawthorne Road, the FEIS Alignment heavily impacts many of the businesses within industrially zoned land along North Market Street. This area is home to clusters of businesses which support each other, such as auto dismantling and used auto and truck part sales. Such businesses can be difficult to relocate, since they require large parcels of land within industrial zoning and where proximity to each other could be maintained. Also, these types of businesses tend to be objectionable to adjacent residents due to their visual, noise, dust, and odor characteristics. In this segment, the FEIS Alignment displaces five (5) of these types of businesses in addition to five (5) others on North Freya Street. The Preferred Alternative displaces only one (1) business in this area.

Between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere, the FEIS Alignment with the Stoneman Road Interchange displaces a total of six (6) businesses, including two (2) home businesses and one (1) senior assisted living center in the vicinity of US 2 and Pittsburg Street. It has a minor impact to one wrecking yard business, and major impact to the Kaiser operation, taking approximately 52.6 hectares (130 acres) from the main plant parcel. The Preferred Alternative, with the Parksmith Drive interchange, displaces four (4) businesses, causes major disruption to one wrecking business, and has greatly reduced impact to Kaiser, taking approximately 5.7 hectares (14 acres). The FEIS Alignment bisects the Kaiser Aluminum Mead parcel on which the north plant is located, between Hawthorne Road and Farwell Road. The Preferred Alternative has greatly reduced impact on this parcel.
Direct Impact: Business Relocation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment Alternative</th>
<th>Number of Businesses Displaced</th>
<th>Approximate Number of Employees Affected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEIS Alignment, Spokane River to Hawthorne Road</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>725-764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIS Alignment, Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermere</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEIS Alignment TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>749-803</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative, Spokane River to Hawthorne Road</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>279-313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative, Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermere</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preferred Alternative TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>330-372</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See full Business and Employment Impact Estimate Tables, Appendix C.

Indirect Impact: Number of Businesses within 1000 ft of Right-of-Way

The number of businesses within an area extending 305m (1000 ft) on either side of the alignment right-of-way were counted using aerial photographs and field surveys. This count does not include the businesses located within the NSC right-of-way. This was the method used in the FEIS to determine the number of commercial properties likely to experience disruption as a result of the NSC. The number of businesses within 305m (1000 ft) of the FEIS Alignment and of the Preferred Alternative between the Spokane River and Hawthorne Road are not significantly different; approximately 100-105. There are 2 businesses within 305m (1000 ft) of the right-of-way of the Preferred Alternative, between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere (Wandermere Golf Course, and Willow Grove Senior Care Home). There is only one business within 305m (1000 ft) of the FEIS Alignment right-of-way (Wandermere Golf Course).

Mitigation

The revisions to the FEIS Alignment were designed in part to avoid or minimize economic impact on businesses in the corridor. Kaiser Mead Aluminum plant is the largest employer in the study area. Kaiser Aluminum stated that any reduction of its property south of Farwell Road would jeopardize the plant’s long-term viability. The
selection of the Preferred Alternative reduces impacts from displacement to disruption on other employers, including Food Services of America, the Koch Asphalt plant, as well as several smaller businesses. The highest concentration of business relocation is in the Hillyard area. Preliminary studies indicate that there is adequate vacant land within this business district with proper zoning for business relocations.

**Residential Land**

Between the Spokane River and Wellesley Avenue, the number of homes directly and indirectly impacted by the alternative alignments do not differ. Just north of the Spokane River on Greene Street, an apartment complex built in the spring of 1997 affects the impacts of both the alternative alignments. Spokane Neighborhood Action Program (SNAP) manages the 11-unit apartment complex, which was built with State Housing Trust Funds and Federal Home Funds. The apartments house families with household incomes less than 50% of the county median income. Both alignment alternatives cause the displacement of this apartment complex.

Between Wellesley Avenue and Francis Avenue, the Preferred Alternative is approximately 134m (440 ft) further west than the FEIS Alignment. The Preferred Alternative is therefore within 152m (500 ft) of approximately 10 more homes on the west side of the corridor than the FEIS Alignment.

Between Francis Avenue and Lincoln Road, the Preferred Alternative is shifted approximately one-half block to the east of the FEIS Alignment. The FEIS Alignment displaces homes along the east side of Freya Street, between Wilding Road and Lincoln Road, in the neighborhood known as Morgan Acres. It intrudes into the residential area on the west side, displacing 17-25 homes, but maintains the division between industrial and residential land uses. The Preferred Alternative, adjusted in response to the VE study for this segment, includes a redesigned interchange on Freya Street, and shifts the roadway one half block east. It avoids displacement of the first row of homes along Freya Street. The Preferred Alternative results in the displacement of approximately 35 single family homes in Morgan Acres. The Preferred Alternative also comes in proximity to a higher number of remaining homes as compared with the FEIS Alignment in this segment. In this neighborhood, there are 40 homes within 152m (500 ft) of the FEIS Alignment, and 45 homes within 152m (500 ft) of the Preferred Alternative. The indirect impacts to these residents are not mitigatable.

The FEIS Alignment passes within 30.5m (100 ft) of the southwest corner of the Mead Royale Mobile Home Community, which is located between Hawthorne Road and Farwell Road. The Preferred Alternative runs parallel to the western edge of this community, at an average distance of 30.5m (100 ft). The Preferred Alternative would therefore have increased noise and visual impact on the community center and outdoor recreation area, as well as to a higher number of homes in this neighborhood, as compared to the FEIS Alignment. These impacts are considered mitigatable with a buffer and/or noise wall.
The FEIS Alignment bisects a rapidly developing residential area between US 2 and US 395 at Wandermere, which is within the IUGA. While this area, known generally as Forest Glen, is zoned UR 3.5 (Urban Residential, permitting up to 1.4 units per hectare [3.5 units per acre]), it has generally been developed at roughly half of the allowed density. In addition to several single-family homes and duplexes, a 14-unit senior assisted living facility is displaced by the FEIS Alignment.

From the southwest corner of the Mead Royale Mobile Home Community, the Preferred Alternative diverges from the FEIS Alignment. The Preferred Alternative crosses US 2 at Shady Slope Road and then curves to the west, passing on the north side of the Northwood Middle/Farwell Elementary School complex. The residential areas directly impacted by this alignment are less densely developed and the homes were generally built less recently than those within the FEIS Alignment. The Garden City neighborhood is located north of US 2 and east of Shady Slope Road. This area is developed at maximum density of 1.4 units per hectare (3.5 homes per acre). Approximately five homes would be within the right-of-way of this alignment, at the intersection of Shady Slope Road and US 2. The neighborhood on the west side of Shady Slope Road is known as Garden City Addition. Both of these neighborhoods would experience impacts associated with having a depressed section of freeway between the homes and the elementary/middle school/county park complex. Residents of these areas currently have a short walk through undeveloped, wooded land to these facilities. This impact will be mitigated with the Pedestrian/Bicycle trail which will cross the NSC roadway to maintain pedestrian and bicycle access.

Table 4.9 summarizes the direct and indirect impacts to residences for each alignment alternative. Table 4.10 presents the residential relocations by housing type and estimates the number of individuals affected.

**Direct Impact : Number of Residential Relocations**

Between the Spokane River and Hawthorne Road, the FEIS Alignment would result in the relocation of 67 residences (54 single-family, 2 duplex units, and 11 apartment units), and the Preferred Alternative would result in the relocation of 92 residences (77 single-family, 4 duplex units, and 11 apartment units).

Between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere, the impact in terms of residential relocations is reduced by the selection of the Preferred Alternative. The FEIS Alignment results in the relocation of a total of 56 homes (36 single-family, 6 duplex units, and 14 residents of Willow Grove senior care home). The impact of the FEIS Alignment has increased in this area from the published FEIS due to continued development in this area. The Preferred Alternative results in the relocation of a total of 20 homes (all single-family).
Indirect Impact: Number of Residences within 500 feet of NSC right-of-way
The number of homes within 152m (500ft) on either side of the alignment right-of-way were counted using aerial photographs and field surveys. This was the method used in the FEIS to determine the amount of property likely to experience disruption as a result of the NSC. Between the Spokane River and Hawthorne Road, the number of residences within 152m (500 ft) of the NSC is 452 for the FEIS Alignment, and 447 for the Preferred Alternative.

FEIS Alignment, Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermere
There are approximately 102 homes within 152m (500 ft) of the right-of-way:
34 in Mead Royale Mobile Home Community
12 in Camelot development
5 near Farwell/ Shady Slope Road intersection
51 between Hastings/Farwell Road and US 395 at Wandermere, including within US 2 interchange. This is an increase of 20 homes since the FEIS was published.

Preferred Alternative, Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermere
There are approximately 146 homes within 152m (500 ft) of the right-of-way:
59 in Mead Royale Mobile Home Community
2 on Pittsburg south of Hastings Road
85 between Hastings/Farwell Road and US 395 at Wandermere, including within US 2 interchange

Table 4.9 Residential Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alignment Alternative</th>
<th>Direct Impact-Residences Displaced</th>
<th>Indirect Impact-Residences within 152m (500 ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEIS Alignment</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.10 Residential Relocations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEIS Alignment</th>
<th>Single Family Units</th>
<th>Multi-Family Units</th>
<th>Persons Per Household/unit</th>
<th>Total Persons Displaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane River to Francis Ave.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Ave. to Hawthorne Rd.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Rd. to US 395 at Wandermere</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20*</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>308</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>Single Family Units</th>
<th>Multi-Family Units</th>
<th>Persons Per Household/unit</th>
<th>Total Persons Displaced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane River to Francis Ave.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis Ave. to Hawthorne Rd.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Rd. to US 395 at Wandermere</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This number includes 3 duplexes (6 units), and the 14-unit Willow Grove senior care home. Willow Grove units calculated as one person per unit.

### Potential Development- Preliminary Plats

“Wandermere Heights,” a preliminary plat for a major residential, resort, and recreation development associated with the Wandermere Golf Course, has been under review by the County since 1980. The proposal has not had any significant activity since 1993.

A preliminary plat for a major residential development between US 2 and US 395 at Wandermere was filed with the County since the FEIS was published. The proposed development, “Stonehorse Bluff,” involves 43.7 hectares (108 acres). It proposes a rezone from UR-3.5 to UR-7, and a replat to 606 lots under the proposed UR-7 rezone with a Planned Unit Development (PUD) overlay. The FEIS Alignment would affect the southwest corner of the property, reducing the number of potential lots by approximately 118 under the proposed zoning. The Preferred Alternative would also impact this property, but would pass through it close to the northern boundary, and would reduce the potential number of lots by approximately 149 under the proposed zoning. The Spokane County Hearing Examiner denied this proposed preliminary plat, zone change, and PUD overlay zone request on June 30, 2000, and that decision has been appealed by the developer.

Another rezoning and development in the study area under review by the County, “Aspen Meadows,” is a proposed senior housing community. The proposed development includes an 82-unit retirement community (14-unit assisted living facility and a 68-unit independent living facility). A rezoning from UR-7 to UR-22 has been approved along with the preliminary site plan. This future development would be within 152m (500 ft) of the FEIS Alignment. It is avoided by the Preferred Alternative.
Environmental Justice

The preferred alternative alignment impacts a range of population and housing types throughout the corridor. Two locations are discussed here because the residents are relatively lower-income.

SNAP’s 11-unit apartment complex for low-income residents on Greene Street is displaced by both alternative alignments. This complex was built, after the 1997 FEIS was published, within the proposed right-of-way of the then-preferred alignment. The new preferred alignment is unchanged in this location. The proposed NSC alignment in this vicinity is following the Greene Street alignment to minimize overall impact to residences and to the Spokane Community College. SNAP has stated that the complex will be rebuilt in a different location within the same neighborhood.

The Morgan Acres neighborhood, between Francis Avenue and Lincoln Road, east of Freya Street, will be more heavily impacted by the Preferred Alternative than by the FEIS Alignment. (See residential impacts, p. 24-26.) Approximately 30 single-family homes (including mobile homes) will require relocation from this neighborhood with the Preferred Alternative. The FEIS Alignment would require relocation of approximately 17-25 homes. This neighborhood is within Census Tract 112.01, Block Group 2, in which the minority population is lower than county-wide; the population over the age of 65 is slightly higher than county-wide; the median household and per capita incomes are lower than county-wide; the percentage of persons living below poverty level (19.8%) is higher than county-wide (13.7%); the percentage of home ownership is slightly higher than county-wide; and the median home value ($45,300) is lower than county-wide. These statistics, as reported in the FEIS, are taken from the 1990 US Census.

This semi-rural residential area is within the Hillyard Neighborhood Council area, but outside of the Hillyard Community Development Neighborhood, because it is outside of the Spokane City limits. However, Morgan Acres did receive a Spokane County Community Development Block Grant of $1.7 million for neighborhood revitalization in 1986. The revitalization included making improvements to 56 homes ($25,000 each), paving streets, and constructing the new water tower on an adjacent property.

Relocation for displaced residents of Morgan Acres will be difficult. The neighborhood is zoned Semi-Rural Residential and is adjacent to the city limits. It has a unique combination of having large lots, agricultural animals and accessory uses permitted, along with STA bus service and proximity to employment areas and city services.

In order to avoid impact to this neighborhood, acquisition of the TOSCO property, which is part of the North Market Street Superfund Site, would be necessary. This is a complex of seven sites, which have significant but not quantified contamination.

The FEIS Alignment has a lower impact on Morgan Acres, not only in terms of total number of homes displaced, but the significance of intrusion into the neighborhood. The FEIS Alignment would require displacement of 17-25 homes along the west side of the
neighborhood, essentially widening the separation between the residential area and the industrial land on the west side of Freya Street. The Preferred Alternative intrudes further into the interior of the neighborhood. It would create a large barrier approximately through the middle of the residential area, and leave a one-block wide strip between Freya Avenue and the NSC. Noise walls in this location do not meet WSDOT cost/benefit standards. However, WSDOT will evaluate alternative means of noise abatement for this neighborhood as the project progresses. (See Noise Impacts, this Chapter.)

The dislocation of the residents within the two areas discussed above does not constitute disproportionately high and adverse impacts on low-income population because the residential impacts throughout the corridor are not predominately borne by low-income persons, and will not be appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effect that will be suffered by the non-low-income population. In no location along the corridor are low-income residents impacted to avoid or reduce impacts to non-low-income residents.

Mitigation

The direct impact to residences, in terms of residential relocations, is reduced by the selection of the Preferred Alternative, from a total of 122 to 109. Meanwhile, the number of residences expected to experience indirect impact due to proximity is increased with the selection of the Preferred Alternative, from a total of 554 to 593. Washington State compensates for proximity damages only when there is a partial acquisition of an improved property. Any adverse effect to a specific property due to proximity to the new roadway is unknown at this time.

Relocation

Impacts

The general relocation background and impacts are unchanged from the FEIS (pages 4-105 through 4-108, 4-148, and 4-161 through 4-172. The occupancy type and resident characteristics along the corridor have not changed significantly from the information reported in the FEIS.

The number of residence and business relocations resulting from each alignment are described in this chapter under “Residential Land” and “Industrial Land/Business and Employment.”

Mitigation

Mitigation of impacts for relocation will be in accordance with the “Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as Amended,” as described in the FEIS (pages 4-172 through 4-179). WSDOT has documented 32
advance acquisition requests in the approved Relocation Assistance Program Plan (approved September 14, 1999).

The early coordination with neighborhoods and housing groups to minimize disruptions as mentioned in the FEIS (p. 4-148) has begun. The objectives of the NSC Pilot Housing Program are to provide replacement housing stock along the corridor, preserve the architectural integrity of neighborhoods by in-filling, provide additional low income housing stock, and maintain decent, safe, and sanitary housing within the NSC right-of-way until construction of the NSC takes place.

**Tax Revenue**

The acquisition of land for right-of-way for either alignment alternative will displace businesses and residences, resulting in a loss of property tax revenue. This is expected to be offset by the relocation of displaced land uses to other sites within the metropolitan area. Where City and County Comprehensive Land Use Plans permit, increased intensity in land use resulting from the NSC are expected, primarily around interchanges.

Over the long term, the project is not expected to have a significant impact on overall property tax base along the route.

**Property Values**

Improved access to commercial and industrial properties is expected to bring about an increase in their value. The Wellesley Avenue and Francis Avenue interchanges are expected to result in substantial access improvements through the Hillyard business district. Removal of the through truck traffic in the district could enhance the area for shoppers, and could result in increased rents and property values.

The potential damage in value to single family residential properties was addressed, in a general manner, in the report, “Proximity Study; North South Limited Access Corridor, Spokane, Washington” (Michael Ward, WSDOT Real Estate Service, May 21, 1999). The study attempted to measure the affect of the proposed freeway on residential properties in terms of their Fair Market Value. The direct market comparison technique used matched pair properties similar in all aspects except for the property’s proximity to a heavily traveled corridor. The negative elements associated with proximity that can potentially effect a parcel’s market value include: noise, dust, vibration, fumes, loss of privacy and safety. The conclusions of the comparison method are limited in this situation, since the NSC is not a pre-existing route. There are no true comparables available in Eastern Washington that can measure the overall affect caused by the new corridor. Residents currently living along or near the high traffic corridors used for comparison were aware of the negative attributes associated with that location before they purchased the property.

The findings of the analysis concludes that housing located adjacent to heavily traveled roadways could suffer a loss in value which varies with the value of the home and the quality and condition of the home. Properties selling for $90,000 or less typically are
entry level homes, and the location is only a small factor in the decision to buy. These homes, of fair to average quality, could experience a loss in market value from 0% to 5.5%. Homes selling in the range of $90,000 - $185,000, in good condition, have the potential of experiencing a loss in value from 8% from 13%. These variances in selling prices also reflect the typical negotiation range in real estate transactions in general.

**Regional and Community Growth**

**Impacts**

The general impacts of the NSC on regional and community growth are described in the FEIS (pages 4-97, and 4-142 through 4-144).

Due to the minor difference in location between the alignment alternatives between the Spokane River and Hawthorne Road, there are no differences from the FEIS in terms of regional and community growth. Both alignments are held within or adjacent to the existing BNSF railway alignment north to the Francis Avenue/Freya Street interchange. This existing transportation corridor has established a general division between the east and west side.

From Hawthorne Road to Farwell Road, the Preferred Alternative roughly follows existing boundaries between residential and industrial land uses. The Preferred Alternative dislocates fewer businesses and fewer homes overall as compared to the FEIS Alignment, and it avoids a recently developing residential area.

**Community Cohesion / Neighborhoods**

Disruptions to traffic circulation and all other aspects not described here are unchanged from the FEIS. Impacts in terms of community cohesion are unchanged from the FEIS (pages 4-133 through 4-135), with the following addition.

Between Francis Avenue and Lincoln Road, the Preferred Alternative intrudes into the Morgan Acres Neighborhood, while the FEIS Alignment widened, but maintains the division between the industrial activity on the west side of Freya Avenue and the residential use on the east side. More households will be relocated and more homes will be in proximity to the NSC with the Preferred Alternative than with the FEIS Alignment. Morgan Acres is a unique community, having a semi-rural character adjacent to the city limits, and possessing relatively clear boundaries and strong community identity. The elevated Preferred Alternative will create a physical barrier through this neighborhood, and leave a one-block wide strip, containing approximately 12 homes, in between Freya Avenue and the NSC.

Between Hastings/Farwell Road and US 395 at Wandermere, both of the alternative alignments would create a barrier between neighborhoods and schools. Residents of both areas have expressed concern on this issue. The Mead School district stated that most of the students that walk to school live north of the schools, or east of Shady Slope Road.
According to comments from the community, the recently widened Hastings Road (by Spokane County) already creates some barrier between neighborhoods to the south and the schools.

While the FEIS went through full public process, residents of the Garden City neighborhood and vicinity were outside of the published preferred route. Comments from residents of the Garden City area point out that the development that is now being avoided by the northern portion of the Preferred Alternative is recent development and even proposed development; activity which had the warning of being within the corridor due to the published FEIS. Comments from residents in these areas express that the neighborhoods impacted by the Preferred Alternative are more established and cohesive, having been in existence approximately thirty years, and therefore will be experience greater impact than will the newer homes built within the FEIS Alignment.

**Mitigation**

Mitigation for impacts remain as in the FEIS (page 4-150), with the following addition.

The pedestrian/bicycle trail adds a connection for the communities along the NSC. It will provide a pedestrian/bicycle crossing of the Spokane River, connecting neighborhoods on the north side of the river with the Spokane Community College and downtown Spokane. It will provide a convenient connection for the Bemiss and Hillyard neighborhoods to the Centennial Trail. The pedestrian/bicycle trail will incorporate a crossing of the BNRR tracks and the NSC at Garland Avenue, connecting to the J. J. Hill/Wildhorse Park. This will maintain pedestrian access between the Cooper Elementary, Bemiss Elementary, and Shaw Middle Schools on the east side of the NSC with neighborhoods within its attendance boundary on the west side of the NSC.

The pedestrian/bicycle trail will help to mitigate the additional barrier created by the Preferred Alternative. The trail will facilitate bicycle and pedestrian crossing of the NSC, Hastings/Farwell Road, and US 2, and help maintain the connection between the Garden City Neighborhood and schools and play fields.

**Parks and Recreation**

**Impacts**

Between the Spokane River and Wellesley Avenue, the impacts in terms of parks and recreation are unchanged from the FEIS (pages 4-137 through 4-138).

Between Wellesley Avenue and Francis Avenue, the Preferred Alternative is approximately 137m (450 ft) west of the FEIS Alignment. The resulting differences in impacts are shown in **Table 4.11**. All of the recreation sites shown below were evaluated in the FEIS, and were found to not be significantly impacted from the FEIS Alignment due to distance and the depressed roadway profile. While several of these are subject to
Section 4(f) regulations, the impacts do not result in a “use” or “constructive use” of the sites.

**Table 4.11  Park and Recreation Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>distance from centerline, FEIS Alignment</th>
<th>previously documented impact</th>
<th>distance from centerline, Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>difference in impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooper Elementary School</td>
<td>340 m/ 1100 ft</td>
<td>no impacts due to depressed road and distance</td>
<td>400 m/1300 ft, depressed roadway</td>
<td>no change in impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtland Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>760 m/ 2500 ft</td>
<td>no impacts due to depressed road and distance</td>
<td>730m/2400 ft, depressed roadway</td>
<td>no change in impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.J. Hill Park/ Wildhorse Playground</td>
<td>adjacent</td>
<td>impact mitigated with depressed roadway and 12 ft noise wall</td>
<td>adjacent</td>
<td>no change in impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esmeralda Golf Course</td>
<td>430 m/ 1400 ft</td>
<td>no impacts due to depressed road and distance</td>
<td>440 m/ 1444 ft, depressed road</td>
<td>no change in impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw Junior High and Regal Elementary Schools</td>
<td>460 m/ 1500 ft</td>
<td>no impacts due to depressed road and distance</td>
<td>493 m/ 1617 ft, depressed road</td>
<td>no change in impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillyard Swimming Pool</td>
<td>270 m/ 900 ft</td>
<td>no impacts due to depressed road and distance</td>
<td>157 m/ 516 ft, at grade</td>
<td>increased impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharpley-Harmon Park</td>
<td>290 m/ 950 ft</td>
<td>no impacts due to depressed road and distance</td>
<td>156 m/ 511 ft, 4.6 m/15 ft above grade</td>
<td>increased impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Elementary School</td>
<td>820 m/ 2700 ft</td>
<td>no impacts due to depressed road and distance</td>
<td>696 m/ 2285 ft, 7.6 m/25 ft above grade</td>
<td>no change in impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In comparison to the FEIS Alignment, the Preferred Alternative has increased impact on some of these sites. Whereas the FEIS Alignment had no impact on the Hillyard public swimming pool due to the distance and the roadway being in depressed section, the Preferred Alternative passes approximately 122m (400 ft) closer, and is just emerging from a depressed section to a raised section at this point. There is a similar difference in regard to the Sharpley-Harmon park and playfields, approximately 244m (800 ft) north of the swimming pool. At this location the Preferred Alternative is proposed to be approximately 4.5m (15 ft) above existing ground level. While the impact for both of these recreational sites would be increased in comparison to the FEIS Alignment, the impact is still not considered significant due to these sites being on the west side and adjacent to the existing Market Street. Market Street is and will remain the primary noise and visual impact to these two sites.
The Preferred Alternative is farther away from the Esmeralda Golf Course and the Shaw Junior and Regal Elementary School grounds.

The only park north of Hawthorne Road in the study area is Farwell Park, on the north side of Hastings Road between Pittsburg and Crestline Streets. It is included in the Farwell Elementary School and Northwood Middle School complex, and is jointly owned by the Spokane County and the Mead School District. Farwell Park is 4 hectares (10 acres) in size. The total complex site is approximately 14.6 hectares (36 acres) in size, and is equipped with two baseball fields and a track.

The Preferred Alternative passes to the north of the school complex approximately 270m (900ft) at the closest point, while the FEIS Alignment passes to the south, approximately 61m (200 ft) at the closest point. The outdoor recreation areas are subject to noise and visual impacts with the FEIS Alignment. The school buildings lie between the recreation area and the proposed new alignment. The Preferred Alternative will eliminate the visual impact to the outdoor areas, and greatly reduce the noise impacts. Hastings/Farwell Road is the primary noise and visual impact to the schools, and will remain so after the completion of the NSC.

Impacts to the Wandermere Golf Course are the same as described in the FEIS (p. 4-141).

**Mitigation**

No mitigation is required or proposed.

**Farmland**

**Impacts**

The Preferred Alternative impacts more land with prime farmland soil than did the FEIS Alignment; the proposed roadway with a 152 m (500 ft) right-of-way in this location would include 4.3 hectares (10.6 acres) of this farmland soil. However, there is no increased impact on farmland since this area is not zoned for agriculture and is not used for agriculture. The Natural Resources Conservation Service, which implements the Farmland Protection Policy Act, has made the interpretation that this area is exempt from the regulation due to current zoning and land use.

Farmland Protection Policy Act (FFPA), 7 USC 4202, Rules, 7 CFR Part 658, Sec. 403.4, Exempted Conversion and Farmland Exclusions:

(c) Lands that are already in or committed to urban development

The indirect impacts on agricultural land of project-induced urban growth northeast of the City are not changed from the FEIS, p. 4-84. The limitation of growth outside of the IUGA depends upon the enforcement of development regulations by Spokane County. (See Prime Farmland Soils Map, Figure 3.11)
Mitigation
There is no mitigation required or proposed.

Services
Impacts
The impacts in terms of services of the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative are unchanged from the FEIS (pages 4-146 through 4-147), except as described below.

Educational Facilities
Although the Preferred Alternative passes closer to some schools and farther from others between the Spokane River and Hawthorne Road, the difference in proximity is not enough to affect the status of no significant impacts, as described in the FEIS (p. 4-138 through 4-139).

Between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere, impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative, and changes in impacts of the FEIS Alignment due to changed conditions, are described below.

There are two schools in the study area, Farwell Elementary and Northwood Middle School. The FEIS Alignment would be within approximately 259m (850 ft) of the school buildings and 61m (200 ft) of the outdoor use area. The Preferred Alternative passes further from the buildings, at approximately 274m (900 ft), and much further from the outdoor use areas, at 427m (1400 ft).

The Mead School District recently (August 1998) purchased the Wismer-Martin building for administrative office space. The building is located north of Farwell Road just east of US 2, and will house 66 employees. The FEIS Alignment would have resulted in removal of this building, while the Preferred Alternative avoids direct impact to it.

Both of the alignments cross the school district attendance boundary, and would require changes to bus routes and affect pedestrian access to the schools and park. The school district Assistant Superintendent has stated that the district’s concern is about how school bus circulation and vehicle traffic will be affected around the two schools. The District’s preference of the alignment alternatives is the WSDOT’s Preferred Alternative since it is furthest from the school site. See School Attendance Boundaries Map, Figure 4.2.

Fire Protection
The segments in which the alignment revisions deviate from the FEIS Alignment occur between Francis Avenue and US 395 at Wandermere. This area is served by Fire District No. 9. The Fire District advised WSDOT on its service standards, which were incorporated into the design of the alignment revisions. There is no difference in the
impacts, and no disruption of service, with either the FEIS Alignment or the Preferred Alternative.  See Fire District Map, Figure 4.3.
Religious and Social Institutions

The Mead United Methodist Church would be displaced with the FEIS Alignment. The Preferred Alternative avoids displacement, taking a portion of the church’s parcel and temporarily disrupting parking. While the FEIS Alignment is 123m (400 ft) south of the Fairwood Community Baptist Church, the Preferred Alternative is approximately 457m (1500 ft) north of this church. The Preferred Alternative lessens the impacts of the NSC on both of the existing churches in the vicinity.

Water and Sewer

Since the FEIS was published, an additional water supply well has been located near Helena Street and Hastings Road, which falls within the FEIS Alignment. This well was established by the Spokane County Water District No. 3 in 1996, at a cost of $700,000. The wellhead protection zone is a 30.5m (100 ft) radius from the well, which precludes road construction and stormwater disposal. This new well is within the FEIS Alignment. The Preferred Alternative avoids impact to this new well (over 305m (1000 ft) away), as well as all other water supply wells and wellhead protection zones in the vicinity.

The Preferred Alternative passes within 15m (50 ft) of an Spokane County Irrigation District # 8 water supply tank. A 36cm (14 inch) water line and spill pad will be disturbed with this alternative. Coordination will continue between WSDOT and the Irrigation District to maintain operation of the water supply.

There is no change or difference in impacts in terms of sewer service.

Mitigation

Mitigation for the impacts of the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative remains as in the FEIS (pages 4-150 through 4-151). The impacts on services for the north end of the project are reduced by the selection of the Preferred Alternative.

Transportation

The VE Study recommended an interchange at Parksmith Drive rather than at Stoneman Road. Once modeled with current traffic information the Francis Avenue interchange as proposed in the FEIS was found to not function adequately in terms of Level of Service and air quality. Additionally, the interchange ramps would have impacted two major businesses, Pasta USA and Food Services Inc., as well as the TOSCO property, which is a Superfund site. The interchange was therefore redesigned to be located primarily on Freya Street, with an eastbound Francis Avenue ramp onto the southbound NSC. The redesign improved the Level of Service and air quality in this vicinity, but resulted in an increased impact on the Morgan Acres neighborhood, east of Freya Street.
Frontage Roads

Frontage roads needs were identified in two areas of the Preferred Alternative: from Lincoln Road north to the vicinity of Piper Road on the east side of the NSC, and north and south of US 2 from the north side of Deadman Creek (in the vicinity of Shady Slope Road) to the vicinity of Deer Road. Preliminary alignments have been established for the frontage roads. Determination of the final alignments will involve coordination with Spokane County and emergency services.

Public Transit

All proposed alignments reserve right-of-way for possible light rail lines. There are no changes in impacts in terms of public transit from the FEIS. STA’s most recent Master Plan references the North Spokane Freeway, and states:

Any change in transportation patterns within north Spokane will need to be closely coordinated with transit service to ensure an appropriate mix of transportation alternatives are available. STA will be a part of these studies and implementation as they occur. (STA, Transit Development Plan 1999-2005, p. 5.6.)

Pedestrian and Bicyclist Facilities

Children living on the south side of Hastings generally do not walk to the elementary and middle school on the north side due to the lack of safe crossing. Students who walk to school generally live directly north and northeast of the school complex (sources: Mead School District Transportation Coordinator; and a neighborhood leader from Camelot Neighborhood). Busing is also available for these students. The pedestrian/bicycle path will bridge the NSC to maintain a connection between the Garden City neighborhood and Northwood Middle and Farwell Elementary schools and play fields.

Both alternative alignments include provisions for a pedestrian/bicycle/non-motorized path within the right-of-way. This is much needed throughout the corridor, especially north of Francis where there are few options for non-motorized travel. The proposed pedestrian/bicycle trail within the NSC right-of-way was only in a preliminary conceptual stage at the time the FEIS was completed. The FEIS (p. 4-132), states, “bicycle traffic will be prohibited on viaduct portions of the freeway, primarily from the I-90 interchange to the Wellesley interchange. Bicycle traffic would have access to the freeway at Wellesley Avenue, and would use the shoulder for travel on the freeway from that point northward. No bicycle traffic would be allowed southbound from Wellesley Avenue.”

This concept has been expanded to a full-length pedestrian/bicycle trail along the NSC. See Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail Map, Figure 4.4. This part of the project will provide an alternative transportation mode route the full length of the corridor. The pedestrian/bicycle route will be a paved, separated pathway, within the NSC right-of-way.
County Urban Connectors

There is no difference in impact in term of the County Urban Connectors between the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative. The Comprehensive Analysis of the Urban Connectors states that the connectors will enhance the overall efficiency of the NSC by providing additional system capacity and reducing demands on the congested section of I-90 between the Liberty Park Interchange and the Sprague Avenue Interchange. (See Urban Connectors Map, Figure 3.15.)

Cultural Resources

Impacts

The identification of cultural sites within the proposed Preferred Alternative included extensive involvement of the Spokane Tribe of Indians (STI). WSDOT, Eastern Washington University Archaeological and Historical Services (EWU-AHS), and the STI developed a plan to survey two sites of interest in the corridor. The survey found one confirmed significant cultural site, on a promontory landform just north of Gerlach Road (the Wittkopf Site). This site has been identified by the Spokane Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) and the Tribe’s archaeologist as a significant cultural site associated with the STI. WSDOT responded by revising the proposed alignment in this area to avoid direct impact to this cultural feature. The site will be impacted visually and audibly by the NSC. The site is privately owned, and is no longer used in the culturally traditional manner. The interest of the STI and intent of WSDOT is to avoid loss of, or physical damage to, the site. Therefore, the indirect impacts do not result in interference with the essential functions of the site, and do not result in a 4(f) impact.

The investigation of the second site, performed with a STI elder present, concluded that the site held no cultural significance.

FHWA has concurred with WSDOT’s documented process of compliance with the tribal consultation requirements of CFR 36, prior to the November 1999 revisions to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. WSDOT is now initiating formal consultation with all tribes in the region in order to comply with the new regulations.

The State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred with EWU-AHS’s determination that no sites investigated within the proposed corridor are likely to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. (Letter from SHPO dated June 7, 2000 is on file.)

Mitigation

The proposed alignment was altered to avoid directly impacting the Wittkopf site. Indirect effects (including visual, audible, and atmospheric) will constitute no adverse effect to the site. Construction activities should be kept as far away from the Wittkopf site as possible. WSDOT should ensure that access to the site is not permitted during
construction. As a precaution, the Spokane Tribe recommends that excavation of the upper few feet of the cut to be made nearest the Wittkopf site be monitored by an archaeologist.

Clearing of the forested areas between Fairview and Piper Roads should be monitored, as investigation of a nearby possible site of interest to the Spokane Tribe proved inconclusive. Should cultural resources be encountered during construction, the Spokane Tribe and office of Archaeological and Historical Services of Eastern Washington University in Cheney, Washington, should be notified immediately.

Release of culturally sensitive information will be subject to the provisions of the Spokane Tribal Cultural Resource Protection Ordinance. Compliance with that Ordinance, although not mandatory off the Spokane Indian Reservation, should ensure WSDOT compliance with the disclosure provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archaeological Resources Protection Act, and Executive Order 13007.

**Hazardous Waste**

**Impacts**

Between the Spokane River and Lincoln Road, no new or different confirmed or suspected contaminated sites are involved in the Preferred Alternative as compared to the FEIS Alignment. This portion of the corridor has undergone an intrusive investigation performed by an environmental consulting firm and WSDOT personnel. The sites of greatest impact in this part of the corridor are the same for the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative: Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railroad/Hillyard Rail Corridor, Koch Materials, and The Plant. All soils within the Preferred Alternative right-of-way where hazardous materials were suspected were specifically investigated. The remainder of the former rail-corridor was investigated using a planned grid method. The updated estimates for these properties are shown in Table 4.12.

**Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railroad/Hillyard Rail Corridor, and Koch Materials**

In these adjacent sites, the impacted soils were generally shallow (less than 3m [10 ft] in depth). The soils were classified by the nature and extent of the contaminants found, using a site-specific, elevated MTCA Method A Industrial cleanup level. The highly contaminated soils will require off-site disposal. The remainder of the impacted soils may be contained on site. The containment issue will require concurrence by Washington State Department of Ecology (WDOE), and may cause the right-of-way to fall under a deed restriction. The preliminary construction plans within the rail yard corridor appear to be able to contain those soils as required.

**The Plant**

This site is the location of an acetylene gas manufacturing and distribution facility. There was speculation the materials in the existing unlined slurry pond may designate as a hazardous material; however, analysis revealed that it does not. The characteristic of the
slurry material reportedly forms a bottom seal in the pond, preventing further soil or groundwater contamination. Based on the analytical results, nothing above the selected cleanup limits was detected. Worker safety issues and a material handling plan will be required to be in place prior to dealing with these materials.

**Table 4.12 Hazardous Site Remediation Estimate for Koch Materials, Burlington Northern/Hillyard Rail corridor, and The Plant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Contaminant</th>
<th>Estimated Disposal Quantity</th>
<th>Estimated Containment Quantity</th>
<th>Total Estimated Remedial Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum, SVOC’s, and Metals</td>
<td>13,212 m$^3$ (17,280 yd$^3$)</td>
<td>115,882 m$^3$ (151,568 yd$^3$)</td>
<td>$1,752,000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Cost</td>
<td>$1,296,000$</td>
<td>$456,000$</td>
<td>$1,752,000$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: The FEIS reported an estimated remediation cost for these sites of $19,319,600. This estimate was prior to intrusive investigation.)

Between Lincoln Road and US 395 at Wandermere, the proposed alignment revisions result in the avoidance of some previously identified contaminated sites; however, some new sites are encountered (See Known and Suspected Contaminated Sites Map, Figure 4.5). The methodology used in the investigation of the sites within the Preferred Alignment has progressed beyond that used in the FEIS. Following potential hazardous site identification, the field investigations consisted of soil sampling for each parcel. From the soil investigation findings, it was determined that no groundwater impacts were resulting. The estimated remediation of these sites is shown in Table 4.12.

**Swanson Hay Trucking**

This site has been used as the office and vehicle maintenance facility for Swanson Hay since 1982. The property contains a 18,931 liter (5,000 gallon) diesel above ground storage tank. This tank and soils around it, estimated at 49.7 m$^3$ (65 yd$^3$), will be removed. There is no evidence of any other potentially hazardous materials. There are both septic systems and a water well that will require decommissioning prior to construction.

**Costich Fertilizer Plant**

This former fertilizer manufacturing facility reportedly operated until about 1969. A building, assumed to be the main manufacturing facility, remains as does much of the machinery used in this operation. Such a large quantity of solid waste is located on this site that a partial investigation was possible. Estimates for the suspect petroleum contaminated soil total 405 m$^3$ (530 yd$^3$). Numerous unidentified drums (estimated 2,272 liter [600 gallons] total) of liquid were also found on this parcel. These liquids will require identification testing and disposal coordination. The estimated partial remediation cost on this parcel may vary once the solid waste is removed and the hazardous materials investigation can be completed.

**Devlin Property**
The Preferred Alternative involves a portion of this property which is adjacent to an operational gravel pit site (Acme). The former site of a rock crushing operation has reportedly been used as a dumping site for demolition debris as well as numerous 208 liter (55-gallon) drums. The content of the drums is unknown. Test pits revealed petroleum contamination slightly exceeding current cleanup levels. It is believed that the levels and quantities are low enough that containing them on site will be the most viable option. An estimated 1,529m$^3$ (2000 yd$^3$) on this site will require special handling.

**Wilson Landfill**
Between 1987 and 1991, a former owner used this site as a permitted inert and demolition waste landfill. The closed landfill file was reviewed at the Spokane County Health Department. No violations were noted in the file. The facility appears to have previously been a borrow pit due to the irregular topography and historical photographs.

This site required investigation of soils due to the historical usage. However, the soils did not designate as hazardous material. The excavations did reveal large quantities of woody debris that will not be suitable base material for road building and will require excavation (see “Topography” section). Estimates are for the relocation of 123,093m$^3$ (161,000 yd$^3$) of debris. The disposition of this material will be determined by reaching an agreement with the Washington State Department of Ecology to relocate and encapsulate the debris to another portion of the same parcel, outside of the NSC right-of-way. Should an agreement not be reached, this site may be considered a dump site and the excavated materials will require special disposal. At this time, this will be treated only as a non-suitable fill construction issue.

### Table 4.13 Confirmed or Suspected Hazardous Waste Sites Impacted by the Preferred Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site identification</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Affected media &amp; est. quantity</th>
<th>Investigation &amp; Remediation Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wilson landfill</td>
<td>Lot 25 S15 T26N R43E SW ¼</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swanson Hay Co. Trucking</td>
<td>Lot 86 S15 T26N R43E NW ¼</td>
<td>Soil 49.7m$^3$ (65 yd$^3$)</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Fertilizer Mfg. Plant (Costich-owner)</td>
<td>Lots 60A&amp;B S15 T26N R43E NW ¼</td>
<td>Soil 405m$^3$ (530 yd$^3$) plus 2,272 liter (600 gal.) liquid</td>
<td>$90,000 (investigation is not complete)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devlin Property</td>
<td>Lots 113-122 except 119 S4 T26N R43 E S 1/2</td>
<td>Soil 1529m$^3$ (2000 yd$^3$)</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1983.7m$^3$, 2,272 liter (595 yd$^3$, 600 gal.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$118,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional contaminated media or hazardous material can be expected to be found along the NSC before and during construction. Underground and above ground storage tanks,
and home heating oil tanks will be found containing hazardous material as well as having contaminated media surrounding them. Drywells and septic systems are commonly misused for hazardous material disposal. Asbestos may be encountered in structures or used as insulation for underground utility lines.

The proposed alignment revisions in this section will result in avoidance of some sites previously identified in the FEIS as impacted, shown in Table 4.14. Stormwater runoff remains an issue within the vicinity of some of these sites. In the vicinity of the North Market Street and Kaiser Aluminum sites, stormwater should still be subject to hydrogeologic investigation to assure that no additional impacts are caused by NSC project. It should be noted that the sites in Table 4.14 have not had intrusive investigation. The affected material volumes and remediation costs listed were estimated as described for the FEIS, and have not been further refined. Meanwhile, the sites identified within the Preferred Alignment (Table 4.13) have had further investigation, making the remediation cost estimates for these sites more accurate.
Table 4.14  Hazardous Waste Sites Avoided by Selection of the Preferred Alternative north of Lincoln Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE INFORMATION</th>
<th>IDENTIFIED or SUSPECT CONTAMINANT</th>
<th>AFFECTED MEDIA</th>
<th>REMEDIATION ESTIMATE (SAVED) $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| North Market Street Site (TOSCO) 3225 E. Lincoln Rd. | 1) Petroleum  
2) PAHs  
3) Solvents  
4) Halogenated organics | Soil  
Groundwater  
Drinking water | 15,000* |
| Cram’s (C&T Salvage) 9700 N. Market | 1) Four, waste oil USTs  
2) Petroleum spillage | Soil | (100,000)  
(50,000) |
| Precious Metal Auto Body 9700 N. Market | 1) Paint wastes  
2) Petroleum spillage | Septic/Drainage Soil  
Soil | (10,000)  
(10,000) |
| Mead Auto Parts 9700 N. Market | 1) Petroleum spillage | Soil | (50,000) |
| Mead Auto Glass 9700 N. Market | Not highly suspect |  | ∅ |
| Allan’s Motorcycle 9700 N. Market | 1) Petroleum spillage | Soil | (10,000) |
| Jacks Automotive 9700 N. Market | 1) Petroleum spillage | Soil | (30,000) |
| C&T Truck Parts 9902 N. Market | 1) One, waste oil UST  
2) Petroleum spillage | Soil | (20,000)  
(150,000) |
| Kaiser Aluminum Hawthorne Rd. | 1) Cyanide Plume | Groundwater | ∅ ** |
| TOTAL SAVED            |                                                        |                           | ($415,000)                      |

* See site description and comments, Limited Initial Site Assessment of Known and Suspected Contaminated Sites on Proposed North Spokane Freeway Alternatives, 1995; p. 91.
** See site description and comments, Limited Initial Site Assessment of Known and Suspected Contaminated Sites on Proposed North Spokane Freeway Alternatives, 1995; p. 98.

Note: Allan’s Motorcycle, included in impacts in the FEIS, has moved outside of the corridor.  
The McKinley BS/SF dump site previously identified has completed cleanup.

Mitigation

A joint comprehensive investigation of the Preferred Alignment between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere was performed by WSDOT and an environmental consultant. Remediation costs were estimated based on this investigation, and are presented in Table 4.13.

All structures, either residential or commercial, that necessitate demolition for the completion of this project will require both an asbestos and a lead paint survey. All asbestos and lead paint found during these surveys will require abatement measures in compliance with all regulations both for disposal and for worker safety. Heating oil tanks, although considered exempt, will be removed in accordance with all regulations. Septic systems and water wells will require decommissioning in accordance with State and Spokane County regulations.
Any site containing hazardous materials not identified during this assessment, discovered during the construction of this project will be reported and mitigated as required by all hazardous materials regulations.

During construction, all contractors are required to have and follow a detailed Spill Prevention Containment and Countermeasures Plan, prepared in accordance with WSDOT and WDOE guidelines. This plan covers spills of fuels, petroleum lubricants, or any other hazardous materials required to be on site for construction purposes. This plan also develops procedures for recognizing and controlling unknown contamination discovered during construction.

These procedures must provide training for recognition of contamination and hazardous conditions and reporting of such conditions to management and the proper regulatory agencies. The prime concern is to protect worker health and safety and the environment.
Visual Quality

The proposed alignment changes were assessed and compared to the FEIS Alignment as documented in the FEIS, in terms of visual quality from and towards the proposed corridor. Visual quality was analyzed for existing conditions and for the future build proposal. The following criteria were assessed on a scale ranging from 0 to 7, with 7 as the highest score. The average scores are shown in the Table 4.15.

- Vividness (memorability of impression of landscape components)
- Intactness (integration of natural and human components)
- Unity (compositional harmony of the view)

### Table 4.15 Visual Quality Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From</td>
<td>Toward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane River to Hawthorne Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIS Alignment</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEIS Alignment</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
<td>3.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Alternative</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-233.

Impacts

Views From the Facility

The difference between the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative proposals begin in the Wellesley Avenue vicinity, and continue heading Northward. North of Wellesley Avenue, the visual experience becomes restricted as the Preferred Alternative proposes a combination of “At Ground”/“Depressed” elevations, paralleling the Hillyard Retail and Industrial area along an acquired railroad grade corridor just west of the FEIS Alignment.

North of Francis Avenue, the Preferred Alternative proposal crosses and continues parallel east of the FEIS Alignment. The two alignments converge for a short distance between the Lincoln Road/Fairview Road areas, and then split again.

The Preferred Alternative continues northward, cutting into the hillside to create a depressed section. It proposes to cross and connect with the SR 2 Interchange in a location Northeast of Farwell Road, continues cutting into the hillside, and curving due west. It transitions from a depressed section to a raised structure, before connecting to the US 395 Interchange in the Wandermere vicinity at a location southeast of the newly constructed US 395 bridge crossing the Little Spokane River.
Both the Preferred Alternative and the FEIS Alignment traverse gently hilly, heavily vegetated Residential and Rural areas, with few notable features. While the FEIS Alignment between US 2 and US 395 at Wandermere is on a raised section, the Preferred Alternative is in depressed section which severely limits views from the roadway.

The proposed depressed roadway sections will restrict the travelers' views of the existing surrounding terrain. These restrictions will, in certain locations, be beneficial to block visually distracting views from the traveler, depending on location and adjoining land uses.

Other views from the proposed “at ground elevation” and “raised” roadway locations will negatively impact the travelers' visual quality, due to the presence of numerous automobile wrecking yards, aggregate pits and quarries awaiting reclamation, petroleum storage areas, industrial complexes and storage yards, unkempt residential areas, and the increased automobile and truck traffic itself. These negative visual elements will become more apparent when the traveler is positioned atop expansive vertical curves of the "raised" roadway sections.

**Views Toward the Facility**

The assessment of the views toward the facility are similar resulting from the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative, although the corridors are in slightly different locations. The visual quality of the views toward the two alternatives of the proposed facility will continue to be impacted in a greater degree by the "raised” and “at ground elevation” roadway sections of the proposal than by the “depressed” roadway sections. Any proposed viaducts, bridges, and major arterial overcrossing structures will increase, and in certain instances, introduce the "Urban" visual element into undeveloped, rural, and residential neighborhoods.

"New Jersey" type concrete traffic barriers and lane delineators are anticipated to be constructed along both the FEIS Alignment and the Preferred Alternative on the "raised" roadway structures to delineate lanes and structure edges. These traffic barriers will also function to partially redirect tire noise. A substantial noise barrier structure, currently envisioned as an earthen berm, is proposed to be constructed along the western edge of the mobile home community located in the Mead, WA area. The original “at ground elevation” to “depressed” roadway section, which is located east of and paralleling the Hillyard retail area, will continue to propose a noise barrier structure to be constructed to mitigate noise impacts on the adjoining residential neighborhood and Wild Horse Park located eastward of the proposed alignment. This particular noise barrier structure should actually improve the visual quality within the neighborhood and park by screening out the traffic congestion and retail attributes of the downtown Hillyard corridor.

**Light and Glare Impacts**

Light and glare impacts are unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-235.
Visual Impacts of Induced Growth
Visual impacts of induced growth are unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-236.

Mitigation
Mitigating measures are unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-236.

Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources
In addition to the discussion of this topic in the FEIS, p. 4-276, the proposed Preferred Alternative abrogates a public investment made in the Morgan Acres neighborhood. See Environmental Justice discussion, this chapter, p. 26.

Relationship of Short-Term Uses of Environment and Long-Term Productivity
This topic is unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-277.

Secondary and Cumulative Impacts
This topic is unchanged from the FEIS, p. 4-277 - 4-281.
Table 4.16 Alternative Route Comparison Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>FEIS Alignment: Market/Greene with North Option connection</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative: Revised Market/Greene with VE North connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional and Community Growth</td>
<td>Cuts across Urban Growth Area in County.</td>
<td>Aligned with edge of Urban Growth Area in County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement and Relocations</td>
<td>123 homes, (90 single-family, 33 multi-family), and 1 church</td>
<td>112 homes (97 single family, 15 multi-family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>total 244 hectares (602 acres)</td>
<td>total 255 hectares (629 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>no exceedance of NAAQS</td>
<td>no exceedance of NAAQS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impacts</td>
<td>220 homes impacted; 40 remain unmitigated by noise walls (FEIS, p. 4-28)</td>
<td>286 homes impacted; approx. 42-95 remain unmitigated by noise walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>40 businesses and approximately 795 employees displaced</td>
<td>35 businesses and approximately 345 employees displaced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Quality</td>
<td>impacts over large residential area between US 2 and US 395 at Wandermere, Northwood Middle and Farwell Elementary Schools</td>
<td>impact reduced with depressed section north of Hawthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(f) and 6(f) Sites; Hist. Parks and Recreation Sites</td>
<td>No properties taken or used</td>
<td>No properties taken or used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geology and Soils</td>
<td>no significant impact</td>
<td>involves designated geologically hazardous soils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife and Habitat</td>
<td>no impact to unique habitat, threatened or endangered species</td>
<td>no impact to unique habitat, threatened or endangered species; increased impact to common habitat and species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>Estimated remediation south of Lincoln Rd: $1,752,000</td>
<td>Estimated remediation south of Lincoln Rd.: $1,752,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimated remediation north of Lincoln Rd.: $445,000</td>
<td>Estimated remediation north of Lincoln Rd.: $118,000.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No difference in impact in: Air Quality, Overall Economic Activity, Water & Hydrological Systems, Flood Plains, Wetlands, Prime Farmland.
**Chapter 5  Public and Agency Coordination**

This chapter documents the public and agency coordination on the NSC since the approval of the FEIS in 1997.

**Agency Coordination**

Since the publication of the FEIS, continued agency coordination has taken place primarily through the Value Engineering (VE) process, as described in Chapter 1.

The Team for the first VE Study, focused on the area between the Spokane River and Lincoln Road, included participants from Spokane County and the City of Spokane. Guest speakers included the Traffic Engineer for the City of Spokane, and the roadmaster for Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (via conference phone call).

The second VE Study, in March 1999, focused on the proposed project between Lincoln Road and US 395 at Wandermere. The study team included representatives from Mead School District, Spokane County, Federal Highway Administration, and local neighborhoods. Three residents from the Garden City Addition neighborhood and one from the southeast side of the proposed US 2 interchange participated in the study.

**Access Control Plan**

WSDOT will continue to coordinate with the City of Spokane, Spokane County and emergency services regarding access issues. Within the City of Spokane, the NSC proposes to eliminate east-west traffic on three city streets (Cleveland, Fairview and Bridgeport). East-west traffic will be maintained on Euclid, Wellesley, and Francis Avenues. Within Spokane County, the NSC proposes to cul-de-sac Fairview Road and Piper Road. Local agency approval is required for any planned frontage roads, county road or city street connections, or cul-de-sacs. The local agency must also agree in writing to accept and maintain the connecting section as a county road or city street. Upon WSDOT approval, the Access Report Plan will be submitted to city and county officials for review and meetings will be held to discuss the report.

**Cooperating Agencies**

There has been no change from the FEIS, as outlined in Chapter 5, pages 5-1 through 5-2. The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) are serving as cooperating agencies for this project. The BPA has jurisdiction over a large amount of land on the north end of the project, and the corridor crosses several BPA power transmission lines. The EPA is a cooperating agency based on its jurisdiction over the Spokane Valley-Rathdrum Aquifer.
General Coordination

The following civic organizations have indicated their support for the NSC project:

- Spokane Area Chamber of Commerce
- Bemiss Neighborhood Council
- Hillyard Neighborhood Council

As WSDOT continues to coordinate with affected agencies and major property owners along the corridor of the NSC, meetings have been held with the following (neighborhood coordination is found under Public Involvement):

NSC Pilot Housing Program

A special effort has been made in the cause of neighborhood rehabilitation and affordable housing. The early coordination with neighborhoods and housing groups to minimize disruptions, as mentioned in the FEIS (p. 4-148), is the purpose of this program. The objectives of the NSC Pilot Housing Program are to provide replacement housing stock along the corridor, preserve the architectural integrity of neighborhoods by in-filling, provide additional low-income housing stock, and maintain decent, safe, and sanitary housing within the NSC right-of-way until construction of the NSC takes place.

Fire District 9/ Emergency Services

Since the FEIS, Fire District 9 has assumed service for Fire District 6. (See Fire District Map, Chapter 4.)

Meetings:

Fire District 9 presented the following concerns during the development of the proposed alternative alignment, which were incorporated into the VE study.

- Maintain access to Gerlach Road from Market Street, as this is principal route to Mount Saint Michael.
- Investigate need for signalization at Pittsburg/Farwell intersection.
- Maintain direct access from Farwell Road to Shady Slope Road.
- Obtain Fire District input on location of fire hydrants.
- Provide emergency vehicle turn-arounds on US 395.
- Review access to Wellington Heights.
- Provide Opticoms at all new signalized intersections.


Mead School District

The Assistant Superintendent of the Mead School District No. 354 participated in the Lincoln Road to US 395 at Wandermere VE Study.
Area Churches

Information and concerns gathered through discussions and correspondence between WSDOT and the two churches in the study area have been considered in the selection of the Preferred Alternative. Both the Mead United Methodist Church and the Fairwood Baptist Church had a strong desire to remain in their current location, and therefore favor the Preferred Alternative.

Burlington Northern and Santa Fe Railway Company

At the time the FEIS was written, Burlington Northern and consultants were creating a master development plan for the vacated Hillyard Railroad yard (FEIS, p. 5-3). The Master Plan has been completed, but it is not an active plan at this time. No binding site plan or permits are approved on this property.

Agreements and permits have been obtained for WSDOT to enter railroad property for survey purposes. An engineering firm has been retained as consultants to provide engineering and design work for railroad facilities impacted by the NSC project. WSDOT is working toward an agreement with BNSF on the realignment of the mainline tracks, spur lines, and the continued operation of the train assembly yard. An environmental consultant has been retained to investigate suspected soil contamination of BNSF properties.

Following is a list of the meetings that have taken place with BNSF since the publication of the FEIS:

1. June 30, 1998. Update on project status and obtain permission to set aerial survey targets.
6. February 2, 1999. Discussed property acquisition issues, right of entry permit for environmental investigations, BNSF approval process, involvement of the BNSF operation group in the rail design process.
7. February 24, 1999. Discussed operations issues. BNSF preferred that tracks remain east of NSC. WSDOT committed to investigate this option.
10. December 14, 1999. Meeting with BNSF to discuss current project status and to review proposed rail configurations and right-of-way issues.
Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corporation

Informational meetings continued with Kaiser representatives after the publication of the FEIS in April 1997.
2. March 26, 1998
6. December 30, 1999. WSDOT provided updated information of proposed alignment changes between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere.
7. February 4, 1999. WSDOT staff discussed alternative alignment process status. Kaiser provided information on their environmental mitigation area for waste water treatment and air monitoring station.

Bonneville Power Administration

WSDOT proposes the purchase of a portion of BPA’s Bell-Boundary No. 3 transmission line corridor, which runs north-south between Kaiser Aluminum and Mead Royale Mobile Home Community. BPA determined that there are no future expansion plans for this transmission line corridor, but would require that adequate right-of-way be retained by BPA in order to protect the existing transmission line. Current leases on BPA property have been discussed for optimum coordination.

WSDOT and BPA have also discussed the relocation and/or raising of transmission for clearance where the NSC will cross the utility corridor. Adequate time frames have been established for this procedure.

Following correspondence on the above issues, WSDOT and BPA met on August 11, 1999, to discuss updates of the NSC project, impacts to BPA properties, and scheduling concerns.

Avista Utilities

The following meetings have been held to date to coordinate the project with Avista.
1. March 9, 1999: WSDOT provided information on the project status and requested information on current and future utility plans.
2. March 20, 1999: Avista provided maps of current and proposed utility facilities.

City of Spokane

The City of Spokane was represented in the first VE Study (see above, “Value Engineering Studies”), and continues to be involved in the Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail planning (see below, “Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail.”)
The City of Spokane and WSDOT have worked in coordination on projects within the NSC corridor. A meeting was held September 25, 1999, to share information regarding the following City projects.

- Euclid Avenue improvements from Market Street to Freya Street. The NSC does not negatively impact this project, and is not impacted by this project.
- Francis Avenue/Market Street concrete intersection. (This project has since been canceled by the City of Spokane.)

Coordination is continuing regarding the treatment of the city streets and the associated utilities on the west side of the NSC between Illinois Avenue and Francis Avenue.

**Spokane County**

Spokane County was represented in both of the VE Studies (see above, “Value Engineering Studies”), and continues to be involved in the Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail planning (see below, “Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail.”)

- January 5, 1999. WSDOT staff attended an informational meeting on the County Urban Area Connectors plan, presented by Spokane County.
- January 12, 2000. County and WSDOT staffed discussed coordination of county road projects with the NSC, including: improvements to Farwell Road between US 2 and Market Street, reconstruction of Market Street north of Francis Avenue, frontage road locations, Shady Slope Road realignment.

**Spokane Transit Authority**

The following meetings have been held to date to coordinate with Spokane Transit Authority (STA):

1. November 12, 1998: discussion of overall project
2. October 26, 1999: discussion of proposed alignment changes, and locations of park-and-ride facilities
3. November 10, 1999: STA provided WSDOT with a letter outlining preferred locations of park-and-ride facilities. These locations have been included in the current NSC plans.

**Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC)**

Following is a brief description of the coordination between WSDOT and SRTC:

1. August 19, 1999: Discussed the proposed location of the NSC Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail between the Spokane River and US 395 at Wandermere.
2. September 9, 1999: SRTC Advisory Committee member joined WSDOT meeting with neighborhood council representatives, local pedestrian and bicycle clubs, to discuss the proposed NSC Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail location.
3. January 24, 2000: WSDOT submitted a request to SRTC to modify the regional base and forecast land use data in order to capture significant existing trip generators which are located in close proximity to NSC but were not reflected in the data files. WSDOT also requested minor modifications to the regional travel demand model network in order to more discretely represent trip paths in the vicinity of NSC interchanges.
4. February 2, 2000: A letter was received from SRTC approving the changes requested in the January 24, 2000 correspondence.

5. February 9, 2000: WSDOT requested guidance concerning the Northside Arterial (NSA). The NSA is a proposed Spokane County project which is currently in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP), but is no longer part of the County’s long-range transportation plan.

6. February 15, 2000: SRTC indicated that until Spokane County requests that SRTC remove the NSA from the regional plan, the NSA should be considered part of the MTP. Therefore, travel demand for forecasting for the NSC should include the NSA as a forecast facility assumption.

7. February 22, 2000: WSDOT requested clarification of the MTP amendment process, especially as it related to the removal obsolete facility plans.

8. February 22, 2000: SRTC provided a letter to WSDOT supporting WSDOT’s request to amend the Spokane Area Functional Classification System to incorporated the NSC as a limited access freeway.

9. March 1, 2000: Spokane County requested SRTC to remove the NSA from the forecast network.

10. March 8, 2000: WSDOT was advised that the request to remove the NSA from the network is being processed, and that WSDOT should proceed with travel demand forecasting assuming the NSA is not part of the forecast transportation network.

Additionally, numerous informal meetings were conducted among WSDOT and SRTC staff, between September 1999 and March 2000, to ensure that travel demand forecasting for the SEIS was done in a manner consistent with SRTC practices, policies, and procedures.

### Public Involvement

The public involvement plan for the revisions to the NSC used the following approaches to ensure inclusion of business, private citizens, federal, state, and local agencies, and other interested groups in the EIS process:

- Disseminating information to the general public, businesses, citizen groups, and public agencies and officials.
  
The dissemination of information was enhanced with two new modes. A page devoted to the NSC was established on the WSDOT Eastern Region’s web site. This page was created and posted in January 1999, and has been updated as changes and development occur. It also provides another opportunity for feedback. A NSC newsletter was created to keep the public updated on the project. Three issues were distributed: Fall 1998, Winter 1998/1999, and Fall 1999. Over 15,000 copies of the Winter issue were mailed out along with the Open House announcements in February, to residents and businesses in the vicinity of the corridor, property owners, and to those on the general mailing list.

- Holding Open Houses.
All open houses were informal, with displays and staff to present the latest information on the project, and to receive verbal and written comment.

1. February 18, 1999: focusing on the Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermere segment, held at Northwood Middle School, 6-10 pm. with 525 people signing attendance sheet (estimated attendance: 700-1000). The changes within the FEIS Preferred Alignment corridor were presented, along with the preliminary proposal and comparison of the revised northern alternative alignment.

2. February 25, 1999: focusing on the Spokane River to Hawthorne Road segment, held at the Northeast Community Center, 6-8 pm. with 337 people signing attendance sheet. The Revised Market/Greene Alignment resulting from the VE Study was presented with comparison to the FEIS Preferred Alignment.

3. June 30, 1999: focusing on the Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermere segment, held at Mead Middle School, 4-8 pm. with 530 people signing attendance sheet.

Further design and refinement of the alignment continued, including the input from the public. More accurate assessments of residential and business displacements and environmental impacts were developed, and these were presented in the following forums:

4. January 12, 2000: meeting with Hillyard/Bemiss area business owners and operators; held at the Northeast Community Center, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 33 people signing attendance sheet.

5. February 8, 2000: meeting with Garden City and Mead area residents to develop preferred alignment of the pedestrian/bicycle trail in that neighborhood; held at Northwood Middle School, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 32 people signing attendance sheet.

6. February 15, 2000: meeting with Hillyard/Bemiss area residential landowners and occupants; held at the Northeast Community Center, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 84 people signing attendance sheet.

7. February 22, 2000: open house presenting the latest information on alignment and impacts of the Preferred Alternative between the Spokane River and Gerlach Road; held at the Northeast Community Center, 5:00-8:00 pm, with 177 people signing attendance sheet.

8. March 22, 2000: meeting for business owners and operators between Gerlach Road and Wandermere; held at Northwood Middle School, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 16 people signing attendance sheet.

9. April 19, 2000: meeting for residential landowners and occupants between Gerlach Road and Wandermere; held at Northwood Middle School, 6:30-8:30 pm, with 66 people signing attendance sheet.

10. May 24, 2000: open house presenting the latest information on the alignment between the Spokane River and Wandermere; held at Rogers High School, 5:00-8:00 pm, with 127 people signing attendance sheet.

- Holding community meetings.
Additional information meetings were held at the request of individuals and community groups. Below is a synopsis of the meetings with neighborhoods which are between the Spokane River and US 395 at Wandermere.

**Bemiss Neighborhood Council**
- **January 12, 1999.** 10 attendees. Council chair responded with letter of support for the project, stating it will reduce traffic congestion and be good for neighborhood as well as Spokane as a whole.
- **November 9, 1999.**

**Hillyard Neighborhood Council**
- **January 20, 1999.** 21 attendees.
- **April 15, 1999.** Meeting with Council Chair. Project Engineer Keith Martin was invited and committed to attend neighborhood council’s monthly meetings to provide brief updates and receive input.
- **May 19, 1999.** 10 attendees. Residents invited to serve on advisory committee. General concerns were about elevation of roadway.
  - **Monthly meetings continue.**

**Cooper Neighborhood**
- **November 24, 1999.**

**Garden City - Mead Neighborhood Coalition**
- **April 20, 1999.** WSDOT Project Engineer, Environmental Manager, and Real Estate Services Manager met with neighborhood for question and answer session following open house.
- **July 6, 1999.** WSDOT Project Engineer, Environmental Manager, and Real Estate Services Manager met at Mead United Methodist Church as follow-up after June Open House.

**Friends of Little Spokane**
- **February 23, 1999.** Approximately 75 attendees.

**Public Comment**
Public comment received regarding the selection of the VE North Alignment as the new Preferred Alternative reflect that the published FEIS set up a level of expectation of the eventual location of the NSC. The Garden City area neighborhoods were never included in the alternatives considered in the original EIS process, but are impacted by the new Preferred Alternative. The major concerns expressed by the Garden City area residents are:
- After going through full public process, the preferred alignment published in the FEIS set up a level of expectation about the future location of the NSC. This information was available to be used by both residents within and outside of the published corridor in making decisions on property purchases, sales, or improvements. The Garden City neighborhood and vicinity were well outside of the published preferred alignment.
- The reason given for the reconsideration of the alignment location between Hawthorne Road and US 395 at Wandermere was to reduce impact on a growing...
residential area. This growing residential area involves recent and proposed development which has taken place within the preferred alignment at published in the FEIS. The Garden City residents point out that the new Preferred Alternative avoids this growing area by instead impacting their older, more established and cohesive neighborhood. They feel that the impacts to a neighborhood which has been in existence for approximately 30 years will be greater than the impacts would have been to the newer homes and proposed development.

The other major issue of concern expressed by the residents throughout the project area is reduced property values. Residents believe that the construction and existence of the freeway in proximity to their homes will greatly reduce desirability of their property and the future sale price of their homes. The question of compensation for reduced value, as well as for damaged views and general desirability of their properties was raised many times. WSDOT completed a proximity analysis, to project impact of the freeway on close-by residential property values.

**Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail**

The project office is continuing to coordinate the planning and design of the pedestrian/bicycle path with the City of Spokane, Spokane County, SRTC, the County Health District, the Spokane Police, the Friends of the Centennial Trail, area bicycling and walking clubs, and neighborhood councils along the corridor. The NSC Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail is included in Spokane County’s report, “Inventory and Analysis, Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities” (January 2000).

The meetings held to date:

1. August 19, 1999. Meeting with agencies and organizations which may have projects planned which the path may intersect with, or who have experience to lend.
2. September 9, 1999. Meeting with neighborhood council representatives and user groups to present preliminary alignment and receive input on improving alignment and design to best serve community. Input from this meeting along with advisement from the WSDOT Statewide Bicycle Coordinator resulted in the current alignment of the trail.
3. February 8, 2000: Meeting with the Mead/Garden City neighborhoods to discuss trail issues between Farwell Road and Pittsburg Street.

Additional meetings and mailings have shared the trail planning information with and offered the opportunity to comment to various interest groups and organizations:

- City of Spokane Bicycle Advisory Committee
- the regional Citizens Advisory Committee for Transportation
- Transportation Choices Coalition
- Spokane Bicycle Club
- Bicycle Alliance (statewide)
- Hobnailers (walking club)
Chapter 6 Final Section 4(f) Evaluation

The purpose of this Section 4(f) evaluation is to provide the information required to make a 4(f) determination on various parks, recreational sites, and historical sites that may be affected by construction of a new NSC facility as identified in Chapter 1 of this Supplemental EIS.

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act states that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) will not approve the use of land from a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or any significant historic site, unless a determination is made that: (1) there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of such land, and (2) the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property.

Recreational 4(f) properties along the NSC corridor from the Spokane River to US 395 at Wandermere are evaluated in Chapter 4 of this document. No portion of these properties is proposed to be taken or used for this project. In comparison to the FEIS Alignment, the Preferred Alternative is in closer proximity to two recreation sites; the Hillyard public swimming pool and the Sharpley-Harmon Park. While the Preferred Alignment is closer to both of these recreational sites than is the FEIS Alignment, the distance is still more than 152 m (500 ft), and Market Street is located between the sites and the proposed alignment. Market Street is and will remain the primary noise and visual impact to these two sites. Neither these or any other 4(f) properties along the corridor were found to be impacted by the project’s proximity such that the protected activities, attributes, or features of the property are substantially impaired. Consequently, no take, use, nor constructive use is projected for any of the recreational properties in the project study area.

Eastern Washington University Archaeological and Historical Services determined that no sites investigated within the proposed corridor are likely to be eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Section 6(f)
There are no properties subject to the provisions of Section 6(f) located within the project study area.
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### Preparers of Document

**Washington State Department of Transportation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Title</th>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Professional Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elena Aleckseeva</td>
<td>map production</td>
<td>AA Civil Engineering Tech.</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Allen</td>
<td>design, construction estimate, schedule</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Anderson</td>
<td>real estate issues</td>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Manager, Eastern Region Real Estate Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Bennett</td>
<td>air quality impacts, travel demand projections</td>
<td>M. Public Administration</td>
<td>Transportation Studies Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Blegen</td>
<td>hydraulics, design</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrick Bohnet</td>
<td>traffic modeling, air quality</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn Boyd, P.E.</td>
<td>design team leader</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Denning</td>
<td>design</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Engle</td>
<td>graphics</td>
<td>AAS Natural Resources Management, AAS Graphic Design</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Farrar</td>
<td>Preliminary Air Quality Analysis</td>
<td>Civil Engineering Certificate</td>
<td>Air Quality and Acoustics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janelle Hitch, PE</td>
<td>air quality studies</td>
<td>BS Environmental Engineering</td>
<td>Air Quality Studies Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Title Participation</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Professional Discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natasha Kinser</td>
<td>AA Civil Engineering Tech.</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>map production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>document assembly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erv Koller</td>
<td>B.A. Biology</td>
<td>Wildlife Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wetland Ecology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Martin, P.E.</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dave McCoury</td>
<td>Acquisition and Relocation Supervisor</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>real estate relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph McElfish</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ray McNamara</td>
<td>AAS Computer Drafting</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Miller</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad Phillips</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveying, construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimates, schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Prudente</td>
<td>BS Biological Science</td>
<td>WSDOT Eastern Region Environmental Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Rennaker</td>
<td>Office Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>correspondence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Smith</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials Specialist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hazardous sites mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Smith</td>
<td>M. Urban &amp; Regional Planning</td>
<td>Environmental Planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEIS production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Storey</td>
<td>AA Civil Engineering Tech.</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graphics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Veldhuizen</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name/Title Participation</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Professional Discipline</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn Wagemann, P.E.</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Project Engineer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Ward</td>
<td>BS Marketing</td>
<td>Real Estate Appraiser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Proximity Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Welty</td>
<td>BA Liberal Arts</td>
<td>Air Quality Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Air Quality Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Westby</td>
<td>AA Civil Engineering Tech.</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design, construction estimate, schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acoustics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Noise Impact Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Winkler, P.E.</td>
<td>BSCE</td>
<td>Civil Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Yach</td>
<td>B.S. Landscape Arch.</td>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Quality Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Professional Consultants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline Report</th>
<th>Firm</th>
<th>Lead Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Resources Survey</td>
<td>Archaeological and Historical Services, Eastern Washington University, Cheney, WA</td>
<td>Craig Holstine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detailed Site Investigation for Hazardous Waste and Evaluation of Construction Impacts</td>
<td>EMCON Spokane, WA</td>
<td>Jeff Lower, P.E. Project Engineer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Investigation for Hazardous Waste</td>
<td>Tetra Tech, Inc. Seattle, WA</td>
<td>Rick Osgood, R.P.G. Senior Geologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise Impact and Mitigation Analysis</td>
<td>Jones &amp; Stokes Assoc., Inc. Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>Curt Overcast, Project Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B Distribution List

Agencies, Organizations, and Persons receiving a copy of the Final Supplemental EIS and/or Notice of Availability:

**Area Indian Tribes**
- Colville Confederated Tribes
- Coeur d’Alene Tribe
- Kalispel Tribe
- Nez Perce Tribe
- Spokane Tribe of Indians

**Federal Agencies**
- Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
- Bonneville Power Administration
- Council On Environmental Quality
- Environmental Protection Agency
- Federal Emergency Management Agency
- Federal Highway Administration
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
- National Park Service
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Department of Commerce
- U.S. Department of Interior
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
- U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service

**State Agencies**
- Conservation Commission
- Department of Community Development
- Department of Ecology
- Department of Employment Security
- Department of Fish and Wildlife
- Department of Licensing
- Department of Natural Resources
- Department of Revenue
- Department of Social and Health Services
- Gambling Commission
- Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
- Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
- Office of the Attorney General
- State Library
- Utilities and Transportation Commission
- Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission
- Washington State Patrol
- Washington Transportation Commission
Local Agencies
Spokane City/County Emergency Management
Spokane City Engineering Services
Spokane City Manager
Spokane City Park and Recreation Department
Spokane City Planning Department
Spokane City Public Works Department
Spokane City Transportation Department
Spokane County Air Pollution Control Authority
Spokane County Engineering and Roads Division
Spokane County Fire District #4
Spokane County Fire District #9
Spokane County Planning Department
Spokane County Sheriff Department
Spokane Fire Department
Spokane Housing Authority
Spokane International Airport
Spokane Police Department
Spokane Regional Health District
Spokane Regional Transportation Council
Spokane Transit Authority

Public Officials
Slade Gorton, United States Senator
Patty Murray, United State Senator
George Nethercutt, United States Representative
Lisa Brown, State Senator, Third District
Jeff Gombosky, State Representative, Third District
Alex Wood, State Representative, Third District
Larry Crouse, State Representative, Fourth District
Bob McCaslin, State Senator, Fourth District
Lynn Schindler, State Representative, Fourth District
Brad Benson, State Representative, Sixth District
Duane Sommers, State Representative, Sixth District
Jim West, State Senator, Sixth District
Cathy McMorris, State Representative, Seventh District
Bob Morton, State Senator, Seventh District
Bob Sump, State Representative, Seventh District
Don Cox, State Representative, Ninth District
Mark Schloesler, State Representative, Ninth District
Larry Sheahan, State Senator, Ninth District
John Talbott, Mayor, Spokane
Spokane City Council
Spokane County Commission

Organizations
American Medical Response
Arrivee Cycling Club
Associated Industries of the Inland Northwest
Associated General Contractors
Baddlands Cycling Club
Bemiss Neighborhood Council
Bicycle Alliance of Washington
Chief Garry Neighborhood Council
Community Colleges of Spokane
Downtown Spokane Partnership
East Central Neighborhood
Fairwood Community Baptist Church
Friends of the Centennial Trail
Friends of the Little Spokane River Valley
Garden City/Mead Coalition
Hillyard Neighborhood Council
Hobnailers
Inland Automobile Association
Logan Neighborhood Steering Committee
Mead School District No. 354
Mead United Methodist Church
Preserve Our Neighborhood Integrity (PONI)
Spokane Area Chamber of Commerce
Spokane Area Economic Development Council
Spokane Area Good Roads Association
Spokane Association of Realtor’s
Spokane Bicycle Club
Spokane Building Owners and Managers Association
Spokane Construction Council / Spokane Regional Plan Center
Spokane County Medical Society
Spokane Education Association
Spokane Homebuilders Association
Spokane Housing Authority
Spokane Intercollegiate Research and Technology Institute
Spokane Labor Council
Spokane Low Income Housing Consortium
Spokane Merchants Association
Spokane Public School District No. 81
Spokane Valley Chamber of Commerce
SRTC Citizens Advisory Committee on Transportation
Transportation Choices Coalition, Inland Northwest Chapter
Washington State Trucking Associations
West Plains Business Association
### Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spokane City</th>
<th>Spokane County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>Argonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side</td>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
<td>Cheney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moran Prairie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otis Orchards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Colleges and Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argonne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airway Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moran Prairie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Spokane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis Orchards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### News Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Washington University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzaga University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Community College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Falls Community College</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spokane City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple, Robert W.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benson, Brad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binsfield, Harvey D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue, Muriel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocksch, Robert D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brewer, Mike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, Patricia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cameron, Larry    Chaisson, Bill
Christopherson, C B  Compogno, Sam
Dougherty, Paul B.   Dudley, Loren
Edgerton, Pam       Eickmeyer, Roy A.
Elton, David        Fackenthal, Alan
Gaddy, Mary         Gillie, Lee
Greenwood, Earnest   Gumm, Emmett
Hadley, Rich        Harras, Jeanette
Hart, Gil           Herd, Chris
Honecker, Ken       Iliakis, Anna
Irving, Phil        Jacobs, Carolyn
Killian, Charles    Kirkman, David & Jan
Klein, Lotti W.     Knopp, Walter
Landusky, Dennis    LaPoint, Bill, Ben & Gen
Lee, Shane & Julie  Loriana, Diane
Marshall, John S.   McLaughlin, Tom
Mehl, Dorothy       Mertens, Patrick A.
Monteith, John      Murphy, William O., Sr.
Nelson, Dwayne      Niven, Kurt
Nordhagen, Marvin   Pangborne, Duane
Parker, Cecelia     Parker, Steve
Peters, Tom         Powers, Julian
Rees, Larry         Reiner, Lucy
Rhea, Philip R.     Sand-Wichman, Karen
Rogers, Thomas H., Sr. Schmidt, Chas
Schmidt, Earl       Schneider, Ann N.
Simpson, Jim        Smith, Ronald “Mark”
Smith, Sandy        Snyder, Sharon
Thain, Rick & Diane Thompson, Mary Jane
Thompson, Mickey    Thompson, Pete
Walker, Susan       Walt, Debbie
Walt, Patricia      Warner, Wendy
Watson, Margaret R.  Weeks, Patty
Weston, Melanie     Wichman, Tom

Businesses
Avista Utilities   Burlington Northern Railroad
Food Services of America  Groff & Murphy
Hart Enterprises  Hanson Industries Inc.
Inland Pacific Engineering, Inc.  Kaiser Aluminum Mead Works
M.F.G.W., Inc.    Modern Office Equipment
Park Lane Motel   Ramm Associates
Safeway Stores Inc.  URM Stores Inc.
Witherspoon, Kelley, Davenport & Toole
Appendix C
Business List and Employment Estimates
## Appendix C  Business List and Employment Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business List and Employee Estimate</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative</th>
<th>F E I S Alignment</th>
<th>Dis-Place</th>
<th>Disrupt</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>5-year Employment Estimates</th>
<th>85-100 **</th>
<th>1 - 5 **</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPOKANE RIVER to FRANCIS AVENUE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ADDRESS STREET</strong></td>
<td><strong>NAME</strong></td>
<td><strong>TYPE</strong></td>
<td><strong>EMPLOYEES</strong></td>
<td><strong>(Q winter)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2721 N Market</td>
<td>The Bend Restaurant</td>
<td>restaurant and casino</td>
<td>auto sales</td>
<td>1 **</td>
<td>1 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2924 N Market</td>
<td>RJ’s Auto Mart</td>
<td>car wash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2928 N Market</td>
<td>Hay You Car Wash</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3014 N Market</td>
<td>Saw Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3128 E Fairview</td>
<td>Markos Evergreen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3127 E Liberty</td>
<td>Sprinklers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3123 E Liberty</td>
<td>Puget Sound Carver Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3406 N Market</td>
<td>Cosentini Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3416 E Bridgeport</td>
<td>Spokane Food Service/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3416 N Market</td>
<td>McDonald’s Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3502 N Market</td>
<td>Subway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18 0’ 30 P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3502 N Market</td>
<td>Spokane Print &amp; Mail/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69 **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3502 N Market</td>
<td>Smart Shoppe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3510 E Market</td>
<td>Fast Food Restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3510 E Market</td>
<td>Publishing, printing,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Heating &amp; Air Condition</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Heating &amp; Air Conditioning Service</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Joe &amp; Les Auto Electric</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Thornton &amp; Sons</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Richards Refrigeration,</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Shocking &amp; Cooling</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Heating &amp; Air Condition</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Heating &amp; Air Conditioning Service</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Steve’s Auto Body</td>
<td>auto sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Steve’s Auto Body</td>
<td>auto sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Ryan Auto Sales</td>
<td>auto sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>City Neon Sign Co.</td>
<td>auto sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3512 E Market</td>
<td>Balancing &amp; Machine</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>STREET</td>
<td>NAME</td>
<td>EMPLOYEES</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>Preferred Displace</td>
<td>Alternative Displace</td>
<td>Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318 E</td>
<td>Gordon</td>
<td>Kincaid Auto Body</td>
<td>4 **</td>
<td>auto repair</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3096 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td>3 **</td>
<td>former fabrication/building shop</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3050 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Pioneer (formerly All Part Chemical Co.)</td>
<td>3 **</td>
<td>chemical warehousing</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4020 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Nesco, Inc.</td>
<td>3 **</td>
<td>acetylene manufacturing</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4012 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Ziggy’s Building Management</td>
<td>87 **</td>
<td>building materials retail, material supply</td>
<td>3 **</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3412 E</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>R.W. Fabricators, Inc.</td>
<td>9 **</td>
<td>warehouse and distribution</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3450 E</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Food Services of America</td>
<td>30 **</td>
<td>asphalt manufacture</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4010 N</td>
<td>Thor</td>
<td>Keetch Materials</td>
<td>35 **</td>
<td>asphalt manufacturing building</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4410 N</td>
<td>College</td>
<td>Dist. 17 Community</td>
<td>120 **</td>
<td>administration building</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4019 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Quad Motors, Inc.</td>
<td>4 **</td>
<td>former pawn shop</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3015 E</td>
<td>Wellisley</td>
<td>Qwik Stop Gas</td>
<td>1 **</td>
<td>gas station</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3523 E</td>
<td>Wellisley</td>
<td>Faulkner Properties</td>
<td>8 **</td>
<td>auto parts dealer</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5906 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Big Bear Lumber</td>
<td>11 **</td>
<td>lumber &amp; misc. supply</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6116 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Inland Northwest Wildlife Council</td>
<td>2 **</td>
<td>private nonprofit, and auditorium rental</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL DISPLACEMENTS, Spokane River to Francis Avenue**: 26 businesses, 692-722 emp.

* verified by telephone, December 1998/January 1999

** verified by telephone, November 1999

*** verified by telephone, not found, estimated

Information taken from 1997 FEIS, Appendix C.
### FRANCIS AVENUE to HAWTHORNE ROAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>EMPLOYEES</th>
<th>FEIS Alignment</th>
<th>Preferred Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6302 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Plain Jane Restaurant</td>
<td>restaurant (vacant)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6401 N</td>
<td>Freya</td>
<td>Lee's Pallet Service</td>
<td>pallet recycling</td>
<td>15*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10 winter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3501 E</td>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Jackpot Food Mart</td>
<td>convenience store</td>
<td>3**</td>
<td></td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7118 N</td>
<td>Freya</td>
<td>A. M. Irrigation</td>
<td>landscape material supply</td>
<td>30***</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td></td>
<td>(9 winter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7511 N</td>
<td>Freya</td>
<td>U.R.M.</td>
<td>grocery distributor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7610 N</td>
<td>Freya</td>
<td>Building America</td>
<td>wood roof truss manufacturing</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8102 N</td>
<td>Freya</td>
<td>Digatron</td>
<td>small manuf. &amp; service</td>
<td>30*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8102 N</td>
<td>Freya</td>
<td>Jetseal</td>
<td>small manufacturing</td>
<td>12*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9700 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Mead Auto Parts</td>
<td>used auto parts</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9706 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Mead Auto Glass</td>
<td>auto glass repair &amp; replace.</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9718 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Precious Metals</td>
<td>auto body repair</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3 winter)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9800 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Jack's Auto Parts</td>
<td>wrecking yard</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9902 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>C&amp;T Truck Parts</td>
<td>wrecking &amp; truck parts and repair</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11110 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Great Northern Interiors</td>
<td>carpet &amp; tile shop</td>
<td>1±</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Displacements, Francis Avenue to Hawthorne Road**

1 business, 9-30 employees, 2 businesses, 10-31 employees

---

* verified by telephone, December 1998/January 1999
** verified by telephone, November 1999
*** verified by telephone, January 2000
± information not found; estimated
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>STREET</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>FEIS Displacement</th>
<th>Alternative Displacement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10713 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>C&amp;R Auto Dismantlers</td>
<td>wrecking yard</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10825 N</td>
<td>Market</td>
<td>Uncle Jim's Auto</td>
<td>wrecking yard</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3505 E</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Moore Perma-Match</td>
<td>landscape materials, fuel oil</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3421 E</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Swanson Hay</td>
<td>hay supplier, distributor</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2111 E</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
<td>Kaiser Aluminum Mead</td>
<td>contractors storage</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10704 N</td>
<td>Mead</td>
<td>Max J. Kuney</td>
<td>senior assisted living home</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1620 E</td>
<td>Mead</td>
<td>Willo Grove</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12505 N</td>
<td>Pittsburg</td>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td>home business</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12505 N</td>
<td>Pittsburg</td>
<td>Caremeaking Inc</td>
<td>home business</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13011 N</td>
<td>Shady</td>
<td>Beck's Machine Shop</td>
<td>machine shop</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13100 N</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>the Lincoln Agency</td>
<td>home business-mailing service</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13225 N</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Specialty Home Care</td>
<td>home business - nursing</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 2</td>
<td>US 2</td>
<td>B&amp;C Construction</td>
<td>construction</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL Displacements, Hawthorne Road to US 395 at Wandermore:**

*verified by telephone, December 1998/January 1999

*verified by telephone, February 2000

*Information not found, estimated

Information to the Mead School District Administration building documented in Public Services section.

Did not include in this table since it is not a business, and the jobs would not be lost to the area if they had to use a different building.
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Affected Environment
Those elements of the project area which may be changed by the proposed alternatives. These changes may be positive or negative in nature.

Alignment
In transportation, the horizontal and vertical ground plan of a roadway, railroad transit route, or other facility as it would appear in plan and profile.

Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990
Federal law that mandates extensive changes in building codes, transportation, and hiring practices to prevent discrimination against persons with disabilities, not only in projects involving federal dollars, but in connection with all new public places, conveyances, and employers. The significance of ADA in transportation is mainly felt in terms of transit operations, capital improvements, and hiring.

Best Management Practices (BMPs)
Physical, structural, and managerial practices that, when used individually or in combination, prevent or reduce pollution of water and attenuate peak flows and volumes. Source control BMPs are designed to prevent the introduction of pollutants into runoff. Examples would be mulches and cover over bare soil, and putting roofs over outside storage areas. Water quality BMPs include facilities that remove pollutants from runoff by simple gravity settling of particulate matter, filtration, biological uptake, and soil adsorption. Examples include wet ponds and vegetated swales. Water quantity BMPs protect stream ecosystems from excessive erosion by reducing peak rate of runoff during a storm event by storing the flow and releasing it at a lower rate. Typical examples are dry ponds and dry vaults. The selection of proper BMPs for a project is dependent on characteristics of the project site, and often any one of a number of BMPs could be utilized to accomplish the same result.

Capacity
The maximum number of vehicles that a given section of roadway or traffic lane can accommodate in one direction in one hour.

Carbon Monoxide (CO)
Air Pollutant caused by automobile emissions. Advanced health effects can occur when the carbon monoxide levels exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for carbon monoxide. The primary method of reducing carbon monoxide levels is through reductions in automobile pollution emissions using such measures as federal motor vehicle emission standards and local emission testing programs. Improvements to transit service which result in fewer vehicles, and therefore less vehicle emission, would help in meeting and/or maintaining NAAQS for carbon monoxide.

Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990
Federal law that identifies “mobile sources” (vehicles) as primary sources of pollution and call for stringent new requirements in metropolitan areas and states where attainment of National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) is or could be a problem.

Collector/Distributor Road (C/D Road)
A one-way roadway at an interchange that is separated from the freeway main line (through traffic) and provides access between two or more adjacent interchange ramps and the freeway mainline.
Commuter Trip Reduction Law (CTR)
This state law requires major employers in the eight most populous counties of the state to reduce the number of single-occupant vehicle (SOV) trips and the number of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by their employees. SOV trips and VMT must be reduced from a baseline year within homogeneous trip-reduction zones. The reduction goals are 15% by 1995, 25% by 1997, and 35% by 1999.

Comprehensive Plan
A compendium of maps, charts, and text which contain a city or county’s plan for long-term development. Also a legal document required by the state’s Growth Management Act. The detailed requirements for the plan are outlined in RCW 36.70A.

Concurrency
The Growth Management Act requires that adequate public services and facilities such as water, sewer, storm drainage, and transportation infrastructure must be available at the time new development is occupied. Also, the level of service for that infrastructure must meet standards set by the city or county.

Conformity
A federal and state requirement that transportation plans, programs, and projects should improve, not worsen air quality. Conformity applies in those counties in which there is a nonattainment area for carbon monoxide, particulate matter, or ozone.

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)
A categorical funding program contained in Title 1 of ISTEA that provides funds for projects and activities to reduce congestion and improve ambient air quality. To be eligible for CMAQ, projects and activities must contribute to achieving National Ambient Air Quality Standards and must be included in a Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Corridor
A strip of land or linear band, normally within a system corridor, through which various alternative transportation facilities may be placed, allowing flexibility of alignment that is refined at the design stage. Location corridors are chosen based on social, economic, environmental, engineering and transportation factors.

dBA
The sound pressure levels in decibels measured with a frequency weighting network corresponding to the A-scale on a standard sound level meter. The A-scale tends to suppress lower frequencies, e.g. below 1.000 Hz.

Decibel
The basic unit of sound pressure level measurement. It represents one-tenth of a Bel, a measurement on a logarithmic scale which indicates the ratio between two sound powers. A ratio of 2 in power corresponds to a difference of 3 decibels between the two sounds.

Design Standards
Engineering Principles which determine the principal features of the highway.

Environmental Justice
On Feb. 11, 1994, President Clinton signed Executive Order 12898 entitled “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income
Populations”. Its goal is to avoid disproportionately high and adverse impacts on low income and minority populations. WSDOT has endeavored to explicitly demonstrate awareness of and sensitivity to issues affecting low income and minority neighborhoods.

4(f)
Section 4(f) of the (U.S.) Department of Transportation Act (49 U.S.C. 303) states that the FHWA will not approve the use of land from a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge, or significant historic site unless a determination is made that:
(1) There is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the property; and
(2) The proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use.

The Section 4(f) evaluation is a separate analysis of impacts to Section 4(f) resources that would be caused by the various alternatives under consideration.

Growth Management Act (GMA)
A state law passed by the legislature in 1990 and amended in 1991 which addresses the negative consequences of unprecedented population growth and suburban sprawl in Washington state. The GMA requires all cities and counties in the state to do some planning and has more extensive requirements for the largest and fastest-growing counties and cities in the state. Its requirements include guaranteeing the consistency of transportation and capital facilities plans with land use plans.

High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV)
An automobile, van, pick-up truck, or bus that carries enough people to travel in the HOV or Diamond Lane. In Washington state, most HOV lanes require that two or more persons travel together, although in some places three people are needed.

Impact
A direct or indirect consequence of the construction or operation of a proposed alternative on the environment in the study area.

Interdisciplinary Team
A group of employees from the WSDOT and other agencies who have expertise in a variety of subject areas. This group conducts preliminary design and environmental studies to analyze the engineering, environmental, economic and social impacts of various project proposals. This leads to the development of a departmental recommendation for the project. The Team also is responsible for integration of the Public involvement Plan in the planning and design process.

Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21)
Reauthorization of the landmark 1991 Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act. This federal law provides conditions and authorization for flow of federal highway revenue to states for roads, transit, ferries, and other transportation purposes.

Level-Of-Service
A qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream; generally described in terms of such factors as speed and travel time, freedom to maneuver, traffic interruptions, comfort and convenience, and infrastructure as a part of the policies governing growth management.

Mainline
The through lane(s) of the roadway.
**Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO)**
The agency designated by the governor (or governors in a multi-state areas) to administer the federally required transportation planning process in a metropolitan area. An MPO must be in place in every urbanized area over 50,000 population. The MPO may also be Council of Governments, Planning Association, Planning Authority, Regional or Area Planning Council, or Regional or Area Planning Commission. ISTEA provides procedures under which local governments and governor(s) may designate or redesignate an MPO.

**Mitigative Measure**
An action taken to reduce or eliminate an adverse impact stemming from construction or operation or maintenance of a proposed action alternative.

**Multi-Modal**
Concerning or involving more than one transportation mode (e.g. buses, carpools, trolleys, private automobiles) at the same time.

**National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)**
Standards created by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to help mitigate the health impacts of air pollution. EPA established NAAQS measures for six pollutants: carbon monoxide, ozone, particulate matter, lead, sulfur dioxide, and nitrous oxide.

**National Highway System (NHS)**
Designated by Congress in 1995 and contains all Interstate routes, a large percentage of urban and rural principal arterials, and strategic highways and connectors. ISTEA funding will be available for the NHS.

**National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)**
A part of the Clean Water Act that requires point source dischargers of pollutants to obtain a permit. The Department of Transportation is affected by this requirement because of highway runoff. The Department of Ecology administers the permitting process.

**Nonattainment Area**
A nonattainment area does not meet the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. In Washington, Seattle/Tacoma, Spokane, and Vancouver are nonattainment areas for ozone and/or carbon monoxide. There are other nonattainment areas for particulate matter.

**Overcrossing, Overpass**
A grade separation where the freeway passes over the crossroad or rail line.

**Peak Hour**
A single morning or evening hour during which the maximum traffic volume occurs.

**Peak Period**
The time period during which the transportation system operates at or near the maximum traffic volume.

**PM10**
An air quality measurement of particulate matter smaller than or equal to 10 microns.

**Regional Transportation Plan**
A plan required of all Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) receiving funding for regional planning under the Regional Transportation Plan Program of the Growth Management Act.
Regional Transportation Planning Organizations
Authorized by the Legislature in 1990 as part of the Growth Management Act. RTPOs are created by local governments to coordinate transportation planning among jurisdictions and to develop a regional transportation plan. Washington state provides funding and a formal mechanism that is available to all local governments (and not only those required to plan under GMA) and the State to coordinate transportation planning for regional transportation facilities. Currently, RTPOs are formed through voluntary associations of local governments within regions defined as at least one county with at least 100,000 population or at least three counties if the combined population is less than 100,000.

Relocation
A program for the fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced as a result of public works programs undertaken by state and local governments so that such persons do not suffer disproportionate impacts as a result of programs designed for the benefit of the public as a whole.

Right of Way
Land, property or property interest, usually in a strip, acquired for or devoted to transportation purposes.

State Implementation Plan (SIP)
A three-year investment strategy required at the state level, that addresses the goals of the state long-range plan and lists priority projects and activities throughout the state.

Surface Transportation Program (STP)
One of the key capital programs in Title 1 of ISTEA. It provides flexibility in expenditure of “road” funds for nonmotorized and transit modes and for a category of activities known as transportation enhancements. It also broadens the definition of eligible transportation activities to include pedestrian and bicycle facilities and enhancement of community and environmental quality with 10 categories of activities.

Transportation Control Measures
Implemented to enable nonattainment areas to meet their emissions goals. They can include TDM measures, parking policies and pricing, or other system improvements that reduce congestion.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
An effort to reduce the number of people traveling by single-occupant vehicles (SOV) by promoting non SOV modes of transportation (e.g.; carpools, vanpools, transit). TDM efforts may also discourage the use of SOVs by imposing tolls or taxes.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
A three-year transportation investment strategy required under ISTEA. It is similar to the six-year program required by state law, which addresses the goals of the long range plans and lists priority projects and activities for the region. [At the state level, the TIP is also known as a state transportation improvement plan (STIP), not to be confused with a SIP. TIPs from all regions are incorporated in the STIP.]

Transportation Management Areas (TMAs)
Areas subject to special requirements under ISTEA and in some cases benefit from preferential treatment with regard to air quality needs and local authority to select transportation projects. Any urban area over 200,000 population is automatically a Transportation Management Area, which subjects it to additional planning...
requirements but also entitles it to funds earmarked for large urbanized areas under the Surface Transportation Program. Additional areas may be designated TMAs if the governor and the MPO or affected local officials request designation. Such a designation would entitle them to greater local project selection authority through their MPOs and to STP funds earmarked for large urban areas. TMAs must also prepare Congestion Management Systems.

**Transportation System Management (TSM)**
A variety of actions and activities designed to make the existing transportation system more efficient. For example, traffic synchronization.

**Undercrossing, Underpass**
A grade separation where the freeway passes under the crossroad or rail line.

**Urban Growth Areas**
Areas where urban growth will be encouraged. Counties and cities must cooperatively establish the urban growth areas. Cities must be located inside urban growth area. Once established, cities cannot annex land outside the urban growth boundary. Growth outside of the urban growth boundary must be rural in character.

**Weaving**
The traffic flow stemming from the crossing of traffic streams moving in the same direction as associated with closely spaced adjacent on and off-ramps.

**Wetlands**
Lands that are either permanently or seasonally inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support and under normal circumstances does or would support a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction.
BE IT REMEMBERED that on the 29th day of June, 2000, at the hour of 10:00 a.m. at the International Ag Trade Center/Spokane Convention Center, 334 West Spokane Falls Boulevard, Spokane, Washington, the Washington State Department of Transportation, WSDOT, held this Design, Supplemental Environmental and Limited Access Hearing on the US 395 North Spokane Corridor Project. The hearing was held under the guidelines of the Federal Aid Highway Act, Title 23 USC 101, subsection 128, and related amendments.

The following comments were taken:

(From 10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. no comments were given.
Recess from 2:00 p.m to 3:00 p.m.)

*   *   *
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STATE OF WASHINGTON  
County of Spokane, ss.  

Name: WA STATE DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION  Acct: 194257  
P.O.:  
No. Lines: 240  
Log No: SP8627  

Total Cost: $650.00  

I, Brenda Severino, do solemnly swear that I am the Principal Clerk of the SPOKESMAN-REVIEW, a newspaper established and regularly published, once each day, in the English language, in and of general circulation in the City of Spokane, Spokane County, Washington; and in the City of Coeur d’Alene, Kootenai County, Idaho; that said newspaper has been so established and regularly published and has had said general circulation continuously for more than six (6) months prior to the 23rd day of July, 1941; that said newspaper is printed in an office maintained at its place of publication in the City of Spokane, Washington; that said newspaper was approved and designated as a legal newspaper by order of the Superior Court of the State of Washington for Spokane County on the 23rd day of July, 1941, and said order has not been revoked and is in full force and effect; that the notice attached hereto and which is a part of the proof of publication, was published in said newspaper, one time(s), the publication having been made once each time on the following dates:

May 26, 2000

That said notice was published in the regular and entire issue of every number of the paper during the period of time of publication, and that the notice was published in the newspaper proper and not in a supplement.

Subscribed and sworn to before me at the City of Spokane, this 13 day of June, 2000.

[Signature]

Diane L. Allison
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington
residing in Spokane County, Washington.
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I, Brenda Severino

do solemnly swear that I am the Principal Clerk of the
SPOKESMAN-REVIEW, a newspaper established and regularly published, once each day in the English language, in and of
general circulation in the City of Spokane, Spokane County,
Washington; and in the City of Coeur d'Alene, Kootenai County,
Idaho; that said newspaper has been so established and regularly published and has had said general circulation continuously for
more than six (6) months prior to the 23rd day of July, 1941; that
said newspaper is printed in an office maintained at its place of
publication in the City of Spokane, Washington; that said
newspaper was approved and designated as a legal newspaper
by order of the Superior Court of the State of Washington for
Spokane County on the 23rd day of July, 1941, and that said
order has not been revoked and is in full force and effect; that
the notice attached hereto and which is a part of the proof of
publication, was published in said newspaper, one time(s), the
publication having been made once each time on the following
dates:

June 13, 2000

That said notice was published in the regular and entire issue of
every number of the paper during the period of time of publication,
and that the notice was published in the newspaper proper and
not in a supplement.

Subscribed and sworn to before me at the City of Spokane, this
13 day of June, 2000

DIANE L. THOMAS
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington
residing in Spokane County, Washington.
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Response

A-1 United States Environmental Protection Agency

Comment A-1

[Image of a letter from the United States Environmental Protection Agency to Keith L. Martin, Project Engineer, Washington Department of Transportation, regarding the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) for the proposed US 395 North Spokane Corridor (SCQ # 0007/0) in accordance with our responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and §309 of the Clean Air Act. The proposed North Spokane Corridor (NSC) project is designed to improve safety and mobility through Spokane County, the City of Spokane, northeastern Washington, and northwestern Canada. The DSEIS compares a new preferred alternative, the new Market/Greenway route with the VE North connection, to the Final EIS preferred alternative. Based on our review, we have assigned the Draft Supplemental EIS a rating of EC-2 (Environmental Concerns - Insufficient Information). This rating and a summary of our comments will be published in the Federal Register. A summary of the rating system we used to evaluate the DSEIS is enclosed for your reference. Our primary concerns are related to potential wetland impacts and the lack of analysis of proposed road building activities associated with possible hazardous waste impacts and on geologically hazardous areas. Enclosed please find our detailed comments, which elaborate further on these issues. We are committed to working closely with WSDOT in the resolution of these issues and I encourage you to contact Tom Conner at (509) 533-4421 at your earliest convenience to discuss our comments and how they might best be addressed. Thank you for the opportunity to review this Draft Supplemental EIS on the North Spokane Corridor project. Sincerely, Richard B. Parks, Manager Geographic Implementation Unit.]

Enclosures
Response

A-1 United States Environmental Protection Agency

1. A VE study comparison table has been added to Chapter 2 of this document.

2. Further explanation of Best Management Practices has been added to the document in Geology and Soils sections and Water Quality sections, and has been defined in the Glossary.

3. The former Costich Fertilizer Plant has also been investigated. Approximately 530 yd³ of petroleum contaminated soil was identified. All regulated, petroleum contaminated soils will also be removed from this site and properly disposed of in accordance with State and Federal Regulations. Eleven drums of unidentified liquid were also noted on site. Due to the extraordinary quantity of machinery and other non-hazardous solid wastes on this site, access to these was not available during the investigation. The contents of these drums remain secure and intact, therefore no issues other than proper identification and disposal are being anticipated.

The parcel referred to as Swanson Hay Trucking has undergone an intrusive hazardous materials investigation. An investigative summary is shown in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS. This site contains an estimated 65 yd³ of petroleum contaminated soil associated with a fueling function. Soil exceeding regulatory cleanup levels will be removed and properly disposed of prior to construction.

4. Because hazardous materials cleanup of these parcels will be performed prior to construction, temporary stormwater controls on and around these sites will be implemented during cleanup. Appropriate permanent stormwater controls will be implemented.
Response

A-1 United States Environmental Protection Agency

5. The wetland section in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS, states that there are two wetlands within the proposed right-of-way, but “construction will be designed to avoid impact to both of these wetlands”. This is in accordance with, rather than contradictory to, the statement in the Summary of the FSEIS. The bulleted information in the Summary section has been added to Chapter 4.

6. The two wetlands have been classified and rated, and the additional descriptions have been added to the Wetlands sections of the FSEIS in Chapters 3 and 4.

7. The spring-fed wetland has been further described in Chapters 3 and 4, and smaller scale maps have been added to provide detail on the spatial relationship of the proposed project and the wetland areas.

8. Upon further investigation, it was determined that landslide deposition soils are not impacted by the alternative alignments. The FSEIS has been revised to reflect this, in the Geology and Soils sections. The explanation of how the environmental and safety issues will be addressed and what methods will be used to avoid detrimental impacts exists, in the FSEIS under the Mitigation heading for the Geology and Soils section in Chapter 4.
Response

Comment A-1 (Continued)

A-1 United States Environmental Protection Agency

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Rating System for Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Definitive and Follow-up Actions

Environmental Impact of Action

LO - Lack of Objectives
The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) review has not identified any potential environmental impacts requiring mitigative changes to the proposed action. The review may have overlooked opportunities for applying mitigation measures that could be accomplished with no more that minor changes to the proposed action.

EC - Environmental Concerns
The EPA review has identified environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or application of mitigation measures that can reduce these impacts.

EO - Environmental Objectives
The EPA review has identified significant environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to provide long-term protection of the environment. Corrective measures may require changes to the preferred alternative or consideration of other project alternatives (including the no-action alternative or a new alternative).

EU - Environmental Unadvisable
The EPA review has identified adverse environmental impacts that are of sufficient magnitude that they are inconsistent with the standards of public health and welfare in environmental quality. EPA formed to work with the lead agency to mitigate these impacts. If the potential for unacceptable impacts are not contained in the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), this proposal will be recommended for referral to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ).

Advantages of the Least Significant

Category 1 - Adequate
EPA believes the draft EIS adequately sets forth the environmental impacts of the preferred alternative and those of the alternatives considered available to the project as a whole. The project analyst's data collection is necessary, but the reviewers may request the addition of clarifying language or information.

Category 2 - Insufficient Information
The draft EIS does not contain information for EPA to fully assess environmental impacts that should be avoided in order to fully protect the environment. The EPA review has identified any reasonably available alternatives that are within the scope of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reduce the environmental impacts of the action. The identified additional alternatives, risks, analysis, or data should be included in the final EIS.

Category 3 - Inadequate
EPA does not believe that the draft EIS adequately assesses potentially significant environmental impacts of the selected action. EPA review has identified any reasonably available alternatives that are within the scope of alternatives analyzed in the draft EIS, which could reasonably be adopted in order to reduce the potentially significant environmental impacts. EPA believes that the identified alternative information, data, analysis, or alternatives are such that they should be addressed in the final EIS. EPA does not believe that the draft EIS is adequate for the purpose of the National Environmental Policy Act and is recommended for further study and should be corrected as needed to fully comply with the National Environmental Policy Act and should be revised as needed. EPA recommends that the applicant complete the final EIS. If the potential for unacceptable impacts are not contained in the final EIS, this proposal will be recommended for referral to the CEQ.

Response

A-2  United States Department of the Interior

1. This letter was responded to in a letter dated July 13, 2000 from James B. Prudente. A copy follows the Department of the Interior’s letter.
July 13, 2000

Teresa N. Martin, P.E.
U.S. Department of Interior
Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance
Washington, D.C. 20240

Re: EIS 000469 Draft Supplemental EIS for US-395 North Spokane Corridor

Dear Mr. Martin,

I have discussed your request for an extension of time to comment on the statement with the Federal Highway Administration and for the following reasons do not believe it is necessary to grant the extension:

- Impacts to 4(f) properties do not differ from those noted in the 4(f) evaluation in the FEIS.
- Additional coordination with Spokane Parks and Recreation was completed, their comments included in the FEIS and Chapter 6 of that document was revised.
- Spokane Parks and Recreation supports the preferred alternative.
- U.S. Department of Justice supported the FEIS preferred alternative and no additional impacts occur in the modified alignment presented in the Draft SEIS.

The Section 4(f) Considerations in the Record of Decision are unchanged and the commitments therein will be adhered to.

Thank you for your interest in this matter. If you have any further questions or comments please feel free to contact me at 309-234-6171.

Sincerely,

J. B. Prakasa,
Regional Environmental Manager
Response

A-3 Spokane County Division of Engineering and Roads

1. Determined that cul-de-sacs will be designed to urban standards inside the UGA and rural standards outside the UGA.

2. The current limits of improvements will be inside the ROW lines shown on the access plans. Certain roads have “turnback” lines which designate sections that will be improved then turned back to the local agency. The WSDOT will work with Spokane County to develop a process whereby Spokane County has the opportunity to review and comment on contract plans during the design phase. More detailed designs will be developed in the Plans, Specifications and Estimates phase.

3. Frontage road profiles were re-designed to eliminate any sections with grades flatter than 0.5%. A design deviation will be submitted for the FR3 line.

4. Access to each parcel that will remain after construction has been addressed during the development of the access plans and preliminary design phase. The WSDOT will provide access to frontage roads by construction of new driveways, or reconfiguring existing driveways.

5. Arterials outside the urban area only have sidewalk on one side.

6. All ramp intersections with County Arterial Roads have been designed with a skew angle of 15 degrees or less.

7. The transition information from new widened construction to the existing road width is shown on the preliminary interchange plans sent to you in the previous submittal. If there is a specific location you have a question about please let us know.
Response

A-3 Spokane County Division of Engineering and Roads

Comment A-3 (Continued)

a later date.

Again, we thank you for the opportunity to review these plans. We look forward to working with you in reviewing design details of the project as the work progresses. If you have questions about these comments, please call me at 477-7457 or contact me by email at jhaines@spokanecounty.org.

Sincerely,

William A. Jones, P.E.
County Engineer

Jared B. Hanes, P.E.
Program Development Engineer
Response

A-4  Spokane County, Division of Engineering and Roads

1. The Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), or Spokane Regional Transportation Council’s 20-year Metropolitan Transportation Plan, was used for modeling the NSC Preferred Alternative Alignment in the spring of 1999. Bigelow Gulch Road and Forker Road were part of the RTP at that time and therefore are reflected in the traffic and air quality modeling. Modeling will be updated as projects within the NSC are funded. Any changes in the RTP as well as any other enhancements to the transportation system will be reflected in future modeling.

2. The WSDOT makes reasonable efforts to maintain existing traffic patterns, emergency vehicle access, and response times during construction. Any circumstances that require the closure or construction related use of a city or county road will be coordinated and pre-approved with the appropriate local agency before construction. Local agencies will be contacted as details of the individual construction projects are determined.

3. The construction sequence for the NSC as outlined in the March 2000 Implementation Plan shows construction beginning in Section 1 from Hawthorne Road to US 2, then from US 2 to US 395 in Section 2. Section 3 extends from the Spokane River to Francis Avenue, but constructs arterial and railroad improvements only.

4. The referenced statement reflects the comments we received from the school district transportation coordinator and a neighborhood representative. The text has been revised to clarify this.

This section could be sequenced to happen during construction of the first two sections and is essentially a preparatory phase for Section 4. Section 4 then constructs the NSC between Francis and Hawthorne but includes all excavation south to the Spokane River.
Comment A-5

A-5 City of Spokane, Department of Engineering Services

1. The FSEIS has been revised to reflect that the City of Spokane has withdrawn the Francis Avenue / Market Street intersection project (Related Actions section of the Summary, Transportation section of Chapter 3, and General Coordination section of Chapter 5).

2. Comment noted. During the design phase for the various sections of the NSC, the WSDOT will coordinate with local agencies on issues dealing with detour routes, construction impacts to streets and roads, capacity, and maintenance.

3. Comment noted. The City of Spokane may formally request this action through the WSDOT Eastern Region Planning Office.

4. Comments noted.
A-5 City of Spokane, Department of Engineering Services

Response

Comment A-5 (Continued)

case-by-case basis following the WSDOT Highway Runoff Manual as stated on page 4-17 within your report, with consideration for local standards.

- Water and Sewer
  A number of gravity sewer lines will be affected by the proposed corridor alignment. WSDOT shall be responsible for any change in alignment and allowing the City access to our manholes and mains for maintenance.

  The water distribution system must be looped wherever the lines intersect the freeway corridor. All transmission mains must extend across the freeway corridor. In addition, provisions shall be made to allow the City to access and maintain these mains.

- Miscellaneous
  Street closures shall meet current design standards.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the current proposal and look forward to continued cooperation.

Sincerely,

Eldon Brown, P.E.
Principal Engineer - Developer Services

SM/Hypgh

cc: Eldon Brown, P.E., Principal Engineer - Developer Services
    Don Ramsey, P.E., City Traffic Engineer – Transportation Department
    Dick Raymond, P.E., Principal Engineer – Capital Program
    Katy Allen, P.E., Director – Engineering Services (Re-copy)
    Steve Hansen, P.E., Senior Engineer – Developer Services
    Dave Mandyke, Assistant City Manager – General Services

Developer Services/WSDOT HS2 905 response.doc
A-6 City of Spokane, Parks and Recreation Department

1. Comment noted. The WSDOT met with Paul Crutchfield of City Parks and Recreation on August 3, 2000 to discuss and clarify issues. (He will present his report to the Spokane Park Board in September 2000.)

Mr. Keith L. Martin, P.E.
Washington State Department of Transportation
Eastern Region
2714 North Mayfair Street
Spokane, WA 99207-2990

July 22, 2000

Mr. Keith L. Martin, P.E.
Washington State Department of Transportation
Eastern Region
2714 North Mayfair Street
Spokane, WA 99207-2990

Mr. Martin:

I have reviewed the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS). The parks and park facilities under the control of the Spokane Park Board in the DSEIS are: Courtyard, J.J. Hill-Wilkinson, Sharpley-Harmon, Esmeralda Golf Course, and Hillyard Swimming Pool. The Spokane Parks Board’s response to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), sent to Harold White in January 1996, is their current position. Attached is the table portion of that response FYI.

It does not appear that much has changed involving the parks above since the 1996 EIS, except the distances from centerline. Additional concerns in the DSEIS are the distance from centerline changes to Hillyard Swimming Pool (270 meters to 157 meters) and Sharpley-Harmon Park (250 meters to 150 meters).

I would be happy to meet with you to discuss the DSEIS distance from centerline changes and other changes related to the parks above since 1996. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michael Kr fishing
Administrative Assistant

Enclosure: 1996 EIS Response Table

RECEIVED
JUL 5 2000
KEITH MARTIN, P.E.
Response

Comment A-7

A-7 City of Spokane,
Department of Engineering Services

1. Comments noted.

June 26, 2000

MR KEITH MARTIN PE
PROJECT MANAGER
WSDOT
EASTERN REGION
2714 N MAYFAIR ST
SPOKANE WA 99207-2090

RE: US 395 North Spokane Corridor Project; Spokane River to Wandermere Vicinity Access Report

Dear Mr. Martin:

We are in receipt of your most recent Access Report submitted to the City of Spokane dated May 24, 2000. It appears that most of our initial concerns discussed with your staff on May 5, 2000 have been addressed. Specifically, we had requested additional information on road terminations, frontage roads, a center vehicle barrier on realigned Market Street together with wider pedestrian crossing areas and had expressed some concern about the realignment of Illinois Avenue. In addition, there are several City utility crossings, which should be addressed early in the design of the construction plans. Also, many of the terminated roads between Market Street and the proposed highway right-of-way should be vacated as part of your later process. This letter will be followed by a comment list from the May 5, 2000 meeting.

In general, the city concurs with the above-mentioned Access Report and we look forward to working with your department through the acceptance and construction process.

Sincerely,

 Eldon Brown, P.E.,
Principal Engineer - Developer Services

SMHgph

cc: Katy Allen, P.E., Director (file copy)
Steve Hanson, P.E., Senior Engineer - Developer Services
Roger Flint, Assistant City Manager - Operations

(Developer ServicesH-4 Corridor mt.doc)
Response

A-8 Community Colleges of Spokane Foundation

1. The Right of way has been adjusted so that there are no impacts to the Community Colleges of Spokane Foundation building.

2. The North Spokane Corridor is approximately 40 feet below existing ground near the Community Colleges of Spokane Foundation building. There will also be a Pedestrian/Bicycle path between the property and the Corridor which will serve as a buffer. An air quality analysis was performed for the corridor and has shown no mitigation is required. A noise analysis was performed and has shown that no mitigation for noise from the North Spokane Corridor is required in this area.
Response

A-8  Community Colleges of Spokane Foundation

Comment A-8 (Continued)

Page 2
Keith L. Martin
July 19, 2000

Thank you for your consideration and do not hesitate to contact me if you would like to discuss those issues.

Sincerely,

COMMUNITY COLLEGES OF SPOKANE FOUNDATION

Gail Stevenson
Executive Director

Cc: Patt Earley, Director of Head Start, Institute for Extended Learning
Ron LaFayette, Executive Vice President, Institute for Extended Learning
Greg Plummer, Director of Facilities, Community Colleges of Spokane
Charles A. Taylor, Chancellor/CEO, Community Colleges of Spokane
Response

A-8 Community Colleges of Spokane Foundation

Comment A-8 (Continued)
Response

B-1 Kaiser Aluminum

1. Comments noted. Kaiser will be made aware of any plan changes affecting their properties which occur in the adoption of Findings and Order plans.
Response

B-1 Kaiser Aluminum

2. The WSDOT will contact Kaiser during the development of the contract plans for this area. The WSDOT is under no obligation to provide screening for adjacent properties along public rights of way.

3. Comment noted.

4. Kaiser ingress and egress along Farwell Road and US 2 will be affected by the completion of the NSC. Full access control will be implemented on US 2 from just south of Pittsburg Street north to Deer Road. Also, portions of Farwell Road east and west of US 2 will also have Full Access control implemented. The WSDOT will ensure that the outflow to Deadman Creek meets Kaisers capacity requirements of no less than 50 cubic feet per second or 32 million gallons per day. In an attempt to minimize the size of the NSC drainage ponds they are designed to only accommodate the impervious areas created by the NSC. Future development of impervious area on Kaiser property would be coordinated with Spokane County.

Comment B-1 (Continued)

2. We would like to meet with you in the near future to discuss in detail your design considerations for buffering, screening, erosion control, and vegetation along the west side of the freeway corridor. Obviously, we have concern for erosion control, safe access, and screening views onto Kaiser land as much as possible. Since a substantial portion of the freeway will be quite highly elevated on fill alongside Kaiser’s large land parcel, it is important that the activities of our operation are not blantly open to public view.

3. We would appreciate working closely with you with regard to a fair and equitable appraisal process and compensation package for the land you intend to purchase from Kaiser-Mod for the freeway corridor. Please advise how we may best be involved in this and your current intended schedule.

4. Please forward copies of any new plans, design details, and changes, as well as mitigating measures for the freeway impacts, as related to Kaiser, to Sue Daywerth, our land use planner, for his review.

5. Please forward copies of any new plans, design details, and changes, as well as mitigating measures for the freeway impacts, as related to Kaiser, to Sue Daywerth, our land use planner, for his review.

6. Please notify us if there are any missing movements for ingress, egress, and circulation in general to and from the Kaiser-Mod facility (all parcels included). Also please notify us if your related drainage facilities will be stored to handle any adjacent Kaiser land drainage in peak runoff periods.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide you this input prior to the July 24, 2000, deadline. We anticipate an on-going dialogue with you throughout the life of this project and, specifically, the issues which I have raised in this letter.

Sincerely,

Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corporation

Carl Jones Forth
Purchasing Manager
Response

B-2 Modern Office Equipment

1. The WSDOT will revise the existing driveways to maintain access to Grace Street.

Comment B-2

[Attached image of a letter from Modern Office Equipment]
Comment B-3

B-3 Groff & Murphy, L.L.C.

1. The WSDOT has not received a request for air quality reports or other environmental documents from the Douglasses or their representatives. All environmental documents are available to the public.

2. The FSEIS discusses the IUGA in Chapter 3, including the impact of the proposed NSC on developable residential land. The FSEIS states: “Planning for population accommodation requires land capacity calculation. Estimates of land capacity done by the county reflect the amount of land necessarily dedicated to public facilities. The county has accounted for the NSC land area in its land capacity estimates within the IUGA”. The FSEIS compares the impact of the location of the NSC on developing areas, rather than proposed development. In Chapter 4, the FSEIS states: “In comparison to the FEIS Alignment, the proposed Preferred Alternative aligns closer to the edges of developing areas rather than bisecting them. It keeps the corridor closer to the northern edge of the IUGA, rather than cutting through rapidly developing neighborhoods between US 395 and US 2. The revision allows this area within the IUGA to develop in a more cohesive manner”.

3. The FSEIS discusses changes in zoning and residential development in Chapter 3. Stonehorse Bluff is not included here since it was a preliminary plat which had not proceeded with rezoning, and for which an EIS had not been accepted. In Chapter 4, the FSEIS discusses the impact of the NSC on potential development and preliminary plats, including Stonehorse bluff. Additionally, Chapter 4 of the FSEIS discusses the status of Stonehorse Bluff and the impacts of the FEIS Alignment compared to the Preferred Alternative on the potential number of lots.
Response

B-3 Groff & Murphy, L.L.C.

4. See response 3.
Response

B-4  Spokane Area Good Roads Association

1. Comments noted.

Comment B-4

[Image of the comment letter from the Spokane Area Good Roads Association]

July 7, 2000

Jerry Lenz, Administrator
Eastern District, WSDOT
2714 N. Mayfair
Spokane, Wa. 99207

RE: North Spokane Corridor Project

Dear Mr. Lenz:

Having attended the hearing on design, environmental and access hearing on the North Spokane Corridor Project June 29 in Spokane I would like to make the following points for the record:

• You and your staff put together and conducted an excellent visual and verbal presentation for citizens attending. The displays were informative and WSDOT personnel helpful in describing the project and answering questions.

• The preferred alternative, I believe, is the correct route, minimizing the impact on residential areas and businesses as compared to other routes.

• The overall environmental impact of the “preferred” route is superior.

• The comparative costs are close enough that “cost” should not be a factor in route decision.

Having served on the Citizens Advisory Committee for the North Spokane Corridor Project over a number of years I can only applaud the effort you and your staff have expended to bring this proposed project to this point of reality.

Considering the great need that exists for improvement of traffic movement through this corridor, I urge all speed toward the first construction phase.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Keith Martin, P.E.
Spokane Area Good Roads Association

[Image of the letterhead with the name and address of the association]
Response

B-5 Bicycle Alliance of Washington

1. Comments noted.

Comment B-5

Bicycle Alliance of Washington

June 15, 2000

James B. Prudentis
Regional Environmental Manager
WSDOT Eastern Region
2714 North Market Street
Spokane, WA 99207-2890

Re: US 295 North Spokane Corridor Draft EA

Dear Mr. Prudentis:

The Bicycle Alliance of Washington is pleased to see that a separated multiuse trail will be included in the entire length of the North Spokane Corridor, and that this trail will make a connection to the Centennial Trail. We recommend that the trail be designed with adequate linkages to adjacent neighborhoods, businesses, and employment centers to encourage bicycle travel.

We also encourage you to work with the Spokane Bicycle Club and other interested bicyclists to identify any east-west routes that are frequently used by cyclists in the vicinity of the North Spokane Corridor. Care should be taken to avoid routing these routes with the corridor or to provide mitigation if routing such a route is unavoidable. Providing linkages between east-west routes and the corridor trail is also desirable.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

June 19, 2000
Response

C-1 Robert W. Apple

1. Comment noted.
Response

Comment C-2

C-2  Michael Brewer

1. The WSDOT is aware of the development proposed in this area. The segment of the NSC between I-90 and the Spokane River will be further evaluated over the coming year.

2. Comments noted.
Response

C-3 Larry Cameron

1. Information provided.

Comment C-3

DESIGN COMMENT SHEET

Name: LARRY CAMERON
Mail Address: 14010 E. Deere St.
SPOKANE, WA 99216
Telephone: (509) 535-1801

Thank you for attending today’s hearing. Written statements may be
submitted today or may be forwarded to Mr. Keith Martin, P.E., at 2714
North Mayfair Street, Spokane, Washington 99207-2090. All written
comments received prior to July 24, 2000 will be considered by the project
administrators and will be included in the hearing record.

THANKS FOR THE VERY INFORMATIVE PRESENTATION.
I WOULD LIKE TO REQUEST A COPY OF THE
CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCE PUBLISHED IN THE BEGINNING
WITH AN UPDATE ON PROGRESS REPORTS REQUESTED
TO COMPLETE EACH SECTOR.

THANKS

LARRY CAMERON

US 395 North Spokane Corridor Project
Environmental, Design, and Access Hearing
International Ag Trade Center/Spokane Convention Center
June 29, 2000

RECEIVED
JUL 8 2000
KEITH MARTIN, PE.
Response

C-4 Sam Compogno

1. The WSDOT design office and Real Estate Services staff met with Mr. Compogno at his home on August 10, 2000. The details of his parcel as located on the access hearing plan and location in relation to the North Spokane Corridor were explained. Real Estate Services staff also described the property acquisition and relocation programs.

2. The WSDOT is required to follow the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended in 1978. When replacement housing is required, homeowner-occupants who have occupied the residence to be acquired for at least 180 days prior to the date of the first written offer to purchase the property, are eligible for specific relocation benefits. The homeowner is also eligible for the price difference, if any, between the amount the WSDOT pays for the displaced person’s home and the asking price of the best available comparable property (as determined by the WSDOT).

3. Changing Market/Greene Street and Nevada/Hamilton Street to a one way couplet such as Maple/Ash Streets would be impractical with Market Street and Nevada Street being over one mile apart. The additional traffic would use east/west streets to crossover between the two arterials. This would add traffic to arterial and residential streets.

4. Comments noted.
Response

Comment C-5

C-5  Paul B. Dougherty

1. There is not sufficient distance between Wellesley Avenue and Euclid Avenue to allow an interchange at each location. The interchange at Wellesley was chosen over Euclid due to the significant impact to the residential neighborhood in the Euclid Vicinity. Impacts include purchasing homes and increased traffic through residential areas and school in the Euclid Vicinity.

2. Comment noted. The design of the North Spokane Corridor from I-90 to the Spokane River is presently underway and has not been finalized.

I think it is terrible that you haven’t worked on an interchange at Euclid. It is a huge benefit between Wellesley and Trent Aves. Students going to Spokane Community College would have to get off the freeway at Wellesley, or keep going to Trent and circle back. The thousands of people who work at the hundreds of businesses along and south of North Foothills Drive west of Christine would lose convenience, that they would just continue using all our North-South Arterials.

The same will be true when they start on more detail work in the southern section of the freeway if they don’t work on a spur going under the Hamilton St bridge and into town, hooking into the one way streets of Spokane Falls Blvd and Main Ave. Thousands of people work downtown. The spur might have to wrap around the east side of the grain elevator near the 1200 block of east S pioneer. Also this would make it easier to get to the arena, opera house and convention center.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Paul B. Dougherty
Response

C-6  Paul B. Dougherty

1. Traffic capacity studies have been performed to determine the number of lanes required for the projected volume of traffic in the year 2020. The right of way footprint for the North Spokane Corridor between US 2 and Francis Avenue provides sufficient width for additional lanes to be constructed as may be required for future expansion.

2. See C-5, response 1.

Response

C-6  Paul B. Dougherty

4. Comment noted.

Comment C-6  (Continued)

This 2-spar needs to be put in from the Hamilton Bridge area and into downtown heading into the one-way streets of Spokane Falls Blvd and Main Street. It could go under the Hamilton St Bridge. Traffic from the west I-90 could come off at the Hamilton St off ramp. Traffic going west on I-90 from town could use the area where the old crossover from Sprague to 2nd and 3rd St. Either going under Sprague probably could be utilized, also.

Of the 33 viaducts or bridges inside the city, from the I-90 Freeway area (not including the Freeway) to the north side of the river, that the streets have to pass under only 4 conform to Federal standards with minimum height of 15 feet. They are Green, Model, Erich (if you can finish it), and the Hamilton Street Bridge, which is way above several streets. Washington St, is high above the middle, but not on the side and is only one way.


So lets get a spur into downtown from I-90, and the new North-South Freeway (995) and eliminate the bottleneck around I-90 at Division.

And the high bridge up above in the area.
Response

C-7  Paul B. Dougherty

1. See C-5, response 1.

2. The WSDOT is presently constructing an interchange on US 395 at Hatch Road 1.4 miles north of the Little Spokane River. This project is scheduled for completion Summer 2001. This interchange will provide southbound US 395 traffic with access to Wandermere Road. Wandermere Road can also be accessed from the US 2/Farewell Road interchange by using Farwell Road.
Response

C-8 Loren Dudley

1. The current design for the pedestrian/bicycle trail will terminate at Wandermere Road. Extension of the pedestrian/bicycle trail to the Little Spokane River bridge is beyond the scope of this project. However, the Wandermere Road shoulders are sufficient to convey pedestrian/bicycle movement to the Wandermere Bridge. Comments noted.

2. Information provided.
Response

C-9 Gil Hart

1. Information Provided.
Response

C-10  David & Jan Kirkman

1. The WSDOT will construct a 14-foot noise wall along the south side of the North Spokane Corridor (NSC) in this area. The NSC mainline is below existing ground southeast of the Kirkman residence, rises to ground level, and then drops below ground as it proceeds northwest.

2. Comment noted.
Response

C-11 David & Jan Kirkman

1. Traffic noise impacts and mitigation are discussed in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS. Since the publication of the Draft Supplemental EIS the WSDOT has committed to provide noise abatement in the vicinity of Garden Avenue and Winger Road. Lighting of the NSC will be in compliance with the WSDOT Traffic Manual, and provides necessary illumination at merge points for traffic safety. However, the WSDOT will preserve existing trees where possible to afford screening for lighting and visual impacts. Air Quality Analysis is discussed in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS.
Response

C-11  David & Jan Kirkman

2. Impacts to the Garden City neighborhood are recognized and discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 of the FSEIS.

3. Potential impacts to property values are discussed in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS.
Response

C-12  David & Jan Kirkman

1. Classified as a design comment.

2. Comment noted.

3. The WSDOT has coordinated with Fire District 9 regarding response times and emergency vehicle access. The fire district has expressed no concerns regarding response times or access to this area.

4. The design of the North Spokane Corridor through the Garden City vicinity includes provisions for a pedestrian/bicycle trail to link the Northwood Middle School and Farwell Elementary School area with the neighborhoods east of the corridor.
Response

C-12  David & Jan Kirkman
Response

C-13 Klein

1. Classified as a design comment.

2. Comments noted. The WSDOT has modified the alignment of Frontage Road 4 (FR4) to create a more equitable take between the two parcels.
Response  
C-13    Klein

Comment C-13  (Continued)

[Handwritten text]

2

[Handwritten text]

[Handwritten text]
Response

Comment C-14

C-14   L. Klein

1. See C-13, response 2.
Response

C-15  Lotti Klein

1. Comments noted.

2. See C-13, response 2.

Comment C-15

[Handwritten text]

I will be filing a complaint against the WSDOT for discrimination. In addition, it has come to my attention due to the previous events that the WSDOT has been collaborating with other persons to increase the values of properties around the new North South freeway while at the same time decreasing the values of others. For this reason I will be contacting the proper authorities that will investigate this injustice.

The collaboration I speak about is between the WSDOT and Mr. McDonald. In discussions with Mr. McDonald previous to our receiving the letter from the WSDOT dated June 19-00 he said how he has helped the dept. by allowing dumping of sand and clay onto his property. Mr. McDonald was allowed to vacate a public access road A N and S. Freeway has been in planning stages for years, so why was Mr. McDonald allowed to vacate a public road?

The result for Mr. McDonald has been an increase in property value. Instead of 2 separate parcels with a public through fare, it has decided to open the Pine Road. In the plans presented by the WSDOT the plans call for the purchase of a certain domain, property of Lotti Klein's and Mr. McDonald. The plan calls for an unequal amount of land between the property owners, with the WSDOT taking several ft. more from the Klein's than from Mr. McDonald's property.

The injustice of discrimination and behind the scene collaboration by the WSDOT or some of their members and Mr. McDonald in the pursuit of one man's gain at others expense must stop now.

[Signature]
Response

C-16    Lotti W. Klein

1. Comments noted.

Comment C-16

Residential and Vacant Property Meeting
Northwood Middle School
April 19, 2000

COMMENT SHEET
North Spokane Corridor Project
Gerlach Road to US 395

Name: Lotti W. Klein    Date: 4/2/00
Address: 100 Boy 1600
Telephone: 966-8461

Thank you for attending this evening’s meeting. If there is anything else we should know about your residence and/or property that was not discussed tonight, please use this sheet to inform us.

Dear Road had been vacated without any notice to concerning neighbors. Mr. McDonald's tenant never let someone into concerning road property without notice and proper hearing during my neighbor's project. To become a dump for old bicycles, all materials used in his business, and a stack of household garbage, then by clear using my property...
Response

C-16  Lotti W. Klein

2. See C-13, response 2.

Comment C-16 (Continued)

removing all these obstacles it threat underbrush, housing nesting plants, quite
trees are buffers for the noise from
Highway 2 and air pollution from all
the exhaust made by the thousands of
passing cars passing daily. So for my
neighbors on the West side - myself
sound barriers are of utmost imporance
I also strongly object taking more of my
property then No. 12. Would add
there by taking is much more of my front land.
Before this happens I want my family
see your in court!

Sincerely
Mrs. Ruth W. Klein
Response

C-17 Walter J. Knopp

1. The current NSC design will connect Frontage Road 5 (FR5) to Deer Road.

2. Presently, the US 2 and Deer Road intersection meets WSDOT minimum sight distance requirements and is deemed as a “safe intersection” with the current traffic volumes on Deer Road.

3. Comment noted.

4. Spokane County is the regulating land use agency for your affected parcels.

5. Spokane County is the Regulating land use agency and processed your application and solicited recommendations from affected parties. The WSDOT recommended realignment of Deer Road to Freya Street in order to reduce the potential of accidents at the US 2 and Deer Road intersection. Spokane County considered this and other recommendations in granting conditional approval for your subdivision.

6. Comment noted.

7. Currently the US 2 and Deer Road intersection meets WSDOT minimum sight distance requirements and is deemed as a “safe intersection” with the current traffic volumes on Deer Road. However, any significant traffic volume increase on Deer Road would force WSDOT to consider channelization and sign revisions to limit the US 2 and Deer Road intersection to right-in, right-out traffic movements.
Response

C-18 Bill, Ben, & Gen
LaPoint

1. Comment noted.
Response

Comment C-19

C-19 Shane & Julie Lee

1. The traffic model used for the Air Quality Analysis shows a slight overall reduction in traffic volume on Shady Slope Road with the construction of the NSC as compared to without the NSC in the year 2020. In addition, the NSC design provides for the elimination of the High Accident Location at Shady Slope Road and US 2.

2. See C-11, response 2.

3. See C-11, response 3.

4. See C-11, response 1.

5. Comment noted.

Thank you for attending today's hearing. Written statements may be submitted today or may be forwarded to Mr. Keith Martin, P.E., at 2714 North Mirador Street, Spokane, Washington 99207-2909. All written comments received prior to July 24, 2000 will be considered by the project administrators and will be included in the hearing record. If we would just like to get on record no being opposed to this project. Not only do we get to have a freeway very close to us, we also get to have new, not old,360/290, so it won't even cut through on traffic on Sky, but more than likely will accentuate that this is going to build our neighborhood a better quality of life, not to mention decrease our noise value. There are many small children who live on Sky, and this will make it even more dangerous than it already is. They are in the 110 mph zone, so not only pollution, but also 110 mph. I think a public high speed transit system is a better idea, but then again. I don't see that it is a problem with going until 110 mph, but of course the 35s solution is always built into people, maybe we can be like all these other cities with the 25s for every other day and then speed is limited.
Response

C-20    John S. Marshall

1. Comments noted.

Comment C-20

June 28, 2000

Mr. Keith Martin,
Project Engineer
Washington State Department of Transportation
2714 N. Mayfair Street
Spokane, WA 99207-22090

Dear Mr. Martin,

RE: North South Freeway – North Option of North Alternative

Confirming our telephone conversation of this morning, I have enclosed a copy of my letter to you dated March 15, 2000 in which I have addressed my concerns about the impact of the North South Freeway on my home and property.

As I understand it, my March 15 letter has been classified as an informal commentary and that this resubmission will make this same letter a formal commentary.

Yours Truly,

John S. Marshall

Encl.
Comment C-20  (Continued)

March 15, 2000

Mr. Keith Martin
Project Engineer
Washington State Department of Transportation
2714 N. Mayfair St.
Spokane, WA 99207-22090

Dear Mr. Martin:

RE: North South Freeway – North Option of North Alternative

Our home is located at 13516 N. Pittsburg St. – the corner of Pittsburg and Winger Road. We purchased this home in November of 1963. We have made substantial improvements to the house and to the grounds over the passing years. Our 4 children grew up in this house and it has been our desire to spend the rest of our lives here.

I realize that nothing always remains the same but the evolution of the North Option of the North Alternative of the proposed North South Freeway, if built, will have an overwhelming impact on our quality of life.

After much agonizing over our many concerns resulting from DOT’s choice of this routing, I have tried to compile our major concerns and suggestions as to how DOT can make our remaining years less stressful.

Enclosed are a summary of our concerns and pictures to help explain them. I also have a video of our property that more clearly shows the problems I have outlined and will provide you with a copy if you wish.

It is my hope that we can work together to arrive at the most satisfactory solutions to our cares and concerns and that we can continue to enjoy the amenities and the beauty of our home of all these past years.

Yours truly,

John Marshall

509-466-6004

C-20  John S. Marshall

1. Comments noted.
Response

Comment C-20 (Continued)

C-20 John S. Marshall

1. These comments were responded to in a letter dated April 3, 2000 from Keith L. Martin. A copy follows Mr. Marshall’s letter.

---

North South Freeway – North Alternative

1. Noise pollution
   Abatement:
   Raise the level of the NW quadrant of my property to the level of the NW quadrant. This would create an enhanced barrier between the freeway level and the level of my home. Depositing excavated material removed from the freeway trench could do this. Topsoil should be provided in order to allow sound absorbing plantings or Acoustic barriers or both [See enclosed Industrial Acoustics Co. Bulletin 8.000].
   See enclosed pictures.

2. Visual pollution
   Abatement – See item 1

3. Vehicle ingress and egress.
   The current slope of Pittsburg St. in front of my home is about a 10-degree rise from south to north to where it meets Winger Road. During the snow season we frequently have trouble negotiating this slope but can manage to exit our driveway by turning left on Pittsburg and going downhill to Garden. In returning we can come home by way of Shady Slope Road and Winger Road and then turn left into our driveway off Pittsburg.
   See enclosed pictures.

   The new freeway will place us at the end of a long cul-de-sac and will mean we can no longer exit downhill and we will be forced to exit uphill to Winger. Most likely county surfacing will be infrequent and winter time egress will be nearly impossible.
   Abatement:
   Lower the level of Pittsburg and Winger to the level of my driveway so we can enter and exit four roads. This would involve 120 feet of Pittsburg and 120 feet of Winger.
Response

C-20    John S. Marshall

4. Isolation:
   Currently we have a mixed traffic flow on Pitsburg of cars, bikers, runners, buggy
   pushers and so on. This tends to connect us to the community. We also have walking
   access to the school grounds and beyond. The proposed freeway will totally isolate us
   from these associations and from our neighbors to the south.

   Solutions:
   a. Pedestrian bridge over freeway at Pitsburg or tunnel under freeway at Pitsburg.
   b. Walking path west to Perry and pedestrian lane on bridge over freeway.
   c. Pedestrian bridge over freeway on Creative as indicated on
      pedestrian/bicycle trail alternative C.

5. Pitsburg cul-de-sac:
   Should be large enough to accommodate fire trucks and other emergency units.
   To enter, turn around and exit as needed.

6. Provision for future sewer and any other utility connection:
   Solution - Utility or tunnel under freeway at Pitsburg.

7. Street address
   Prefer to remain Pitsburg St. - Alternates could be Pitsburg Circle or Court

8. Construction impact
   Noise - Dust - Blasting
   Our option – put up with it.
Response

C-20 John S. Marshall

April 3, 2000

Mr. and Mrs. Marshall
5316 North Pintburg Street
Spokane, WA 99208

RE: March 20, 2000 Office Visit

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Marshall:

Thank you for coming to my office and sharing your concerns regarding the proposed North Spokane Corridor (NSC) Project as it relates to your property, and for providing me with a packet of information listing those concerns.

Although it is premature to give you concrete answers to many of the questions or concerns you raised in your packet, I will respond based on the best available information and the process we have in place today. For clarity, my responses will follow the numbered sequence as presented in your packet:

1. Leveling the SW quadrant of your lot with roadway fill material is not something that can be committed to at this phase of project development. These discussions are better left for the right of way negotiations phase after it has been confirmed that we need a portion of your property for public use, and we have funds available to purchase your property.

2. Visual obstructions may also be associated with the pending matter of noise abatement in terms of views from your home towards the proposed NSC. This may also be a point of discussion in right of way negotiations, if and when that occurs.

3. The detailed design of the Pintburg Street cul-de-sac won't take place until we develop the contract plan to build it. The cul-de-sac will be designed in accordance with current Spokane County Roadway Standards; in addition, we will give practical considerations to your ingress and egress situation when that time comes.

4. It has been my experience that streets with cul-de-sacs have more neighborhood activity due to the removal of through traffic. As the north side of Wingert Road develops and through traffic is removed, you are likely to see an increase in the foot traffic island activities listed in your packet.

Comment C-20 (Continued)
Response

C-20  John S. Marshall

Mr. and Mrs. Marshall
Page 2
April 3, 2000

At this time we are not considering additional pedestrian/biking trails or bridges beyond what is currently being proposed. Unfortunately it is not practical to provide everyone with their most desirable access to the NSC and/or trail system.

Through a public input meeting held on February 8, 2000, trail alternative D was selected by residents of the Garden City area. Alternative D was selected by those folks as the best overall trail solution in terms of safety, efficiency of route to the schools, service to the community in that specific area, and the most economical trail option to build. The regional pedestrian/bike trail lies on the south side of the NSC, which was located with the help of targeted interest groups in September of last year. Therefore, a dedicated and well used trail system will be available for your use via Shady Slopes Road.

5. The Pittsburg Street cul-de-sac will be constructed to current Spokane County Road Standards, which means at the time 100 feet in diameter. Emergency vehicles are able to readily turn around in these areas.

6. Utilities will be extended across the NSC at our proposed Perry Street Bridge crossing.

7. The postal service makes these types of determinations, however, I cannot think of a reason why your street address would change as a result of our project. Pittsburg Street will still remain a public road.

8. Noise, dust, and blasting are a reality in road construction, however, we do generally limit the contractor to daylight hours and they rarely work weekends unless they are behind schedule. We will be sensitive to residential needs as we develop our contract plans and specifications in this and other areas along the NSC.

I hope this information answers your questions. If you need additional information regarding my response or just want to discuss other questions which may arise, please call me at 324-6695 or my assistant Glenn Wagemann at 324-6695.

Sincerely,

Keith L. Martin, P.E.
Project Engineer

KLMar

Attachment: List of questions and concerns from the Marshall's and Bike/Ped Trail Option D.
cc: File L3453-52g
Response

C-21  John S. Marshall

1. Comment noted.

2. The detailed design of the Pittsburg cul-de-sac will not take place until the WSDOT develops the contract plans for construction for this section of the project. The cul-de-sac will then be designed to the latest Spokane County standards. At that time, the WSDOT will give practical consideration to ingress and egress issues relating to the cul-de-sac.

3. No extension of Winger Road is planned as part of the North Spokane Corridor project.
Response

C-21 John S. Marshall

4. At this stage of project design, the WSDOT cannot commit to supplying fill material to level a portion of your property. This type of commitment can be discussed during the real estate negotiation phase once funds are available to purchase your property.

5. Comment noted.

6. At this time, the WSDOT is not considering additional pedestrian/bicycle trails or bridges beyond the current proposals. Through a public meeting held on February 8, 2000, four trail alternatives were presented to residents of the Garden City area. The residents selected the route they felt was the safest, most direct and economical, and provided the best service to the community. The regional pedestrian/bicycle trail, located with the assistance of targeted interest groups, lies on the south side of the NSC between US 2 and Wandermere.
Response

C-21 John S. Marshall

7. Comment noted.

I wish to thank you again for the courtesy you have extended to us in past meetings. The preceding pages have expanded on the concerns that we have expressed in previous contacts. We realize that you have to balance many factors in your work in order to arrive at a final design that everyone can relate to. We hope that we can work together with you and your staff to reach a fair and satisfactory settlement of the fears and trepidation that we are facing.

Yours truly,

[Signature]

John Marshall

13516 N. Pittsburgh St.
Spokane, WA 99208
466 6004
Response

C-22 Pat Mertens

1. Comment noted.

2. See Chapter 2, Bypass/Beltway section of the 1997 FEIS.
Response

Comment C-22 (Continued)

C-22 Pat Mertens

This N. Freeway is a waste of money. A better system of mass transit, a subway system, would solve traffic congestion and pollution which is getting worse. The city needs a better freeway system. It would cost a little more, but would solve some of our traffic problems.

MR. PATRICK MERTENS
1303 EAST DALTON AVENUE
SPokane WA 99207-2335
Comment C-22 (Continued)

Response

C-22  Pat Mertens
Response

C-23  Kurt Niven

1. Comments noted.

Comment C-23

July 13, 2000

Mr. James B. Prud'ente
Regional Environmental Manager
WSDOT Eastern Region
2714 Mayfair St.
Spokane, Washington 99207-2090

Mr. Prud'ente:

I am writing to express my support for the inclusion of a paved bicycle trail as part of the North Spokane Corridor Project. I live in North Spokane and regularly bicycle commute to my job downtown. The construction of this trail from Wandermere to the Centennial Trail would give myself and others living on the Northside an alternate bicycle route into downtown. I believe that such a dedicated, non-motorized trail would also encourage many people to try bicycle commuting who would otherwise be reluctant, due to the danger of competing with auto traffic while riding on city streets.

An important feature of the trail is that it should have connections to other bike trails and neighborhoods if it expects to increase its accessibility and use.

Sincerely,

Kurt Niven
Response

C-24 Larry Rees

1. Impacts to the Garden City neighborhood are recognized and discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 in the FSEIS.

2. See C-11, response 1.

3. Comment noted.

4. See Chapter 2 in the 1997 FEIS and FSEIS.

---

Comment C-24

DESIGN COMMENT SHEET

Name: Larry Rees  Date: 7-21-00
Mail Address: 12522 N Crestline St
Spokane WA 99208  Telephone: 466-3129

Thank you for attending today’s hearing. Written statements may be submitted today or may be forwarded to Mr. Keith Martin, P.E., at 2714 North Mayfair Street, Spokane, Washington 99207-2090. All written comments received prior to July 24, 2000 will be considered by the project administrators and will be included in the hearing record.

I oppose the preferred route for the North Spokane Freeway for the following reasons:

1. It cuts through and divides the long established Garden City - Mead Neighborhood resulting in diminished neighborhood cohesiveness.

2. It greatly affects our suburban quality of life with added noise, light and air pollution. This route goes through and between the schools and through a need that could best be used for a park which this neighborhood lacks.

3. If more time and energy had been spent in sending out alternate by-pass routes, many neighborhoods could have saved and a freeway could be built in much less time and for less cost. My feeling is that the DOT US 395 North Spokane Corridor Project Environmental, Design, and Access Hearing International Ag Trade Center/Spokane Convention Center RECEIVED  June 29, 2000
Response

C-24 Larry Rees

5. Comment noted.

6. See Chapter 2, Bypass/Beltway section of the 1997 FEIS.

7. Property values are discussed in the summary section and in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS.

Comment C-24 (Continued)

5. had a closed mindset for only their chosen route, due to their opposition and also their desire to use the very expensive University Bridge for the north terminus. A bypass route with urban connectors (using all existing roads plus new as needed) would better serve the Spokane area's transportation needs along with better and more mass transit.

6. With a freeway in this location I fear decreased property values affecting our neighborhood.

7. 
Response

C-25 Larry Rees

1. Impacts and mitigation of impacts to the Garden City neighborhood are documented in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS in several sections.

Comment C-25

Environmental Comment Sheet

Name: Larry Rees Date: 7-21-00
Mail Address: 13552 N Crestline St.
Spokane, WA 99208 Telephone: 456-3125

Thank you for attending today's hearing. Written statements may be submitted today or may be forwarded to Mr. Keith Martin, P.E., at 2714 North Mayfair Street, Spokane, Washington 99207-2090. All written comments received prior to July 24, 2000 will be considered by the project administrators and will be included in the hearing record.

This proposed freeway location will reduce green spaces that a becoming necessary for a better quality of life necessary in today's environment. It will increase noise and air pollution for this Garden City, area that it goes through. Loss of wildlife, deer and the occasional moose.

Received
Jul 24, 2000
Keith Martin, P.E.

US 395 North Spokane Corridor Project
Environmental, Design, and Access Hearing
International Ag Trade Center/Spokane Convention Center
June 29, 2000
Response

C-26 Larry Rees

1. Classified as a design comment.

2. Comment noted.

3. The WSDOT has coordinated with Fire District 9 regarding response times and emergency vehicle access in the Shady Slope area. The present NSC design provides safer emergency and public access by grade separating Shady Slope Road from US 2, thus eliminating a High Accident Location (HAL) at the existing US 2 and Shady Slope Road intersection.

4. Comment noted.
Response

C-27 Tom Wichman & Karen Sand-Wichman

1. Comment noted.

2. The current NSC design shows no construction impacts to the trees at the east end of Carlson Court.
Response

C-28  Tom Wichman & Karen Sand-Wichman

1. Comment noted.

2. Crestline Street will remain a two-way residential street.

3. The intersection of Crestline Street and Farwell Road will continue to serve as local access to the Northwood and Farwell schools. However, access to Crestline Street to and from Farwell Road may be limited to right in and right out turning movements due to proposed residential development along Farwell/Hastings Road. This may divert some of the local school and neighborhood traffic to the intersection of Pittsburg Street and Farwell Road. Currently, this intersection is under the control of the Spokane county Public Works Department. The WSDOT will work with Spokane County to provide the best possible solution.

4. Air Quality impacts are discussed in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS.
Response

C-29  Tom Wichman &
Karen Sand-Wichman

1. Crestline Street will remain a two-way residential street.

2. See C-28, response 3.

3. The WSDOT has coordinated with Fire District 9 regarding response times and emergency vehicle access.

4. See response 1.
Response

C-30 Sharon Snyder

1. Comment noted.

2. See “Alternatives” in Chapter 2 of the FSEIS.
Response

C-31 Sharon Snyder

1. The purpose and need for the NSC is discussed in Chapter 1 of the 1997 FEIS.

2. Comment noted.
Response

C-32 Sharon Snyder

1. The design of the North Spokane Corridor through the Garden City vicinity includes provisions for a pedestrian/bicycle trail to link the Northwood Middle School and Farwell Elementary School area with the neighborhoods east of the corridor.
Response

C-33 Mary Jane Thompson

1. Comments noted.
2. See C-19, response 2.
3. Comments noted.

Comment C-33

Thank you for attending today's hearing. Written statements may be submitted today or may be forwarded to Mr. Keith Martin, P.E., at 2714 North Moyfair Street, Spokane, Washington 99207-2090. All written comments received prior to July 24, 2000 will be considered by the project administrators and will be included in the hearing record.

The most recent design of the North Spokane Corridor project slices through an established neighborhood along Garden/Winger and Shady Slope isolating houses from one another. The homes are currently linked in all directions by a series of wooded paths. The quality of life would be destroyed for an entire neighborhood by this design - far beyond the numbers listed as impacted in your presentation.

Our home along Center Rd is in closer proximity to the original corridor design (1997) than it is to the alternative design. We are on record in the 1997 FEIS supporting the original design. The current preferred alternative design decimates a long-standing neighborhood and poses US 395 North Spokane Corridor Project

Environmental, Design, and Access Hearing
International Ag Trade Center/Spokane Convention Center
June 29, 2000
Response

C-33 Mary Jane Thompson

Comment C-33 (Continued)

3 I much greater hardship to residents in the area.
Response

C-34 Mary Jane Thompson

1. The Preferred Alternative is over 650 feet to the north and 800 feet to the east of your home. The Traffic Noise Impact Analysis, detailed in Chapter 4, was performed in accordance with Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations with guidance from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). This section in Chapter 4 describes how all allowable abatement will be provided.

2. Area wildlife is discussed in the FSEIS in Chapters 3 and 4. The Biological Assessment found that the Preferred Alternative passes through more forested undeveloped and suburban land than the FEIS Alignment, and therefore will have higher impact on the wildlife presently occupying this portion of Spokane County. Overall, however, the project will have minimal impact on wildlife habitat, since the majority of the project is within urban area or designated urban growth area.
Response

C-34  Mary Jane Thompson

Comment C-34 (Continued)

2. Home to abundant wildlife.
Response

C-35 Mary Jane Thompson

1. Future traffic projections due to growth indicate that even without the NSC, the Farwell Road & Crestline Street intersection will be limited to right-in and right-out turning movements due to the increase of traffic on Farwell/Hastings Road.

2. Future traffic accessing the Farwell and Northwood schools will continue to have two access points. The Farwell Road and Crestline Street intersection will be designed to limit traffic movements to right in and right out onto Crestline Street. The intersection of Farwell Road and Pittsburg Street intersection will continue to function with full left and right turn movements.

3. The Shady Slope area residents will have access to the Garden City area by the NSC pedestrian/bicycle trail with connections at Lacey Street, Center Court, and Crestline Street via Carlson Court.
Comment C-35 (Continued)

3. through my neighborhood cutting off access to homes currently reached by a 3-4 minute walk.
Response

Comment C-36

C-36 Susan S. Walker

1. Traffic noise impacts and mitigation are discussed in Chapter 4 of the FSEIS.
Response

C-37 Wendy Warner

1. Due to the implementation of full access control on US 2 between Pittsburg Road and Deer Road, a frontage road, will be constructed to provide access for homes currently fronting on US 2. Extending the proposed frontage road on the south side of US 2 to Deer Road instead of the proposed location would cost an estimated additional $100,000. It also would have a very similar impact to the undisturbed area you reference, which is slowly becoming an isolated pocket of habitat. As desirable as it is to area wildlife, urban growth and development will only further isolate this piece of property. Larger wildlife will eventually be forced to move out while songbirds and other small mammals will adapt, especially where concerned landowners such as yourself provide appropriate habitat for them.

2. The options available for the frontage roads in this area are limited. The main concern and responsibility reflected in the proposed design is to provide the safest possible access for existing residents and the traveling public on US 2.
Response

C-37 Wendy Warner

3. Comment noted.
Appendix I
Hearing Exhibits

Final Supplemental EIS
North Spokane Corridor
Real Estate Acquisition Summary

Engineering creates the right of way plan sheets that show the areas needed to build the highway project. Real Estate Services is charged with the responsibility to acquire the needed property and assure the acquisitions are accomplished within the law. Eminent domain laws require the government to pay just compensation for the property needed for public uses. The steps in the acquisition process are as follows:

- Real estate appraisers will determine the market value of the property. The appraiser will:
  - Contact you for a joint inspection.
  - Research sales of similar property in the market area.
  - Value the property before and after the project.
  - Determine the damages, cost to cure items, or special benefits (increase in value due to the project).
  - Some parcels with minor acquisitions will be valued administratively using the appraiser’s sales research. You have the right to request an appraisal on this administrative value.

- A review appraiser checks the appraiser’s work and issues a ‘Determination of Value’ which is the just compensation that will be offered to you.

- A negotiation agent will contact you with the offer to purchase. You will be informed whether an appraisal or an administrative value is being used. The negotiator will:
  - Explain the project and its impacts to your property.
  - Explain your rights under the Eminent Domain laws.
  - Listen to your concerns and, if necessary, convey them to engineering or appraisal for review.
  - Discuss the acquisition with your professional advisors (appraisers, real estate agents, lawyers, etc.).
  - Provide all the documents necessary to acquire the property for the project.
  - Submit the signed documents to headquarters for payment processing.
  - Payments are processed within 45 days of signature.
  - If the negotiator is unable to reach an agreement with you, we refer the acquisition to the Attorney General to begin condemnation proceedings. Condemnation is a legal action to acquire the property needed for the project after negotiations have been unsuccessful.

- If a residence or business is acquired by the state, you or your tenant may be entitled to relocation benefits. A relocation agent will:
  - Explain the relocation benefits available to you under eminent domain laws.
  - Assist you in locating replacement housing.
  - Assist you in the move of your personal property.
  - Assist your business in re-establishing at their new location.
  - Assist tenants in locating replacement housing.

Three brochures, Transportation Property Needs and You, Residential Relocation Assistance Program, and Business Relocation Assistance Program are published by the Department of Transportation. These booklets provide more detail into the acquisition and relocation processes. You may request a copy by contacting:

Washington State Department of Transportation
Eastern Region Real Estate Services
2714 North Mayfair Street
Spokane WA 99207
(509) 324-6286

Washington State Department of Transportation
Benefits of the North Spokane Corridor

Safety
The North Spokane Corridor is estimated to save approximately $22 million per year in societal costs from accident reduction.

Travel Time
The savings in travel time is estimated to be 2 million hours, equating to $28 million annually.

Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail
Starting at the Spokane River, this commuter trail is approximately 8 miles long with connections to the Centennial Trail, SCC, and multiple access points.

Gas Savings
The North Spokane Corridor is estimated to save approximately 1.7 million gallons of gasoline annually.

Employment
Based on Federal Highway Administration research, each million dollars spent on highway construction supports 42 jobs across the nation, of which 25 jobs would be supported within Washington State. Therefore, assuming a funding stream of $30 million per year in construction spending, the project could support 1250 jobs nationwide including 750 jobs within Washington State.

Air Quality
The North Spokane Corridor is estimated to reduce regional emissions by 2.4 million pounds of carbon monoxide per year.
North Spokane Corridor Preferred Alternative

Looking West from Perry Street towards US 395 at Wandermere

Before

After

You Are Here Looking West

The proposed design presented is a conceptual or theoretical design based on preliminary design data. Final engineering design is possible only after final alignments, grades, safety, environmental concerns, economics, and input from public meetings and other interests are evaluated and the optimum design is established.

Washington State Department of Transportation
6/30/99
North Spokane Corridor - Preferred Alternative
Looking North from Garden Avenue just East of Pittsburg Street

You Are Here Looking North

Before

After with Earth Berm

After with Architectural Concrete Wall

The proposed designs presented are conceptual or theoretical designs based on preliminary design data.

Earth berms or concrete walls are possible solutions to reduce traffic noise and visual impacts for this area.

Final engineering design is possible only after final alignments, grades, safety, environmental concerns, economics, and input from public meetings and other interests are evaluated and the optimum design is established.

Washington State Department of Transportation
US 395
North Spokane Corridor Project
Looking North from Bridgeport Avenue Near the BNSF Railroad

Before

Pedestrian/Bicycle Trail

BNSF Railroad

After

The proposed design presented is a conceptual or theoretical design based on preliminary design data.
Final engineering design is possible only after final alignments, grades, safety, environmental concerns, economics, and input from public meetings and other interests are evaluated and the optimum design is established.

Washington State Department of Transportation

2/22/00