Terminal, the access area is a City of Everett permitting condition for the terminal, with enhancements including parking, benches, and a shoreline walkway. The area is not yet officially open.

Edgewater Park is located in the city of Everett, slightly east and upland of the project area. The 1.5-acre site includes picnic tables, tennis and basketball courts, and a playground.

The Cascadia Marine Trail is one of 16 non-motorized water trails designated as National Millennium Trails by the White House Millennium Council. The trail crosses to the west of Point Elliot and extends through Puget Sound from Olympia to Point Roberts on the U.S.-Canada border.

**Recreational Fishing**

The Port of Everett’s fishing pier and the public pier near the Silver Cloud Inn provide access for recreational fishing, which is popular in and near the study area. Salmon, crab, and shrimp are typically harvested by boat, while shellfish are harvested from shore. WDFW divides Washington State waters into Fishing Management Areas. One of the most popular fishing areas is the bar at the south end of Whidbey Island, just offshore from Scatchet Head and Possession Point. The easiest and quickest way to reach this bar from the mainland is to launch at the Mukilteo Lighthouse Park; however, this ramp can be difficult to use in high winds. The Port of Everett boat launch in Everett is farther from the south end of Whidbey Island but is larger and more protected from wave action.

**Demographics**

Racial characteristics for the study area population as of the 2000 Census are shown in Table 4.5-1. The minority percentage for each census block group in the study area is shown in Figure 4.5-2. The analysis also assesses ethnicity in terms of the non-white and white Hispanic populations that may be present. In the study area, less than 4 percent of the population was Hispanic in 2000. Although the City of Everett limits fall within the study area, its populated areas are outside the study area and are not shown here.

**Table 4.5-1. Racial Composition of Residents in Snohomish County, City of Mukilteo, and Census Tracts within the Study Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>City of Mukilteo</th>
<th>Census Tract 413.01</th>
<th>Census Tract 413.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>606,024</td>
<td>18,042</td>
<td>4,845</td>
<td>6,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>518,043</td>
<td>14,540</td>
<td>4,216</td>
<td>4,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>9,587</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>8,127</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>35,534</td>
<td>2,092</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5-1. Racial Composition of Residents in Snohomish County, City of Mukilteo, and Census Tracts within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Group</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>City of Mukilteo</th>
<th>Census Tract 413.01</th>
<th>Census Tract 413.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28,590</td>
<td>18,019</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>11,365</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>22,118</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent non-white</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census 2000 Summary File 3 – Table P006 and P007

Income characteristics for the study area are shown in Table 4.5-2. The percentage of households below the federal poverty threshold in the study area is shown in Figure 4.5-3.

Table 4.5-2. Income Level of Residents in Snohomish County, City of Mukilteo, and Census Tracts within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Snohomish County</th>
<th>City of Mukilteo</th>
<th>Census Tract 413.01</th>
<th>Census Tract 413.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median household income in 1999</td>
<td>$53,060</td>
<td>$67,323</td>
<td>$63,548</td>
<td>$70,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of population below poverty level (%)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census 2000 Summary File 3 (SF 3) – Tables P053, P087

Tribal Communities

There are no tribal reservations in the project area. Several tribes trace their ancestry to the native inhabitants of the Puget Sound region, and their members continue to live, work, fish, hunt, and participate in traditional cultural activities in locations throughout the region. These tribes include the federally recognized Lummi Nation, Muckleshoot Tribe, Samish Tribe, Sauk-Suiattle Tribe, Snoqualmie Tribe, Stillaguamish Tribe, Suquamish Tribe, Swinomish Tribe, Tulalip Tribes, and Upper Skagit Tribe, as well as the non-federally recognized Duwamish Tribe and Snohomish Tribe.

As described in Section 4.12 Ecosystems, the project area supports several species of salmon, crab, shellfish, and other marine species that have always been central to tribal cultures of Western Washington. Tribal harvests focus on salmon, Dungeness crab, and shellfish. The primary mode of harvesting salmon is with anchored or drifting gill nets. Tribal harvesting of Dungeness crab is accomplished mostly with pot gear or during summer low tides. Shellfish have also been harvested by tribal fishers, but in recent years, the occurrence of toxic algae has closed beaches throughout much of the urbanized Tacoma-Seattle-Everett region, because littleneck clams, butter clams, and horse clams accumulate toxins that can be harmful or fatal to humans.
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Figure 4.5-3. Percent Below Poverty
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Fishing opportunities for salmon, Dungeness crab, and other shellfish are shared among federally recognized tribes of Western Washington and they have access to seasons and areas not open to the general public. The tribes also have resource management roles that they conduct in coordination with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Tribal fishers have used the Tank Farm Pier as shelter during periods of strong south winds. The Tank Farm Pier also provides habitat and refuge for crabs. The area off the upland portion of the Mukilteo Tank Farm is not typically fished with drift gear because of the proximity to the Tank Farm Pier. Fishing is precluded in the immediate area around the existing ferry terminal due to ferry traffic.

Tribal harvesting of Dungeness crab is accomplished mostly with pot gear, during summer low tides. Tribal crab and clam harvesting occurs most of the year. Ghost shrimp are harvested year-round for use as bait from the sandy areas near the Port of Everett Mount Baker Terminal. Typically, Chinook salmon are fished from July to September, pink salmon in July, coho from early September to October, and chum salmon from mid-October through November.

4.5.3 Long-Term Environmental Impacts

Long-term social impacts from transportation projects may result from the acquisition of properties, removal of buildings and other physical features, displacement of businesses or residents, separation of a neighborhood from its community resources, impacts on traffic circulation patterns, impacts on parks, or impacts on neighborhood cohesion. Separation of a neighborhood from its community resources may be caused by operational changes such as rerouting traffic, pedestrian or transit service, as well as by physical barriers such as new roadways or other transportation facilities.

No-Build Alternative

Social Impacts

The No-Build Alternative would not alter the overall ferry terminal layout.

The surrounding community is routinely affected by the deficiencies of the current facilities. Long queues block driveways and side streets, and waterfront access is both limited and impeded by conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians.

The No-Build Alternative conditions hinder access to the waterfront, the small businesses, and the Mukilteo Lighthouse Park. In the future, increasing ferry traffic volumes would make vehicular access to the waterfront businesses more difficult.

Currently, only a small portion of ferry traffic uses residential streets to avoid traffic signals on SR 525 and SR 526, although this could worsen as ferry traffic increases in the future.
Impacts on Parks and Recreational Resources

Because of congestion and overall increase in traffic, ferry queues, parking constraints, and ferry loading and unloading, the No-Build Alternative would continue to hinder access to Mukilteo Lighthouse Park and Community Beach Park. Recreational use of this popular park is expected to increase over time. The Port of Everett fishing pier and seasonal day moorage would be replaced, including the floats and piers, temporarily removing the ability of people to use it for fishing.

Environmental Justice Considerations

No resources or services specific to low income and minority populations exist in the area. There would be no impacts on low-income housing sites, social service providers, or other environmental justice resources. The Port of Everett’s existing fishing pier would remain.

The maintenance and structure replacements associated with this alternative would not adversely affect the occurrence or abundance of aquatic species, including species harvested by tribal fishers.

Existing Site Improvements Alternative

Social Impacts

The Existing Site Improvements Alternative would make limited improvements at the existing site, replacing and realigning existing ferry facilities such as the ferry slip and trestle. Congestion and vehicle/pedestrian conflicts at the Front Street/SR 525 intersection would continue to impair the integration of the Mukilteo waterfront with the surrounding community.

This alternative would remove the existing Port of Everett fishing pier and seasonal day moorage, and displace Ivar’s restaurant, and art-related businesses at Park Avenue and First Street. The displacement of these resources would further reduce the limited commercial activities that help draw people to the waterfront area for reasons other than the ferry. The fishing pier is used extensively by the local community and is one of a limited number of shoreline recreational fishing opportunities open to the public in the area. Two potential replacement locations have been identified; see Figure 2-3 in Chapter 2 Alternatives.

This alternative would slightly increase the walk from the ferry to buses relative to the No-Build Alternative, but the improved bus transit center would offer more amenities (shelter, route information, benches) for passengers, and it is closer to the commuter rail Mukilteo Station. Because of the extension of First Street and the new intersection at First Street and SR 525, bus service would improve between the Mukilteo waterfront and nearby social resources. The proximity of the new transit center and the commuter rail station would improve bus-rail connections for rail users in the community.
This alternative, with overhead loading included, would also help reduce delays in the ferry system operations, benefiting all populations.

**Impacts on Parks and Recreational Resources**

The Existing Site Improvements Alternative would remove the Port of Everett’s public fishing pier and seasonal day moorage, which is a recreational resource used by the community and the public. If not replaced prior to its removal, the loss of the pier would be an impact on a recreational resource for the community because it is one of a limited set of shoreline recreational fishing opportunities available to the public in the area.

As discussed for the No-Build Alternative, congestion on the waterfront would continue to impair access to Mukilteo Lighthouse Park and Mukilteo Community Beach.

**Environmental Justice Considerations**

There are few effects that would potentially impact minority or low-income populations disproportionately. Some displaced employees from Ivar’s restaurant may be from low-income or minority groups. These employees could be retained if Ivar’s were relocated to a location in the area suitable for its business and if the restaurant’s operations can transition without a long period of disruption. Otherwise, these individuals could lose their jobs permanently.

The existing fishing pier and day moorage would be removed. Low-income or minority people who rely on fishing as a food source would be affected if no replacement facility is provided before removal. A user survey conducted by WSDOT in October 2011 found that minority and low-income people use the pier, although the number of users fluctuates throughout the year.

As discussed in *Section 4.12 Ecosystems*, the Existing Site Improvements Alternative would not adversely affect the occurrence or abundance of aquatic species, including species that are harvested by tribal fishers.

As discussed in *Section 4.6 Cultural Resources*, the project’s construction would likely impact archaeological resources, many of which are of importance to Native Americans.

FTA and WSDOT would continue coordination and government-to-government consultations with affected tribes to resolve any issues associated with treaty rights. FTA would also continue Section 106 consultations to address adverse effects to cultural resources of significance to the tribes.
Elliot Point 1 Alternative

Social Impacts

This alternative would convert a portion of the Mukilteo Tank Farm to a multimodal transportation use with public shoreline access features, and it would remove the existing ferry terminal facilities. This alternative would improve access to the waterfront and integrate the Mukilteo downtown area with the waterfront.

As discussed below, a public access area near the Mount Baker Terminal would be displaced.

The distance between the ferry and local bus service at the new transit center is a short walk (0.15 mile). However, the distance from Mukilteo Station to the ferry terminal may be longer than some people can walk (0.41 mile).

This alternative would extend First Street and provide a new signalized intersection at SR 525 and First Street. First Street would feature sidewalks and bicycle lanes; at the driveway for the ferry terminal, a walkway would continue outside the holding area to a shoreline promenade to the west of the ferry dock. As with the Existing Site Improvements Alternative, by improving bus circulation, this alternative would improve bus service between the waterfront and nearby social resources. By improving bus-rail connections, this alternative would benefit rail users in the community.

This alternative would increase areas available to queue vehicles waiting to reach the terminal and would provide adjacent bus facilities. As discussed in Chapter 3 Transportation, the queue would not reach SR 525. The additional capacity would reduce traffic congestion, cut-through traffic, blocked driveways, and other impacts in the adjacent neighborhoods compared to the No-Build Alternative. The new roadway would provide access to the public shoreline area near the Mount Baker Terminal. Community access to Mukilteo Station would remain generally the same as it is today.

Impacts on Parks and Recreational Resources

The Elliot Point 1 Alternative would occupy some of the upland area at the eastern end of the Mukilteo Tank Farm currently used for informal access to the shoreline and dedicated for permanent public access in the future. About 0.5 acre of the public access area, including parking, would be displaced and relocated to the west. The site features parking, a pathway, and benches.

The permit approved for the Mount Baker Terminal requires the Port of Everett to provide access to the area, pending completion of planning for the Mukilteo Multimodal Project. The current design for the Elliot Point 1 Alternative would provide access, but parking for the shoreline area would be relocated to the west, which would be less convenient or accessible, particularly for people with disabilities. However, the alternative would extend the shoreline areas available to the public and
open a larger section of the shoreline to public access than is currently available by providing a shoreline promenade to the west and east of the new ferry terminal.

The demolition of the Tank Farm Pier would remove a known dive site, and the operation of the ferry in the area would restrict other fishing or diving activities in the immediate vicinity. However, the removal of the existing ferry terminal would allow for more opportunities for public shoreline access in the central waterfront area.

The transit center would include layover facilities for transit, which would reduce the need for buses to use Mukilteo Lighthouse Park for layover parking. Similarly, the removal of the existing ferry terminal and its related traffic on Front Street would improve access, safety, and parking availability for the park.

**Environmental Justice Considerations**

No services specific to low-income or minority populations exist in this area. There would be no impacts on low-income housing sites, social service providers, or other environmental justice resources. As discussed in Section 4.12 Ecosystems, the Elliot Point 1 Alternative would not adversely affect the occurrence or abundance of aquatic species, including species that are harvested by tribal fishers. Some of the habitat for crabs west of the Tank Farm Pier could be removed, but it is not expected to alter the abundance of crabs that are available to fishers in the Puget Sound or in the crab management region that Point Elliot is within.

Removal of the Tank Farm Pier would open up an area that could be used for additional shoreline access as well as waters for tribal, public, or commercial fishing. Fishing activities, including fishing by tribal members, could be affected by the physical presence of the proposed new ferry terminal as well as removal of the Tank Farm Pier, which currently can provide shelter during storms and winds.

Once the existing ferry terminal is decommissioned, there would be more opportunities for fishing closer to Elliot Point, Mukilteo Lighthouse Park, and offshore areas.

Current clamming areas and ghost shrimp harvest areas would remain accessible to tribal fishers. Upon completion of the new ferry terminal, portions of the Mukilteo Tank Farm shoreline, waters around the Tank Farm Pier, and currently fenced or restricted areas would become publicly accessible. Ferry navigation and terminal security would still restrict areas around the ferry terminal. FTA would pursue government-to-government consultations with affected tribes to resolve potential issues associated with treaty rights.

Potentially beneficial permanent impacts on area fish and shellfish include improvements to water quality and sediment over the long term resulting from the removal of creosote-treated timber at the existing ferry terminal and other timber debris or structures (see Section 4.11 Water Resources).
As discussed in Section 4.6 Cultural Resources, the project’s construction could impact prehistoric archaeological resources important to Native Americans and historic archaeological resources important to Japanese-Americans. This alternative has the least overlap with the prehistoric site and has the lowest potential to impact it. FTA would continue to conduct Section 106 consultations to address adverse effects.

**Elliot Point 2 Alternative**

The social impacts of this alternative would be similar to the Elliot Point 1 Alternative. This alternative would displace one business, the glass blowing art studios, in order to develop the First Avenue extension.

This alternative would provide the shortest walk between the multimodal connections. The distance from the ferry to local bus service would be 0.08 mile, and the distance from Mukilteo Station to the ferry would be 0.19 mile.

Traffic improvements, and the related improvements for local residents, would be similar to those for the Elliot Point 1 Alternative. When the holding area is full, backups could still extend to SR 525, unlike the Elliot Point 1 Alternative. The benefits of Elliot Point 1 Alternative’s expanded vehicle capacity would not occur.

**Impacts on Parks and Recreational Resources**

Impacts on parks and recreational resources would be similar to the Elliot Point 1 Alternative, except this alternative does not affect the Mount Baker Terminal shoreline access area. The Elliot Point 2 Alternative would provide a shoreline promenade to the west and east of the new ferry terminal that would be open to the public, but it would not directly connect to the Mount Baker Terminal shoreline access area facilities. Other impacts of removing the Tank Farm Pier and the existing ferry terminal site would be similar to the Elliot Point 1 Alternative. The Port of Everett fishing pier and day moorage would remain.

**Environmental Justice Considerations**

Minority or low-income populations would not be affected differently than tourists, commuters, or residents.

As with the Elliot Point 1 Alternative, removal of the Tank Farm Pier and establishment of a new ferry terminal could alter existing tribal fishing practices, but could open new areas as a result of the removal of the existing ferry terminal. FTA will continue coordination and government-to-government consultations with affected tribes to resolve potential issues associated with treaty rights. The construction of the alternative has the potential to encounter archaeological resources, including a site of significance to Native Americans. The alternative’s design includes fill to avoid encountering the resource, and limits excavations. FTA would continue Section 106 consultations to address any adverse effects.
4.5.4 Construction Impacts

This section addresses the temporary impacts that may result from the construction of new facilities, hauling of materials, and the staging of major construction activities. Both standard practices and context-specific measures will be incorporated into the project to reduce noise, light and glare, and air quality impacts during construction as well as truck traffic impacts on the community, as discussed in more detail in Sections 4.3 Noise and Vibration, 4.4 Visual Quality, 4.7 Air Quality, and Chapter 3 Transportation. Construction activities are not expected to have disproportionately high and adverse impacts on low income and minority populations.

No-Build Alternative

Construction would take place only as facilities require replacement. Construction would have temporary impacts on adjacent uses from noise and temporary disruption of traffic circulation. As described in Chapter 3 Transportation, this would temporarily alter access and increase delays to businesses and other uses along the waterfront, but access is expected to be maintained.

The construction would fully close the facility for a 4- to 9-month period. Full closure would have the greatest transportation impact on ferry users primarily because the ferry route would be redirected to Edmonds. Waterfront traffic circulation would improve without ferry operation but patronage at some businesses could decline because area activity levels would decrease. Construction activities conducted while the terminal is in operation would result in some disruptions to ferry operations and traffic patterns. Nearby residents would be subject to increased dust, dirt, traffic, visual impacts, and other inconveniences during the construction period. As detailed in Section 4.3 Noise and Vibration, higher noise levels would occur during construction, but mitigation measures are identified to avoid adverse impacts to sensitive receptors such as the hotel and residences near the existing terminal.

The No-Build Alternative would result in a temporary closure of the Port of Everett fishing pier. A nearby public pier beside the Silver Cloud Inn could be used instead. Users of Mukilteo Lighthouse Park would also experience higher noise levels during construction.

Section 4.12 Ecosystems contains a more detailed discussion of potential impacts on fishing. Whenever in-water work is conducted, fish distribution or abundance may be temporarily affected, which may disrupt typical tribal and non-tribal fishing activities. Fishing may be affected by noise, vibration, construction activities, and turbidity. The presence of barges and other construction vessels and equipment could also interfere with the use of private boats in the vicinity for fishing or other activities.
Existing Site Improvements Alternative

Construction and demolition activities would be staged to minimize disruptions to existing ferry operations and traffic patterns. The construction of a replacement facility on and adjacent to the existing ferry terminal site would complicate access to waterfront area properties, as well as public waterfront areas nearby. As described in Chapter 2 Alternatives, construction would close the terminal facility for several months, which is longer than other Build alternatives but shorter than with the No-Build Alternative.

Nearby residents would be subjected to noise, dust, dirt, traffic, visual impacts, and other disruptions during the construction period at levels that are greater than those described for the No-Build Alternative. The construction period would not extend for as long a period as that of the No-Build Alternative.

The closure of the public fishing pier and seasonal day moorage during construction of the Existing Site Improvements Alternative would remove one of a limited number of shoreline recreational fishing locations open to the public in the area. If construction occurs during the offseason, day moorage would not be affected. WSDOT has identified two options for replacing the facility. If either option or a temporary replacement can be developed before the current facility is removed, impacts on recreational use could be reduced. This would also help avoid impacts to low-income or minority individuals who rely on fishing as a food source. Other recreational properties would remain open to the public during construction and demolition. Construction could affect access to and from Mukilteo Lighthouse Park and the public pier beside the Silver Cloud Inn. The access changes would include detours, delays, and alternative pathways for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Similar to the No-Build Alternative, potential impacts on fishing may result from in-water work.

Elliot Point 1 Alternative

Because construction of Elliot Point 1 would take place on the Mukilteo Tank Farm, operation of the existing ferry terminal would continue until construction is complete. Impacts due to the removal of the existing ferry terminal facilities, such as demolition noise, dust, and the presence of haul trucks, would occur for 1 to 2 months after the new ferry terminal is in place and operating. The other impacts of removing the existing site facility would be similar to those discussed for the Existing Site Improvements Alternative, except there would not be a need to reroute ferry traffic to Edmonds.

For most other construction activities, only minor noise, vibration, and visual impacts would be expected because the Mukilteo Tank Farm would not be open to the public and it is not near homes or businesses.
Construction traffic would temporarily impact the downtown street system and cause delays on local streets and SR 525.

The public shoreline access area developed as part of the Mount Baker Terminal is not yet open to the public and so construction impacts are not anticipated. The Elliot Point 1 Alternative would not directly affect any other recreational facilities. First Street is expected to be completed as part of the initial phase of construction, which would move construction traffic away from the city waterfront and Front Street and would help minimize impacts to Mukilteo Lighthouse Park and the fishing pier.

Potential impacts on recreational fishing and crabbing may result from in-water work. In-water work may temporarily affect fish distribution or abundance, which would in turn disrupt typical tribal and non-tribal fishing activities. A large population of crabs is present in the Tank Farm Pier area. Individual crabs could be injured or killed during pile removal or placement, but overall impacts on crabs would not be substantial (see Section 4.12 Ecosystems), and impacts on the community, including tribes, are not expected to occur.

The removal of the existing terminal could require a temporary closure of the Port of Everett’s fishing pier and seasonal day moorage.

**Elliot Point 2 Alternative**

Construction impacts on community cohesion and social resources or interactions would be low and primarily related to construction traffic, similar to those for the Elliot Point 1 Alternative. Only minor noise, vibration, and visual impacts would be expected because the Mukilteo Tank Farm would not be open to the public and it is not near homes or businesses.

Construction impacts on parks and recreation would be similar to those for the Elliot Point 1 Alternative and could include temporary closure of the Port of Everett’s fishing pier and seasonal day moorage.

**4.5.5 Indirect and Secondary Impacts**

Major transportation projects can have community impacts that are removed in time or space from the project area, such as job creation, gentrification, and redevelopment.

**No-Build Alternative**

Impacts that could be considered indirect have been already identified as part of the long-term consequences of the No-Build Alternative. No additional indirect impacts are anticipated.
Existing Site Improvements Alternative

As with the No-Build Alternative, any indirect impacts on the social environment and community groups are discussed as long-term environmental impacts.

Elliot Point 1 Alternative

This alternative would indirectly benefit community cohesion by providing the opportunity for redevelopment of the waterfront area, and helping the City of Mukilteo achieve its planned visions for downtown and Mukilteo Lighthouse Park. This alternative would remove the existing ferry terminal features and operations that are in the center of the downtown waterfront area, and adjacent to the Mukilteo Lighthouse Park. The nearby Buzz Inn property, which is currently leased by WSDOT for holding lanes, would be available for redevelopment by the owner.

Elliot Point 2 Alternative

The indirect impacts of the Elliot Point 2 Alternative would be similar to those for Elliot Point 1.

4.5.6 Cumulative Impacts

No-Build Alternative

This alternative would not affect the Mukilteo Tank Farm. The entire 18.85-acre parcel proposed for transfer to the Port of Everett would be available for development. The City of Mukilteo anticipates the land would be redeveloped as a recreational resource. The redevelopment of the Mukilteo Tank Farm would likely have some positive impacts on the City of Mukilteo and the immediate surrounding neighborhood. This redevelopment would improve local recreation options such as more opportunities for shoreline access, as well as a potential City proposal to relocate a boat launch currently at Mukilteo Lighthouse Park. However, because the No-Build Alternative would not improve the transportation infrastructure in the vicinity of the ferry terminal, lack of access and continued traffic congestion would hinder or limit redevelopment of the Mukilteo Tank Farm.

Pending a land transfer from the U.S. Air Force, the NOAA Mukilteo Research Station is expected to be redeveloped and expanded to include additional public education and research facilities. Plans are still in early stages, but these activities could help enhance the vitality of the waterfront area.

WSDOT has indicated that it does not have plans to fund or build any improvements to SR 525 that would increase its capacity before 2030. However, due to the forecasted increase in traffic volumes on SR 525 from ferry service demand, increased ridership at the Mukilteo Station, development of the remaining Mukilteo Tank Farm, and increases in general traffic, the combined contributions from those traffic generators may accelerate the need for several road improvements that could
ease congestion and improve safety. If they occur, these improvements would improve the public’s ability to access the area’s parks and recreational resources, as well as social resources, businesses, and residences.

**Existing Site Improvements Alternative**

The cumulative impacts of the Existing Site Improvements Alternative and the related redevelopment of the Mukilteo Tank Farm would be similar to those reported for the No-Build Alternative above.

**Elliot Point 1 Alternative**

Relocation of the ferry terminal would result in WSDOT vacating the existing ferry terminal site, potentially allowing a consolidated area of about 3 acres for redevelopment. On the Mukilteo Tank Farm, approximately 5 acres would remain available for development, and could include community facilities, depending on proposals to be developed by the Port of Everett or others, and would be subject to permitting and approvals. The City of Mukilteo has expressed an interest in relocating the boat launch ramp currently at Mukilteo Lighthouse Park to the Mukilteo Tank Farm. Removing the boat launch from Mukilteo Lighthouse Park would help improve the pedestrian and shoreline access functions called for in the park’s master plan, and reduce areas needed for parking and boat loading and unloading. This alternative would construct roadways that improve local circulation and access in the waterfront area, which would support the proposed boat launch relocation.

The alternative’s improvements to local circulation and access in the waterfront area and to the Mukilteo Tank Farm could support plans for the NOAA Mukilteo Research Station redevelopment, which may be expanded to include additional public education and research facilities that would be open to the community and could help support revitalization of the central waterfront.

**Elliot Point 2 Alternative**

The extension of First Avenue would not extend to Mount Baker Terminal or the shoreline access area as part of the project, but it would provide an opportunity for the Port of Everett or others to complete a roadway to the shoreline access area, or to further develop the public shoreline area, consistent with the City of Mukilteo and City of Everett Shoreline Master Plans. As with the Elliot Point 1 Alternative, the alternative’s improvements to local circulation and access could support plans for the NOAA Mukilteo Research Station to be expanded to include additional public education and research facilities.
4.5.7 Mitigation Measures

The Mukilteo Multimodal Project is expected to have relatively minor long-term social impacts. Consequently, little mitigation would be required for impacts to social resources, nearby residents, or environmental justice populations.

Mitigation for Long-Term Impacts

As described in Section 4.2 Land Use and Economics, property owners of parcels to be acquired would be compensated, and residents and business owners who would be displaced as a result of the proposed property acquisitions would receive relocation assistance in accordance with state and federal law.

Mitigation for Impacts on Parks and Recreational Resources

For the Existing Site Improvements Alternative, WSDOT would replace the Port of Everett’s fishing pier and seasonal day moorage. WSDOT would coordinate with the Port and the City of Mukilteo to replace the pier at another location. If feasible, the pier would be replaced prior to the removal of the existing pier.

Although a portion of the public shoreline access area parking at the Mount Baker Terminal would be occupied as part of the Elliot Point 1 Alternative, the alternative would provide replacement parking and a promenade that would connect to the site. It also would provide access improvements needed to open the site to the public. As discussed in Chapter 5 Section 4(f), a modified design to maintain parking and direct access to the shoreline access area could mitigate the impact.

Environmental Justice Considerations

Interference with access to tribal fisheries is the only foreseeable environmental justice impact. FTA would pursue government-to-government consultations with affected tribes to resolve potential issues associated with treaty rights.

As described in Section 4.6 Cultural Resources and in the Cultural Resources Discipline Report, mitigation for adverse impacts will be developed in consultation with interested tribes and parties, and the State Historic Preservation Officer. Potential measures are discussed in Section 4.6 Cultural Resources.

Mitigation for Construction Impacts

A project communication and public awareness program would describe the changes occurring on the Mukilteo waterfront and inform the public that businesses there are open and accessible during construction. WSDOT, the Port of Everett, Sound Transit, and the City of Mukilteo would coordinate if multiple projects in the waterfront area are implemented concurrently.

During construction, reduced parking along Front Street would negatively affect businesses on the waterfront by impeding customer and employee access. Potential
mitigation measures to address construction impacts on businesses, including closure of the terminal, are identified in Section 4.2 Land Use and Economics.

For the No-Build Alternative, the Port of Everett fishing pier would be closed temporarily during construction of the new replacement facilities at the existing terminal. The temporary closure of the pier could be partially mitigated by encouraging the use of the nearby public pier adjacent to the Silver Cloud Inn and by public information and signage identifying other available locations for fishing.

Public notification of proposed construction activities, including timing of construction, would be provided to all local service providers and schools within the immediate vicinity of the project site.

Recycling of demolition debris on site has been incorporated into construction practices to reduce the amount of material hauled off site to regional facilities and to reduce truck traffic on roadways. A construction traffic control plan would be developed prior to construction to minimize disruptions to traffic patterns during construction, as described in Chapter 3 Transportation.

Mitigation measures for traffic, noise, and visual impacts are discussed in Chapter 3 Transportation and Sections 4.3 Noise and Vibration and 4.4 Visual Quality, respectively.

4.5.8 Initial Environmental Justice Conclusions

The preceding sections evaluated the potential for direct or indirect social impacts in general. This section specifically assesses the likelihood that one or more of the alternatives may result in disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations.

Question 1: Does the project affect a resource that is especially important to a minority or low-income population?

The Mukilteo Multimodal Project alternatives would not displace housing, social service providers, unique ethnic establishments, or other resources that are particularly important to low-income and minority populations. The project alternatives would potentially displace or temporarily close a fishing pier or the Tank Farm Pier. The fishing pier is open to the public, and although the areas around the Tank Farm Pier are not open to public access, boaters can access the surrounding waters. In scoping comments provided in 2010, the Tulalip Tribes stated that they continue to use the Mukilteo shoreline to harvest salmon, shrimp, and crabs; however, effects on these natural resources are not anticipated and are not likely to change the availability or abundance of marine species. This in turn would not be likely to result in changes to harvests. Several key elements, such as the removal of the Tank Farm Pier, are expected to provide environmental benefits due to the removal of over-water structures and potential sources of contamination.
**Question 2:** Would the project result in high and adverse impacts that would be predominantly borne by a minority or low-income population?

No data suggest that the displacements, construction impacts, or other impacts would be predominantly borne by minority or low-income populations.

**Question 3:** Would the project result in high and adverse impacts that would be suffered by a minority or low-income population that would be appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the impact that would be suffered by the non-minority and/or non-low-income population?

No data suggest the displacements, construction impacts, or other impacts would be appreciably more severe for minority or low-income populations, particularly if a replacement for a public fishing pier is available before it is closed or replaced.

**Question 4:** Does the project propose mitigation and/or enhancement measures?

Yes. Through the Section 106 process and ongoing EIS coordination among WSDOT, FTA, cooperating and participating agencies, and tribal governments, the project is working closely with consulting tribes on ecosystems and natural resources, archaeological resources, and other issues of interest to Native Americans. Design refinements and mitigations are being developed through consultations with the consulting tribes and others to address impacts on resources important to Native Americans. Any potential impacts to tribal treaty rights would be addressed through government-to-government agreements. With mitigation, the project does not anticipate severe impacts remaining in any area of the environment.

**Question 5:** Are there project benefits that would accrue to minority or low-income populations at similar or greater levels than the general population?

As described above, the Elliot Point 1 and Elliot Point 2 alternatives would benefit enhanced public shoreline access and the aquatic environment through the removal of the Tank Farm Pier over-water structures and piles that are potential sources of contamination. The Elliot Point 1 Alternative also provides improved shoreline access and open space areas, including the daylighting of Japanese Creek.

Also, the jobs created to construct the new terminal facilities would be available for low-income and minority populations, although outreach, training, and other incentives would likely increase the potential for low-income or minority individuals to obtain these jobs. Lastly, all Build alternatives would provide increased transit capacity and reliability, as well as improved safety conditions for motorists, bicyclists, and pedestrians accessing the ferry and the waterfront. The improvements in transit and non-motorized access would benefit low-income individuals at the same or higher levels as the general population, because these modes are lower in cost than vehicular use.
Conclusion: Potential interference with tribal fisheries is the only foreseeable environmental justice impact. WSDOT and FTA anticipate continuing state and federal government-to-government consultation with affected tribes.

4.6 Cultural Resources

This section discusses the project’s potential effects on cultural resources. This analysis was conducted in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and its implementing regulations with FTA as the lead federal agency.

4.6.1 Overview of Analysis and Regulatory Context

The NHPA requires federal agencies, in this case FTA, to identify and assess the effects of federally assisted undertakings on historic properties and to consult with others to find acceptable ways to avoid or mitigate adverse effects. Properties protected under Section 106 of the NHPA are those that are listed in or are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Eligible properties generally must be at least 50 years old, possess integrity, and meet at least one of four criteria of significance. Historic properties may include archaeological sites, buildings, structures, districts, or objects.

In consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), at the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), FTA determined the project Area of Potential Effects (APE) for archaeological resources and historic buildings and structures. The APE encompasses an area beginning west of SR 525 at Elliot Point (current name for the geographic area where the Point Elliott Treaty was signed) and extending 0.75 mile east along the shoreline, well beyond the end of the Mukilteo Tank Farm (Figure 4.6-1). The BNSF railroad tracks generally mark the southern boundary of the APE. Although the project’s direct, physical impacts would be limited to a smaller area, the APE was drawn large to accommodate potential indirect impacts, such as visual and auditory changes and vibration, on cultural resources.

According to the NHPA implementing regulations, certain people or groups are automatically entitled to consulting party status, including appropriate federally recognized Native American tribes (36 CFR 800.2). WSDOT and FTA are consulting with the federally recognized Tulalip Tribes, Suquamish Tribe, Swinomish Tribe, Muckleshoot Tribe, Samish Tribe, Sauk-Suiattle Tribe, Snoqualmie Tribe, Stillaguamish Tribe, Upper Skagit Tribe, and the Lummi Nation. FTA and WSDOT have also consulted with the following interested parties: the Japanese Cultural and Community Center and the non-federally recognized Duwamish Tribe and Snohomish Tribe.
Figure 4.6-1. Historic and Cultural Resources Area of Potential Effects
4.6.2 Affected Environment

The project has identified five resources that are listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP.

- Mukilteo Shoreline Site, an archaeological site with stratified pre-contact shell midden deposits
- Point Elliott Treaty Site where the 1855 treaty between the U.S. government and Puget Sound Native American tribes was signed
- Old Mukilteo Townsite, an archaeological site with buried remnants of the early Mukilteo business district
- Japanese Gulch Site, with buried deposits associated with early twentieth century Japanese mill workers
- Mukilteo Light Station, a NRHP-listed early twentieth century lighthouse complex

Nine other properties were also assessed and FTA’s determined they are not eligible for NRHP listing, including the buildings and structures on the property now owned by the U.S. Air Force, as well as the Ivar’s restaurant building, and the existing Mukilteo ferry terminal. Resources found not to be eligible for the NRHP are not subject to the NHPA and are not discussed in this section. The Cultural Resources Discipline Report (see Supporting Technical Reports in the Table of Contents for location) includes details on those resources.

4.6.3 Historic Background

The Mukilteo vicinity, with a Salish name meaning “a good place to camp” or “goose neck,” was well known historically as a gathering place for local Native American people. The importance of the area to Native American groups is reflected in its selection as the site for the signing of the Point Elliott Treaty in 1855. Euroamerican settlement of the site vicinity began soon after signing of the treaty, with J.D. Fowler and Morris Frost filing the first land claims. By 1858, Fowler and Frost had established a post for trading with local Native American residents; a store, saloon, hotel, and a post office soon followed (Figure 4.6-2).

In 1903, the Mukilteo Lumber Company established a mill on the Mukilteo waterfront, which was acquired in 1909 by the Crown Lumber Company. This mill, which employed both Euroamerican and Japanese workers, operated until 1930. The last of its buildings was destroyed by fire in 1938. The millsite was subsequently
acquired by the U.S. Army and an ammunition shipping facility was built in the early 1940s. Ownership of this facility was transferred to the U.S. Air Force in 1951 for construction of a fuel supply depot and tank farm.

Figure 4.6-2. Photo Showing Indians, Canoes, Early Settlers, and J.D. Fowler with his Oxen at Mukilteo

The specific cultural resources within the project area are discussed below. Five of these properties have been determined eligible for the NRHP because they meet one or more of four National Park Service (NPS) criteria of significance:

A. The property is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.

B. The property is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

C. The property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction.

D. The property has yielded, or is likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The five eligible resources are described in detail below:
Mukilteo Shoreline Site

The Mukilteo Shoreline Site (designated 45SN393 by DAHP) was identified in 2005 during initial cultural resource studies for the Mukilteo Ferry Terminal Project. The site’s original landforms have been obscured by pavement and buildings or buried beneath fill. The north-facing shoreline of Elliot Point has been at least occasionally occupied by Native Americans for approximately 1,000 years. The Mukilteo Shoreline Site contains the remnants of this occupation, including a thick, horizontally extensive shell midden over 1,500 feet (0.3 mile) in length. The midden is characterized by intact, bedded layers of crushed shell, charcoal, charcoal-stained sediments, and fire-modified rock. The alkaline depositional environment of the shell midden has created ideal preservation conditions for bone, in the form of both unmodified animal remains and fragments of mammal bone and beaver teeth modified into tools. Within the shell midden layers are the remains of animals that were hunted, fished, and gathered by the Native occupants of the site, the plants that they are, and the wood that they used for fuel and implements. Stone tools and tool-making debris reflect the kinds of stone implements they used, how they used them, and the various ways in which the tools were made.

The archaeological investigation established preliminary boundaries and content for the Mukilteo Shoreline Site. Geoarchaeological tests helped investigators deduce the physical framework of the site, establish the depositional context for the shell midden, and construct a preliminary landform history.

Testing suggests that the Mukilteo Shoreline Site was an important year-round occupation that played a prominent role in the settlement systems of Native American communities. Elliot Point would have been a valuable place not only for the year-round availability of certain subsistence resources, but also as a strategic landform near the intersection of south Puget Sound, the protected tidewaters east of Whidbey Island, the entrance to Hood Canal, and the exit to the Strait of Juan de Fuca through Admiralty Inlet. The site is also near the mouth of the Snohomish River, which provides a transportation route east to the foothills, the Cascade crest, and beyond. This site has been determined eligible by the U.S. Air Force under NRHP Criterion D, for the property’s potential to provide information important in understanding history or prehistory.

Point Elliott Treaty Site

The Point Elliott Treaty Site (designated 45SN108 by DAHP) is the location where the 1855 treaty between the U.S. government and the Native American tribes of northern Puget Sound was signed. The Treaty caused extreme changes for Native American people by divesting them of their lands and establishing the reservation system. At the same time, the Treaty is a legal document that establishes the sovereignty of independent tribal governments, and it is a symbol of survival. Work associated with the Point Elliott Treaty Site included archival research, coordination with the tribes, and
oral history interviews with tribal informants. Although exact locations where 1855 Point Elliott Treaty events occurred remain uncertain, the size of the Treaty gathering, nature of the landform, and other factors suggest that the site boundary should encompass the entire original geography for the point, which ended east of where the Tank Farm Pier is today or just past Japanese Gulch.

FTA has determined the Point Elliott Treaty Site is eligible for listing as a historic site in the NRHP under Criterion A for its association with the history of Indian/white relations, and under Criterion B for its association with prominent political leaders of the day, Governor Isaac Stevens, and a number of Indian leaders including Seattle, Patkanim, Goliah, and Chowitshoot. DAHP has also suggested the site is eligible as an archaeological site under Criterion D for its potential to provide information important in understanding history and prehistory.

**Old Mukilteo Townsite**

Archaeological investigations associated with the Mount Baker Terminal in 2006 provided physical evidence of the community’s history in the form of buried historical archaeological sites. The Old Mukilteo Townsite (designated 45SN404 by DAHP) studies offer unique insights into the town’s early community structure, commercial systems, demographics, and lifeways, while recovery of a few clay tobacco pipe fragments, a bead, and a stone pendant may be evidence of Mukilteo’s trading post period. Observed historical materials also included deteriorated lumber, burned brick, and historical artifacts, and remains identified through historical research as the Crown Lumber Company store and butcher shop. This site has previously been determined eligible by the U.S. Air Force under Criterion D, for the property’s potential to provide information important in understanding history, and under Criterion A for its association with Mukilteo’s early development.

**Japanese Gulch Site**

The Japanese Gulch Site (designated as 45SN398 by DAHP) was also identified in 2006. It is evidence of early twentieth century Japanese mill workers who resided in the racially segregated Mukilteo Japanese Gulch settlement.

The early city directories did not include the Japanese workers, who were evidently employed by the Mukilteo Lumber Company from the beginning of its operation. Newspaper accounts indicate that the mill had hired at least 30 laborers of Japanese ancestry to work in the yard by February of 1904, and reported that other Japanese crews were planned. Caucasian workers initially threatened to leave the company if the Japanese workers were not dismissed, but their protest had little effect. The numbers of Japanese employed at Mukilteo Lumber Company continued to rise and later historical accounts suggest that the number had increased to 150 by 1905.

This site has previously been determined eligible by the U.S. Air Force under Criterion D, for the property’s potential to provide information important in
understanding history, and under Criterion A for its association with the Japanese community that settled there.

**Mukilteo Light Station**

This lighthouse complex, consisting of 11 buildings and structures, is listed in the NRHP. The lighthouse, two keepers’ residences, and a coal storage building were constructed in 1906. A two-bay garage, concrete fence posts, sidewalks, a seawall, ladder storage, water basin, and triangle alarm were added before 1935 and are contributing elements.

The Mukilteo Light Station is listed as being historically significant under Criterion A for its association with the maritime history of Puget Sound. It is also significant under Criterion C as a well-preserved complex of buildings and structures typical of those produced by the federal Light House Board in the Pacific Northwest during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

**4.6.4 Adverse Effects**

For historic properties, adverse effects occur when an undertaking may alter, directly or indirectly, any of the characteristics that qualify the property for inclusion on the NRHP in a manner that would diminish the integrity of the property's location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, or association. Examples of adverse effects include physical destruction or damage; restoration, rehabilitation, repair, or other alteration inconsistent with the Secretary’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties; relocation of a property from its historic location; change in the character of a property’s use or physical features of the setting; introduction of visual, atmospheric, or audible elements that diminish the property’s integrity; neglect that causes deterioration; and transfer, lease, or sale of property out of federal ownership or control without adequate preservation controls.

Table 4.6-1 provides a summary of potential adverse effects. Construction of the Mukilteo Multimodal Project, under any alternative, would not change the characteristics that qualify the Point Elliott Treaty Site or the Mukilteo Light Station for the NRHP. The Treaty site’s location, association, and setting would remain unchanged, while the lighthouse’s location, association, setting, design, materials, and workmanship would remain unaltered. Therefore, FTA has determined there would be no adverse effects on either of these resources. While the construction of the multimodal terminal within the Treaty site’s boundaries would not affect the characteristics that make the site historic, FTA and WSDOT recognize the site holds great historic significance. They are, therefore, inviting tribes to participate in a context-sensitive design process and will continue to conduct government-to-government consultations with interested tribes to define satisfactory means of recognizing the site’s cultural significance; these measures would apply under any of the alternatives.