

THE HONORABLE THOMAS S. ZILLY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

CITIZENS FOR MOBILITY; STUART
WEISS; DONALD F. PADEL FORD;
RICHARD NELSON; RICHARD FIKE;
THOMAS COAD; AND EMORY BUNDY,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NORMAN MINETA, Secretary of
Transportation; NURIA I. FERNANDEZ,
Administrator of the Federal Transit
Administration; HELEN M. KNOLL, Regional
Director, Federal Transit Administration,
Region X; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
TRANSPORTATION; FEDERAL TRANSIT
ADMINISTRATION; AND CENTRAL
PUGET SOUND REGIONAL TRANSIT
AGENCY,

Defendants.

NO. C00-1812Z

DECLARATION OF JOHN D. ALKIRE
ACCOMPANYING PLAINTIFFS'
RENEWED MOTION FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT

John D. Alkire, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

DECLARATION OF JOHN D. ALKIRE
ACCOMPANYING PLAINTIFFS' RENEWED
MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT
(NO. C00-1812Z) - 1
[/SL022520210.DOC]

1 1. The following documents, listed by Exhibit letter and attached hereto in the
2 order indicated, are true copies of the source documents. References are made to excerpts
3 from those documents in the following paragraphs of this declaration:
4
5
6
7

Exhibit	Description	Date	Pages
A	FTA : Frequently Asked Questions on New Starts Projects		All
B	FTA New Starts Submission Requirements		All
C	FHWA "Development and Evaluation of Alternatives"		All
D	FTA "New Starts Baseline Alternative Review and Approval Procedures		All
E	Sound Transit's New Starts Report to FTA	Sept. 1999	Title, 7
F	Sound Transit's New Starts Report to FTA	Oct. 2001	Title, 7
G	Letter from Sound Transit to FTA (with copy of 11-6-98 letter attached)	Sept. 24, 2001	All
H	Sound Transit's "Ridership Projections: Questions and Answers"	Sept. 26, 2001	All
I	FTA letter to Sound Transit	Oct. 15, 2001	All
J	Sound Transit (Tracy Reed) e-mail	Nov. 5, 2001	All
K	Sound Transit briefing paper to FTA	Nov. 13, 2001	All
L	Sound Transit memorandum (J. Irish to J. Earl)	Nov. 19, 2001	All
M	Sound Transit (Eric Pihl) e-mail	Nov. 28, 2001	All
N	Sound Transit's SEPA "Addendum"	Nov. 2001	All
O	King County Metro's Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) study	Nov. 2001	All

Exhibit	Description	Date	Pages
P	Sound Transit (S. Asatoorian) chart	Dec. 7, 2001	All
Q	FTA Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment	Dec. 2001	All
R	FTA letter to Sound Transit	Dec. 18, 2001	All
S	Environmental Assessment, FTA and Sound Transit, Feb. 4, 2002	Feb. 4, 2002	Title, I-xii, 1-26, App. L, 19-28,45,49
T	Amended Record of Decision, FTA	May 8, 2002	Title, 1-20, and Attachment F, pp. 10-22, 29-32, 58
U	DMJM+Harris Technical Memorandum	October 2001	All
V	Excerpt from Council on Environmental Quality's "NEPA's Forty Most Asked Questions"		Paragraphs 36a, 36b
W	FTA letter to Sound Transit	Aug. 21, 2002	All
X	USDOT, Office of Inspector General, Memorandum to Federal Transit Administrator	Sept. 4, 2002	All

Project Definition; Alternatives Addressed

2. In 1999 Sound Transit identified a "locally preferred alternative" (LPA) light rail project proceeding from Sea-Tac Airport northward to NE. 45th Street, with an option extending to Northgate, funds permitting. This LPA project (sometimes called "Central Link") was the subject of the September 1999 New Starts Report to the FTA, and of the November 1999 Final Environmental Impact Statement (Final EIS) promulgated by FTA and Sound Transit.

1 3. In January 2000 the FTA issued its Record of Decision (ROD) for the LPA
2 project. The ROD at pages 1 and 2 defined and described the same LPA project as described
3 in the 1999 New Starts Report and Final EIS.
4

5
6 4. The January 2000 ROD also identified the same alternatives as the 1999 Final
7 EIS. Those length alternatives were as follows:
8

- 9 • Northgate to SeaTac (S. 200th);
- 10 • University District to SeaTac (S. 200th);
- 11 • N.E. 45th to S. McClellan St. (MOS A);
- 12 • Capitol Hill to S. Henderson (MOS B); and
- 13 • N.E. 45th to S. Lander (MOS C).

14 See January 2000 ROD, page 5; Final EIS at S-16, section S.4.2. (AR at 3094.)
15

16 5. In January 2001, Sound Transit and the FTA entered into a Full Funding
17 Grant Agreement (FFGA) for the LPA project identified above.
18

19 6. During years 2000 and 2001 Sound Transit began formulating plans for a new
20 "Tukwila Freeway Route" for a southern portion of the LPA project. Eventually, on
21 November 16, 2001, Sound Transit and the FTA published a Final Supplemental
22 Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Tukwila Freeway Route.
23

24 7. In April 2001, the Inspector General of the U.S. Department of
25 Transportation (OIG) issued an Interim Report calling into question the financial feasibility
26 of the LPA project. (A copy of that Interim Report is attached as Exhibit J to the Declaration
27 of Thomas Rubin, July 11, 2001, filed herein.)
28

29 8. As a result of that April 2001 OIG report and other developments, Sound
30 Transit reconsidered the scope of its proposed action.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 9. On or about September 27, 2001, Sound Transit identified a new, 14-mile
2 "Initial Segment" light rail project. This new, "Initial Segment" plan calls for a route from
3 Convention Place in the Downtown Seattle Transit Tunnel (DSTT) southward to S. 154th
4 Street. According to Sound Transit, "[k]ey changes from the old MOS include new northern
5 and southern termini, joint bus-rail operations in the DSTT, funding for the station at Beacon
6 Hill, and deferral of the Boeing Access Road Station." (Sound Transit Briefing Paper for
7 Meeting with OIG, Nov. 13, 2001, at page 1; copy attached as Exhibit K hereto.)
8
9

10 10. The "Initial Segment" plan was not identified as an alternative, or discussed
11 as such, in either the 1999 Final EIS or the January 2000 ROD.
12
13

14 11. In October 2001, Sound Transit submitted a new, New Starts Report for
15 funding to the FTA. In that report, at page 7, section 2.1, Sound Transit defines the project
16 that is the subject of the new funding request as follows: "Sound Transit is submitting the
17 following project definition for consideration by the FTA: The Central Link Initial Segment
18 project from Convention Place to S. 154th Station." (Copy attached as Exhibit F hereto.)
19 This project, as defined at page 7, is the 14-mile "Initial Segment" project. On the same
20 page, Sound Transit confirms this is the project defined for federal funding purposes, stating:
21 "This initial 14-mile segment is the same as will be submitted for Federal Full Funding
22 Grant Agreement [FFGA] negotiations on a Minimum Operable Segment (MOS) project."
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 12. (The October 2001 project definition contrasts with that in the
37 September 1999 New Starts Report at page 7: "Sound Transit is submitting two project
38 definitions for unique consideration by FTA: (1) a Minimum Operating Segment [MOS]
39 from N.E. 45th Street to S. Lander. . . and (2) the entire project from Northgate to South
40 SeaTac as described in *Sound Move* . . ." (Copy attached as Exhibit E hereto.))
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 13. In a letter to Sound Transit dated December 18, 2001 (Exhibit R hereto), FTA
2 advised in part: "However, technically FTA will be considering Final Design approval for
3 the entire new [Initial Segment] MOS since that new project has never been formally rated in
4 the New Starts process nor formally approved for Final Design."
5
6

7
8 14. In February 2002, the FTA and Sound Transit promulgated an Environmental
9 Assessment (EA) for the Initial Segment proposal. (Excerpts of EA attached as Exhibit S
10 hereto.)
11
12

13
14 15. Following a public hearing and a comment period, on or about May 8, 2002
15 the FTA issued an "Amended Record of Decision for . . . Initial Segment of the Central Link
16 Light Rail Transit Project" ("Amended ROD"). (Copies of excerpts attached as Exhibit T
17 hereto.)
18
19

20
21 16. In the May 2002 Amended ROD, at page 1, the FTA described the changed
22 decision making that led to definition of the Initial Segment, and concluded: "These changes
23 effectively altered the LPA, for Federal record of decision-making purposes under NEPA, to
24 a project and alignment that is now referred to as the "Initial Segment" (hereinafter
25 sometimes referred to as "Amended LPA"). (Exhibit T hereto.) The FTA then stated: "*This*
26 *Initial Segment or Amended LPA constitutes the Federal project for which this Amended*
27 *Record of Decision (Amended ROD) applies.*" (Id.; emphasis supplied.) In a December 7,
28 2001 e-mail, Sound Transit planner Steve Asatoorian identified the January 2001 FFGA for
29 the 21-mile "Central Link" as "previously abandoned" and identified the need for a "new
30 FFGA" for the 14-mile Initial Segment. (Exhibit P hereto.)
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

42 17. The FTA further clarified the point by stating that the Amended LPA "is the
43 14-mile light rail line connecting downtown Seattle, southeast Seattle and the City of
44 Tukwila." Amended ROD, at 2 (Exhibit T hereto). (With this clarification the FTA brings
45
46
47

1 the definition of "project", for NEPA purposes, into alignment with the definition of
2 "project" used in the New Starts Report of October 2001 for federal funding purposes. See
3 paragraph 11 of this declaration, above.) The FTA then affirmed that the Amended ROD
4 supersedes the ROD of January 5, 2000 "which, by the issuance of this Amended ROD, is
5 NULL AND VOID." Id. Finally, at page 2 of the Amended ROD, the FTA states that:
6
7 "Within this Amended ROD, FTA specifically concludes and incorporates a finding of no
8 significant impact for the Initial Segment EA, as discussed below." (Exhibit T hereto.)
9

10 11 12 13 14 15 **Initial Segment not Addressed as Alternative**

16
17 18. It is undisputed that Initial Segment was *not* one of the length alternatives
18 addressed in the 1999 Final EIS. (See Amended ROD, Responses to Comments, page 13;
19 Exhibit T hereto.)
20

21
22 19. In the 1999 Final EIS, the 21-mile project was selected as the LPA; the
23 14-mile Initial Segment was not an evaluated alternative strategy in that Final EIS, and was
24 not selected as the LPA from among those alternative strategies. Now, however, the 14-mile
25 Initial Segment proposal is identified by the FTA, in its May 2002 Amended ROD, as the
26 "Amended LPA [Locally Preferred Alternative]." Id. at 1, 2. (Exhibit T hereto.)
27
28

29 20. Every length alternative analyzed in the 1999 Final EIS, including all
30 "Minimum Operating Segments" ("MOSs"), included proposals for construction at least as
31 far north as the Capitol Hill section of Seattle. (See paragraph 4 of this declaration, above.)
32 By contrast, Initial Segment does not proceed north of the DSTT. (EA at pages vii; ix; and
33 Figure 1; Exhibit S hereto.) Accordingly, Initial Segment does not encompass even the
34 *minimum* length range addressed in the 1999 Final EIS. Stated differently, it does not
35 incorporate one of *the least common denominators* in terms of length range.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

1 20. The Initial Segment plan calls for mixed modal use (joint use by buses and
2 light rail trains) in the DSTT. This was an option summarily rejected in the 1999 Final EIS,
3 at 3-12; AR at 3226. Apart from that one-page rejection, and associated negative comments
4 in the referenced DSTT Report of September 21, 1998, mixed use in the DSTT was not
5 discussed in the 1999 Final EIS. That mixed modal option was not analyzed as an
6 alternative in the 1999 Final EIS.
7
8
9
10
11

12 **DSTT Joint Bus-Train Use not Adequately Addressed**
13

14 21. Defendant Sound Transit admits that joint bus-rail operations in the DSTT
15 "would be . . . a first of its kind in the country." (Sound Transit Briefing Paper, Nov. 13,
16 2001, at page 3; Exhibit K hereto.) All defendants also admit there are "no predecessors
17 currently available" anywhere in the world for this joint operations plan. (Amended ROD,
18 Responses to Comments, page 29; Exhibit T hereto.) In other words, it has never been done
19 before.
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 22. In the 1999 Final EIS, the joint operations plan was rejected in part because
27 of safety concerns: "The system must depend on operator judgment to maintain a safe
28 stopping distance due to the lack of a fail safe signal system." Id. at 3-12; AR at 3226.
29
30
31
32

33 23. In the EA at page 26 (Exhibit S hereto), defendants state: "With joint
34 operation of buses and trains in the DSTT there is the potential for collisions between buses
35 and light rail vehicles or other buses." The FTA, in its comments on Sound Transit's draft
36 EA, raised the following questions about safety in the DSTT:
37
38
39
40

41 Concerning the signal system and the potential for collisions between
42 railcars and buses, how and when will you know if the signal system
43 works? Will there be testing? How confident are you in the system?
44 . . . Is there any hazard of crossover collisions in the station areas? . . .
45 [Do the fire/life/safety issues] need to be resolved in order to fully
46
47

1 evaluate the safety impact? What are the fire/life/safety issues that
2 need to be resolved? How and when will they be resolved?

3
4 (Exhibit Q hereto, at page 9.) More recently, in an August 21, 2002 letter to Sound Transit,
5
6 the FTA has raised serious questions about unresolved DSTT safety issues. Id. at 2 (copy
7
8 attached as Exhibit W hereto). The USDOT Office of Inspector General also recently raised
9
10 an issue about DSTT safety in its latest audit memorandum. (Copy attached as Exhibit X
11
12 hereto.)

13
14 24. In a December 7, 2001 Memorandum, Steve Asatoorian of Sound Transit
15
16 states that while joint rail/bus operations in the DSTT had been approved by the Sound
17
18 Transit board, "there are operational safety issues." (Exhibit P hereto.)

19
20 25. These safety issues are not addressed in the Environmental Assessment (EA),
21
22 except with general statements such as:

- 23
24 • "an improved signal system has been developed to . . . increase safety";
25
26 • "Analysis has shown that fire/life/safety and other issues can be addressed with
27
28 joint operations";
29
30 • agencies "have developed solutions" regarding "fire/life/safety . . . signaling, and
31
32 other issues";
33
34 • a "Bus/Train Separation and Signal System" is summarized (but framing that
35
36 discussion is the statement that both trains and buses "would remain under the
37
38 control of on-board operators").

39 (EA at pages 8-10; Exhibit S hereto.) No details of the new signal system are provided.

40 The referenced "Analysis" and "solutions" are not provided or delineated. The referenced
41
42 "other issues" are not defined or discussed.

43
44 26. Defendants have suggested that "[l]ive tests using a proxy for a light rail train
45
46 may be considered in the future." (Amended ROD, Responses to Comments, page 29;
47

1 Exhibit T hereto.) They have further suggested: "The safety of joint operations will be
2 demonstrated before revenue service begins." (Id. at page 30.) They indicate: "During
3 tunnel closure, extensive testing of light rail vehicles and buses both independently and in
4 joint operations will be conducted before the tunnel is reopened for revenue service." (Id.)
5
6 In other words, this joint use plan has not yet been tested.
7
8
9

10
11 **Baseline Alternative: No-Build vs. TSM**
12

13 27. In section 2.1.4 of its guidelines for submission of New Starts reports FTA
14 emphasizes that the New Starts baseline alternative is the "best that can be done" to improve
15 transit service in the corridor without a major capital investment in new infrastructure. It
16 equates New Starts baseline with "the TSM alternative," and affirms that such an alternative
17 must be discussed in "the majority of cases": "Most metropolitan areas where New Starts
18 projects are proposed would likely fit into this category where additional transit actions short
19 of a New Starts major capital investment are feasible." Id. (Exhibit B hereto.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 28. The FTA states:
28

29 CEQ and FTA regulations governing the NEPA process require the
30 consideration of all reasonable alternatives that address the purpose
31 and need for Federal action. This set of alternatives will normally
32 include some level of evaluation of a TSM alternative that would
33 generally fit the second definition of the New Starts baseline
34 alternative For clarity, the NEPA document will refer to this
35 alternative by a descriptive name such as the TSM alternative or
36 Better Bus alternative.
37
38

39 FTA's Frequently Asked Questions, "Key Changes Introduced in Rule", at page 5 of 13,
40 Exhibit A hereto. (The "baseline alternative" is specifically addressed in 49 C.F.R.
41 611.7(a)(3) as a required component of the alternatives analysis for a proposed light rail
42 project.)
43
44
45
46
47

29. In this Initial Segment case, defendants have used the no-build alternative as the New Starts baseline. (September 24, 2001 letter from Sound Transit to FTA, Exhibit G hereto; see also Sound Transit e-mails of Nov. 5, 2001 and Nov. 28, 2001, Exhibits J and M hereto.) They have not examined a TSM baseline alternative.

Uncertainty over Definition of Project

30. Below is a four-part table quoting a number of statements from documents generated by defendants, bearing on the question of definition of the "Initial Segment" project and its relationship to the "Central Link" project. These statements demonstrate various levels of ambiguity and uncertainty, if not actual contradiction, among defendants as to the definition and characterization of the "Initial Segment" project:

I. SEPA Addendum Nov. 2001 (Exhibit N hereto)

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
	11/16/01 cover letter – "This Initial Segment is a subpart of the adopted project."
	2 – "This Addendum describes proposed changes and refinements to the Central Link Light Rail Project (Central Link Project or Project), a 21-mile light rail line that will connect the Cities of Seattle, Tukwila, and SeaTac."
	2 – "This Initial Segment is a subpart of the adopted project analyzed in the Final EIS"
	3 – "Sound Transit concludes that the proposed project changes and refinements do not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
	existing environmental documents."
	6- "With Initial Segment, the DSTT would be the initial north end of Link. . . ."
	7 (Figure 2) – Describes Convention Place Station as "Initial Segment Interim Northern Terminus"
	10 (Figure 4) – Describes S. 154 th Street as "Initial Segment Interim Southern Terminus"

II. FTA Letter of Dec. 18, 2001 (Exhibit R hereto)

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
p. 1 – "However, technically the FTA will be considering Final Design approval for the entire new MOS [Initial Segment] since that new project has never been formally rated in the New Starts process nor formally approved for Final Design."	

III. EA of Feb. 2002 (Exhibit S hereto)

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
	Vii – "This Environmental Assessment (EA) describes changes and design refinements to the Central Link Light Rail Transit Project (Central Link Project or project), a 21-mile light rail line that will connect the cities of Seattle, Tukwila, and

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
	SeaTac."
	Vii – "The Sound Transit Board has decided to develop the Central Link Project in segments rather than the full 21-mile project analyzed in the Final EIS. . . . "This Initial Segment is a subpart of the original project analyzed in the Final EIS. . . . "
	1 – "The Initial Segment is a subpart of the original project. . . . "
	2 – "Construction and operation of an Initial Segment enables Sound Transit to continue moving forward with implementation of the light rail elements of <i>Sound Move</i> . The light rail line is envisioned as the first phase of a long-range regional transit system with future phases extending to the north, east, and south."

IV. Amended ROD (Exhibit T hereto)

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
	1 – "Further, by action taken on November 29, 2001, the Sound Transit Board preliminarily incorporated changes to the LPA for that portion of the LPA from downtown Seattle to S. 154 th Street in the City of SeaTac."

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
<p>1- "These changes effectively altered the LPA, for Federal record of decision-making purposes under NEPA, to a project and alignment what is now referred to as the "Initial Segment" (hereinafter sometimes referred to as "Amended LPA").</p>	
<p>1 – "This Initial Segment or Amended LPA constitutes the Federal project for which this Amended Record of Decision (Amended ROD) applies."</p>	<p>1-2: "(FTA recognizes that Sound Transit considers its overall Central Link project alignment to continue to consist of that alignment from Northgate to S. 200th Street . . . and may seek additional federal funds for the completion of Central Link to Northgate and S. 200th Street.)"</p>
<p>2 – "This Amended LPA, and to which this Amended ROD applies, is the 14-mile light rail line connecting downtown Seattle, southeast Seattle and the City of Tukwila."</p>	
<p>2 – "FTA . . . hereby issues this Amended ROD finding that the requirements of NEPA have been satisfied for the construction and operation of the Amended LPA alignment by Sound Transit."</p>	
<p>2 – "This Amended ROD supersedes the ROD of January 5, 2000, which, by the issuance of this Amended ROD, is NULL AND VOID."</p>	<p>8 – "The Federal Transit Administration in consultation with Sound Transit . . . has determined that the Amended LPA as put forth in the Final EIS, Tukwila Freeway Route Final Supplemental EIS and the Initial Segment EA and as described herein meets the purpose and need for the project and the goals established for the project as described and evaluated in each of these documents."</p>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
	9-10: "It was not the intent nor the requirement that the Initial Segment EA redo the FEIS for the Central Link project or redo the FEIS for that segment of the Central Link Project that is made up of the Initial Segment. Rather, the Initial Segment EA evaluates whether the changes made to the Central Link Project by Initial Segment and the design refinements would result in substantial adverse impacts not evaluated in existing environmental documents. . . ."
	11 – "FTA finds that the Initial Segment EA, incorporated herein by reference, identified similar or less adverse environmental impacts and no new significant adverse environmental effects that result from changes to the project's construction or operation as identified in the Initial Segment EA and that were not already evaluated in the FEIS and Tukwila Freeway Route Supplemental EIS."
	11 – ""FTA finds, under 23 C.F.R. 771.121 and 771.130, that the proposed changes to the project, with the mitigation to which Sound Transit has committed, will have no new significant adverse impacts on the environment beyond those previously evaluated in the DEIA and . . . Supplemental EIS."
Attachment F – NEPA Environmental Assessment – Response to Comments	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
	10 – "In 1999, following issuance of the FEIS, Sound Transit adopted a 21-mile light rail project based on years of study and review, and FTA issued a ROD for that project in January 2000. The Sound Transit Board has now taken action to construct a 14-mile Initial Segment as a first step toward completing the full Phase 1 system, and the FTA is considering funding the Initial Segment."
	12 – "Sound Transit has represented that it fully intends to complete the project from the University District to SeaTac. The Initial Segment is the first section to be constructed and operated."
	13 – "FTA can respond that the Initial Segment is an element of the project approved by the voters as part of <i>Sound Move</i> , and is not in replacement of the project."
	13 – "[T]he Initial Segment is a Minimum Operable Segment (MOS), which is a stand-alone portion of the project that has independent utility."
	13 – "[T]he Initial Segment is proposed as the first segment of the Central Link light rail project to be built and operated, and Sound Transit represents that it is continuing its efforts to complete the project from the University District to SeaTac in accordance with the commitments of <i>Sound Move</i> ."

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
14 – "A MOS is defined in terms of a project that can be built and operated independent of other extensions."	
14 – "The Initial Segment . . . will have independent utility or independent significance because it contains all elements needed for light rail operation even if no additional transportation improvements in the area are made."	14 – "The 1999 FEIS and its supplements are project level EIS for the proposed Link project. . . . The Link system north of the Initial Segment is being reevaluated in a supplemental EIS Similarly, any changes to the project and its schedule south of the Initial Segment would also be addressed in additional environmental review as appropriate prior to that segment of the project proceeding."
16 – "The EA addresses the Initial Segment, a MOS with independent utility; funding issues related to future extension of the system are not relevant to this NEPA environmental analysis and need not be addressed."	16 – "[T]he discussion of the purpose and need and alternative evaluation relative to the correlating goals and objectives of the original project continue to apply."
17 – "The EA was developed specifically to identify the potential impacts that could occur if only the Initial Segment were built. The Initial Segment constitutes a MOS with independent utility (it can be effectively operated on its own) and logical termini."	19 – "The EA describes the Initial Segment as a stand-alone MOS of the project."
58 – "The Initial Segment has been defined to enable it to be built and operated independent of future extensions or design decisions. There are no benefits to delaying federal action on the Initial Segment, as the project has been defined and evaluated, and funding is available for this stage of the project."	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Suggesting Initial Segment is Independent Project	Suggesting Initial Segment Is Part of Larger Project
58 – "The FFGA for the Initial Segment will not apply to the extension to the University District to the north."	

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed at Seattle, Washington this ____ day of September, 2002.

John D. Alkire