

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
10	2	appb	ESA compliance, documentation, and consultation requirements should be noted in a separate line.	1	Powell	KF	ESA has not been included in this document since that process is being conducted along with the current EIS evaluation and should be complete prior to these permits.
12	2	appb	Line entitled "Feeder Clearance Approval" should be two lines, as below;	1	Powell/ Cunningham	KF	Change will be made.
62	10	Table 1	This Draft Strategy mentions use of a Project Construction Permit similar to the permits issued by SDOT on the Light Rail project. Light Rail PCPs were issued in lieu of several DPD issued permits including grading permits, Stormwater and Drainage Control Review, some building permits, side sewer permits, and some over the counter permits. Why obtain these permits conventionally if a similar approach is applicable to AWVSRP?	1	Baggs	SG	Noted will revise text. The current strategy is for the project to obtain a number of permits typically obtained by the contractor (i.e. Grading permits, noise variance) due to the risk of appeal and potential schedule slippages associated with these appeals. The project is helping set in motion, streamlined review processes so that contracting permitting efforts can move forward in a coordinated fashion.
63	11		DPD's stormwater reviews and approvals are delegated to DPD from SPU. SPU could cover this review and approval through their of the AWV project design with concurrence from SPU.	1	Baggs	SG	Noted
84	12	2	Section 2.2 is a rewrite of a lot of the same information that is shown in Table 1. Is there anyway to combine the two?	1	Boch	KF	Section 2.2 will be revised.
85	12	8	Substitute "discussions" for "negotiations"	1	Kling	KF	OK
86	12	9	The numbering that is discussed here is not shown on the next two pages.	1	Boch	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering
87	12	10	Where are "number in parentheses?" There are no items marked 1 thru 5.	1	Tracy	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering
97	13	8	It would be more clear if this line were a heading and the information in the following lines were placed in a table. Clarify that this is for permits obtained by the project.	1	Tracy	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
100	13	1 & 2	There are no items marked 1 thru 5.	1	Tracy	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering
109	14	10	Why is the design team tasked with getting this approval?? They are not geared up for this type of work.	1	Stenberg	KF	This approval is based on stormwater design. The stormwater and drainage approval will be included as an issue addressed in the City's permits (not a stand-alone approval). Designers will not be preparing applications or taking the lead in permitting, but will take the lead in technical discussions needed to obtain the approval and in designing accordingly. Footnote will be revised to clarify.
117	15		WSDOT and the City should consider "lining up" construction permits, but require the contractor to actually obtain the construction permits.	1	Baggs	SG	The current strategy is for the project to obtain a number of permits typically obtained by the contractor (i.e. Grading permits, noise variance) due to the risk of appeal and potential schedule slippages associated with these appeals. The project is helping set in motion, streamlined review processes so that contracting permitting efforts can move forward in a coordinated fashion.
150	16	20 through 28	This section creates some confusion for me, and would probably create more for someone who doesn't understand the IPT. I think the intent is to say that the Project Permit Team is made up of the Permit Strategy Team and the Permit Core Team (elsewhere mis-named Project Core Team) and members of the IPT, including Managers of other teams, working in a matrix organization. Whether it means this or something else, I think it needs to be clarified.	1	Kling	SG	Will provide clarification in the text.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
160	17	2 sec 3.1.1	More specificity is needed on the role of the permit strategy team (see comment on p43 below). Roles should include: review of project-wide permit applications; review of applications and permit conditions/mitigation related to members' Department; observe and track permit forum activities. It would be fair to also include a statement holding Strategy Team members accountable to schedule and communication protocols.	1	Powell	SG	Will add language after discussion with Permit Strategy Team on future roles and responsibilities
162	18	fig 1	Need to sync up Figure 1 with Appendix C	1	Powell	KF	Will review and revise as needed.
164	19		Should SPU (which I believe will have some permitting authority) and perhaps other City permitting agencies be added to the Permit Forum?	1	Kling	SG	Yes - this figure is not correct and will be revised.
171	19	31 to end	I think this understates what the IPT is. The IPT is responsible for delivering this phase of the project--perhaps the whole project. An organization chart showing the IPT and the primary teams, including the subteams of the Environmental team would be very useful to understand these sections.	1	Kling	SG	Will provide clarification in the text.
177	20	17	Substitute "enable" for "ensure."	1	Kling	KF	Paragraph will be revised.
184	20	1 to 9	I think the key here is that personnel from the other teams that are part of the IPT will provide support as part of a "matrix" system to the Permit Team to enable timely submittal of all permit applications and to assure that they are complete and include all the technical information those teams are responsible for. I wouldn't call them "IPT support teams." They do, in fact, support the permit effort.	1	Kling	SG	Will provide clarification in the text.
186	20	11 to 19	Regulatory agencies cannot appropriately be "partners." They must maintain an objective position.	1	Kling	KF	Intent was to refer to collaborative effort, not a formal partnership. Sentence will be revised for clarity.
187	20	15-16	Add SPU as a City Permit Forum rep.	1	Baggs	SG	Will add.
202	22	22 to 31	Explain in first sentence exactly what is meant by "dedicated" staff. Are these people who are paid by the project, but who take their direction from the agency where they work, who primarily try to coordinate work on project permits? Are there options for their roles and responsibilities? Consider replacing the word "success" in line 28 with "timely completion" and adding "which would provide for dedicated staff" after "agreements" in line 29.	1	Kling	KF	Paragraph will be rewritten.
208	22	15	there are currently no agreements with the city on permitting staff or funding - so remove the "if not already completed" part	1	Stenberg	KF	Will do.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
210	22	13-16	Defining the short-term and extended-term City permit staff scope and schedule should be part of the permit strategy.	1	Baggs	KF	That would have been preferable, but it has not yet occurred. This document may be revised in future to incorporate new processes and procedures that are agreed upon.
211	22	1 to 2	I don't think we need to modify the agency agreements - those agreements already state that WSDOT sets the priorities - so we just need to work on our end to make sure that the priorities are clear to the regulatory agencies with dedicated staff.	1	Stenberg	KF	will revise as needed.
213	22	8 sec 3.2.2	The paragraph introduces a "City Lead" for permitting, but this position is not represented in the organizational chart nor otherwise described.	1	Powell	KF	Document will be revised to correct.
232	24	34	Footnote 1: How will permit applications have sufficient final design details at this point to meet permit application requirements?	1	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Section will be modified to mention that issue.
236	24	31 and 34	We don't "obtain" permits - we apply for permits. We have a strategy for how we will apply for permits and how we will work with the regulatory agencies to permit the project. This whole section needs to be re-read for tone. Please respect the separation of the permitters and the applicants.	1	Stenberg	KF	Section will be revised as needed.
245	25	3	What "commission" is this???	1	Stenberg	KF	This is an error and will be corrected. This should be a reference to the City of Seattle Council.
248	25		This paragraph needs some rewriting. The City is working on an ordinance now to create a process designed specifically to address the permitting for this project. This needs to be rephrased to describe that accurately. The City legislative body is a Council, not a commission. The process could ultimately require Council permit approval, or could define the process well enough in ordinance that appealable administrative approval by DPD could be used instead--a faster and perhaps more appropriate process given the technical issues involved here. One scenario is that the initial land use approval would be a substantial development permit, and perhaps other accompanying MUPs; this would be followed by type I MUPs and construction non-appealable permits, which could be issued once the project demonstrates that all applicable conditions on the initial permit are met.	1	Kling	KF	Document will be revised.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
256	27		Table 2-Has risk been assessed for appeals to any of the permits listed under Project-Wide Permits?	1	Jeffrey Paul	SG	Risk from appeals has been discussed. In addition, risk from appeals has been evaluated in the State's CEVP process.
258	27	10	Disadvantage needs to be pointed out-that an appeal puts less controversial project elements at risk while appeal(s) plays out for Project-Wide permit. Have Areawide permits been considered? These would be logical groupings of contract sections that have independent utility if built that reduces the risk of Project-Wide appeals holding up the entire project.	1	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Document will be revised to clarify this disadvantage. Area-wide permits have been considered. Will consider whether/how to revised the document.
259	27	11	WSDOT and City leadership should be briefed on the exposures associated with project-wide permits.	1	Baggs	KF	WSDOT and City leadership should be briefed on all risks and exposures. Thank you.
267	27	18 to 20	Should we consider proposing a limited amendment to the code, or will new systems being put into effect resolve this problem? Not sure how to address this here. The permit expiration issue applies to all City of Seattle permits, although there is greater greater discretion for longer time periods in shoreline MUPs than other permits..	1	Kling	SG	Will investigate further.
268	27	18-20	Fines apply to working without a permit once a Street Use Permit expires. Don't confuse the application of street use mobility fees with fines associated with violations. The mobility fees always apply, even to the original street sue permit, unless waived by SDOT's Director.	1	Baggs	SG	Noted. Will review text and clarify.
272	28		Risks associated with public appeal depend on the consequences of an appeal. Some appeals impose a mandatory stay of the permit or approval being appealed, while some appeal processes give the adjudicating body the option of staying the permit or approval. This strategy document should identify the consequences of appeal for each of the permits identified for the project.	1	Baggs	KF	Yes this is true, however the thinking was that what appears to happen is that if a court did not grant a stay of the permit, the effect would be to make the appeal moot. Therefore, we have assumed that any court would grant a stay of an appeal. So regardless of whether the court has discretion, any appeal is likely to be either decided during preliminary proceedings (i.e. summary judgment) or involve a stay and longer trial process.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
276	28	6	"life of project" It seems like there are two separate concepts being mixed up here - "life of the project" meaning "for the entire construction period of 10 + years" and "life of the project" meaning "all phases of construction including utility relocation; south end interchange; tunnel; north waterfront; BST; and North Aurora"... Please clarify what is meant everywhere "life of project" is used. (it makes no sense to talk about a "life of project" permit that expires in 5 years and must be renewed.)	1	Stenberg	SG	concepts will be clarified
282	28	10 to 33	This section needs some rewriting to more accurately reflect interrelationship between Shoreline MUP, other MUPs, ordinance being proposed, and any agreement that might govern City permit processes. SDOT will be happy to work with DPD, Law, and Permit Team staff to complete this ASAP. (Note: any shoreline approval under city code would allow for an appeal; subsequent permits to an initial permit would have to be in a different category, most typically a Type 1 MUP and/or construction permit; these have no administrative appeal processes attached to them.)	1	Kling	KF to ask Joyce to provide specific language	Document will be revised.
290	29	"8-17	A better way to characterize the light rail PCP is that it was issued in lieu of other SDOT and DPD permits. They did not "batch" several street use approvals. The City issued over 200 permits to Sound Transit for light rail. The vast majority of the \$820 million in work permitted was authorized by around 20 PCPs. If anything, the SDOT-issued PCPs were the more comprehensive permits. The MUPs and electrical, demolition and select building permits were issued for discrete work.	1	Baggs	KF	The sentence will be revised.
294	29		This document treats construction permits like environmental permits. Construction permits are a more flexible vehicle at the City...SDOT in particular. This strategy document should reflect the differences. In fact, consider separate strategies for environmental versus construction permits.	1	Baggs	KF	Comment noted. Will consider.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
302	30	1 to 4	Exactly what buildings are these? Why have they not been identified specifically in the DEIS?	1	Stenberg	SG	Both the draft and supplemental draft EIS's identify buildings eligible for Seattle Landmarks designation. They don't however, distinguish between those eligible and those designated. Buildings designated as Seattle Landmarks are listed on the City's Historic Preservation - Landmarks Designation (Individual Designation) webpage. Will confirm that the reference to the buildings in question as Landmark was correct and revise if necessary. Will change the word 'classified' to 'designated' .
310	31	10 sec 3.4.1	A role for the Permit Strategy Team or key City Departmental representatives in reviewing proposed permit conditions is needed.	1	Powell	SG	Permit conditions will be designated by the permitting agency. The Permit Team's role is work with the Compliance Team to ensure that project specifications and contracts incorporate permit conditions. Perhaps a role for the Permit Strategy Team is in reviewing contract documents?
314	32	9	Why just Section 8.1? Why aren't all COS standards and related permit conditions being applied to work within the COS right-of-way and on private property?	1	Baggs	SG	Ooops. Will delete reference to Section 8.1
315	32	9	The City-issued permits will require the application of the COS standards in place at the beginning of work authorized by the permit unless otherwise specifically approved by the City. The 2005 standard may not apply for work beginning in 2010.	1	Baggs	SG	Will change the language to reflect City of Seattle specifications current at the time of application. It seems that a vesting agreement is needed. Will evaluate this as well.
316	32	10	What are appropriate BMPS? Are these BMPs that are approved by Ecology?	1	Sax	SG	Revise language to reflect that BMPs included in permits will be incorporated into contractor documents.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
317	32	13	What are typical BMPs? Are these Ecology approved BMPs? It would be helpful to provide an example of when these BMPs would not be appropriate for the proposed construction methods.	1	Sax	SG	Document will be revised to address this.
318	32	23	What are appropriate BMPs? Are these BMPs that are approved by Ecology?	1	Sax	SG	Appropriate BMPs are those BMPs which are chosen, monitored, and adjusted by a competent professional based on field conditions. Ecology approves types of BMPs, but that approval cannot take the place of good judgment by a competent professional in choosing which particular BMP is appropriate.
321	32	34	Should consider agency responsibility for contractor claims to WSDOT if environmental agencies are indeed involved in development of the construction contracts. Also advise that permit applications in addition to issued permits be included in the Construction Contract documents as the applications often have descriptions of the work which are not contained in the actual permit conditions. This can minimize the basis for a contractor claim when contractor says he assumed something different as a basis of bid.	1	Jeffrey Paul	KF	<p>Since the permit forum would not be approving the contract, we do not believe they would have any special liability in this regard. The role of the forum in developing contract language would be to confirm whether proposed language meets the intent of permit conditions and to use their expertise in thinking through how permit conditions would be implemented in the field.</p> <p>Application materials that are the basis of permits issued and which convey information that a contractor must have in order to comply with permits must certainly be included in contracts. Permit Core Team will work with Compliance Team and construction design staff to determine how best to do that. Are you suggesting a document change on this issue?</p>
331	33	21-Jan	Add language that clearly delineates the responsibility of the contractor for any contractor-initiated changes. This is important to address Claims Resolution.	1	Jeffrey Paul	KF	OK. Thank you.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
343	34	25	Question whether there would be greater continuity if there are permitting staff common to both the Permit Core Team and Environmental Compliance Team. We have found on other large projects that the closer the people preparing permits are to transitioning into the Construction phase makes for stronger compliance in construction from the outset and fuller understanding of permit conditions and commitments in the field setting. Less of a learning curve for fewer people.	1	Jeffrey Paul	SG	Compliance team members are part of the Permit Strategy Team - and were inadvertently left off Figure 1. In addition, compliance team and permit team members are part of the larger IPT - environmental group and work closely together.
354	36		The commitment file is a very important component in the project, and it should be fully explained and described, so that the reader understands that this device will enable every single commitment to be tracked throughout the life of the project so no conditions go unfulfilled.	1	Kling	KF/SG	Document will be revised to provide more detail.
359	37	4th Risk	Consider risk especially of Project-Wide approach for permits that have potential to hold up less controversial elements of project by those that are being appealed or challenged.	1	Jeffrey Paul	SG	Noted.
365	38	4th Risk	Suggest contract language like "Contractor shall be responsible for any delays and related costs in contractor-initiated changes that are not covered by project obtained permits or require modifications to such permits".	1	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Will add, thank you.
369	39	Table 3	Second Column, row three: work that can continue in the event of a work stoppage must include the construction management team - that is not an eventuality that permitting and compliance will be able to sort out on their own...	1	Stenberg	KF	Item will be revised.
373	39	General	Section 5.2: Any QA/QC plan/process to provide guidance and procedures specific for obtaining permits should be in concert with IPT QA/QC plan for the project. I suggest the final written plan to be included in the appendices of the IPT QA/QC Supplement.	1	Chu	KF	It is intended that QA/QC processes will be consistent with project protocols that are currently being developed.
377	41	19, 20	Add "conditions" after "measures."	1	Kling	KF	Line 123 was intended to include this. Item will be revised to clarify.
394	41	23 sec 7.1.2	This section also shows that key organizational work is not yet complete. Because it's so central to the strategy, it would be very helpful if evidence were presented indicating a willingness of the regulatory agencies to commit to the Permit Forum.	1	Powell	SG	Resource agencies have expressed their willingness to participate in a permit forum through the RALF process - where the idea was initiated. In addition, the project has been involved in on-going discussions with the City to provide dedicated staff. Are you recommending we add this discussion to the document?

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
434	41	22	(I'm not sure what you mean here. Do you mean to say that if the permit for a project activity expires during the work, that the mitigation needs to be monitored? Can you clarify this statement a bit to identify the timing of the activities and the triggers for compliance?)	1	McCullough	KF	Document will be revised to address. Thank you.
386	42		How will on-going life-of-the-project conditions be fulfilled? What if monitoring doesn't reach completion, but must continue?	1	Kling	KF	Clarify intent of comment over and above what is already discussed here.
387	43		Where is Environmental Compliance Monitoring in the field covered? There should be a clear description of the roles and responsibilities for: a)Environmental Lead; Environmental Monitors; Daily Reports by Monitors; Coordination with Resident Engineering Staff; and working with Contractors and REs to solve problems in the field to avoid agency enforcement actions and documenting those actions in daily reports.	1	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Additional information on compliance processes will be added.
390	43	25	I don't care for the term "permit writers" it presumes a positive decision - see previous comments on the necessary respect we must convey to the decision makers.	1	Stenberg	KF	Item will be revised.
395	43	24-31	The Permit Forum is composed of regulators who must remain completely objective: they cannot "support" the project. This is more an issue of making sure the agencies give the project appropriate priority so it is not unnecessarily delayed in permit processes.	1		SG/KF	Will revise to reflect that the purpose of the permit forum is to streamline the permit process through agency coordination and early review of documents.
396	43	3 sec 7.1.1	The section heading is unclear. Does this mean "Project Permit Team Internal Communications" or is there an "internal project team"? Also, the roles and responsibilities of the Permit Strategy Team should be identified before this "permit strategy" can be considered complete.	1	Powell	KF/SG	Section will be revised for clarity.
406	46	8	Change "The Permit Core Team will continue to work with....to assure..." to "The Permit Core Team will continue to work with all other disciplines staff of the Integrated Project Team to..."	1	Chu	KF	Item will be revised.
408	46	5&6	No mention of work arounds, which are essential in anticipating problems and taking corrective actions to support and maintain the project schedule. Experience on other large projects shows that permits are chronically on the critical path due to design or construction changes. There needs to be a well-defined process in place to have those accountable for such work arounds identified as part of this Plan. Breaking the permit schedule down into as much detail as possible for preparation, review cycles internally and by agencies, issuance dates enables corrective actions to be taken during any phase of the permit cycle.	1	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Implementation plans to be developed for project permitting will include detailed work breakdown structures and will address work-arounds. Document will be reviewed and revised where possible.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
425	48	34	Where is field presence for Environmental compliance? Do NOT rely on paper process during construction phase	1	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Bullet 1 and bullet 4. There is no intent to rely on paper processes.
426	48	34	Create/maintain continuity or permit staff from Design into Construction phases to limit learning curve for Environmental Inspectors	1	Jeffrey Paul	KF	No change.
436	1-401	DON	Should Historic Character Area (piers) be listed?	1	Althaus	KF	We are unfamiliar with the term and if this is an approval that needs to be addressed it will be added. Let's discuss.
439	3.3.2.3	32-38 etc	Include Historic Character Area description	1	Althaus	KF	We are unfamiliar with the term and if this is an approval that needs to be addressed it will be added. Let's discuss.
447	Appendix A		Additional changes will be proposed for accuracy in tracked changes mode tomorrow.	1	Kling	KF	OK
461	Fig C-1		Add Seattle Department of Planning and Development (DPD) to the Permit Strategy Team.	1	Chu	SG	Will revise. DPD has been invited to participate on this team but has not chosen to do so.
462	Figure 1		Add Seattle Department of Planning and Development (DPD) to the Permit Strategy Team.	1	Chu	SG	Will revise. DPD has been invited to participate on this team but has not chosen to do so.
470	General	Row 3	There is still some uncertainty about the reach of Master Use Permits to right-of-way outside the shorelines. This language needs some modification throughout the document.	1	Kling	SG/KF	Document will be revised.
473	general		Be aware that MUPs may have many components, and may include shoreline, grading, and other approvals that could also, under some circumstances, be obtained as separate permits. There is some danger of over-simplification.	1	Kling	KF	Comment noted.
474	i		Text conveys an impression that permit approval is almost automatic, that no critical review will be employed, that speed is more important than analysis on the part of the regulators.	1	Althaus	KF	That was not the intent. The document will be reviewed to determine if and where tone or text can be revised to eliminate misunderstandings regarding intent.
479	Table 3		Please compare this table with Appendix B for consistency. Some permits from Table 1 (e.g., Electrical Transmission Outage Request) may not be listed--or may be listed by another name in App. B	1	Kling	KF	Document will be revised for consistency.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
2	1	20	Will this report also identify who will be negotiating with the permit agencies on conditions? This will be an important part of the process.	2	Sax	SG	While the Permit Team will complete the majority of permit applications for the project, WSDOT will be the applicant and be facilitating permit discussions via the Permit Forum. SPU is facilitating discussions with Ecology on the City's operating NPDES permits. These roles and responsibilities are partially addressed in Section 3 of this document but will be expanded for clarification.
11	2	appb	Acronyms from the table should be included in the document acronym list and/or spelled out here.	2	Powell	KF	This will be addressed for the entire document - all acronyms will be spelled out.
16	4	16	Sentence needs to be re-written to be more specific about each item in the list, since they are so different. Examples might be better.	2	Kling	KF	Agree - item will be rewritten. Would appreciate receiving any examples you could provide.
18	4	10 to 19	This seems like an artificial distinction. Also not sure I agree with the example of an approval - the Water Quality Cert is your 401 permit. Perhaps the CZM cert would be a better example.	2	Stenberg	KF	Discussion of the distinction between these was specifically requested at one point. Example of approval will be changed as recommended. Thank you.
24	5	5	"frequently" before "triggers."	2	Kling	KF	OK
25	5	11	Substitute "areas of special concern" for "special areas of influence."	2	Kling	KF	Item will be revised.
26	5	12	Examples would be helpful; I'm not at all sure what is meant here.	2	Kling	KF	Text refers to situations where railroads or utilities might be impacted by construction and certain approvals or coordination is required with the appropriate organization. Text will be clarified.
28	5	14	Replace the word "projects" with "permits."	2	Tracy	KF	Yes. Thank you.
29	5	16	Influence schedule only? How about impacts on certainty, ability to effectively use limited space for staging and parking, etc.?	2	Kling	KF	The need to address all of these types of issues eventually affects schedule. Item will be expanded to include specifics.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
30	5	21	After "issuance of permits" add "and will inform permit conditioning."	2	Kling	KF	Different context than was intended for this paragraph. Footnote will be added to incorporate this information.
32	5	18 sec 2.1	Considering that some work is proposed outside of the Section 106 process, this paragraph should include reference to State Archaeological/Historical Resource processes as well as Section 106.	2	Powell	KF	It is unclear what work is being referred to "outside of the Section 106 process". Let's discuss.
113	5	4	Portions of WSDOT's Environmental Compliance Assurance Procedure (ECAP) outline activities which can result in the need for construction and other types of permitting in relation to contractor activities or violations. Notification Triggers occur when there are questions concerning contractor compliance. The Project Engineer (PE) and the Regional Environmental Manager (REM) initiate the ECAP to develop corrective actions to solve the identified problem. Notification Triggers can be defined as any action that, in the judgment of the REM, contractor or Project Engineer, may violate environmental permit conditions, agreements, or approvals for the project; or other environmental laws, ordinances, or regulations. They may also be any action or project revision requested by an agency after a site inspection that may be in conflict with other permits.	2	McCullough	KF	Document will be revised to reflect this.
59	10	Row 6	Seems odd we're saying "most likely." What happens in ROW?	2	Kling	SG	City agency projects working in ROW are exempt from Drainage review under SMC 22.800.070. So work in the ROW would be exempt, if this is considered an SDOT project. Will clarify the table.
70	11	Row 2	Triggering event? Statutory authority is SMC 21.16	2	Kling	KF	Yes. Thank you. Project triggering activities should be "alteration or temporary disruption to side sewers."
71	11	Row 3	Triggering activity may also be levels louder than permitted by code.	2	Kling	KF	Yes. Thank you.
72	11	Row 4	Take out "over-the Counter" name. Instead, list the permits now in column 3	2	Kling	KF	Change will be made.
73	11	Row 5	Permits listed are only examples; this should be clear. Street use permits are required for almost all activity in the street of any kind. Reference to 107393 should be taken out unless it has substantive provisions other than fee requirements.	2	Kling	KF	Item will be modified.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
75	11	Street Use Permits	Replace write up in Column 1 to such "Street Use Permits are types of permits for use and/or construction in the rights-of-way. Most common type of permits are utilities, shoring and excavation, street improvements and plan review, etc..." Are parking permits part of Street Use Permits?	2	Chu	SG	Column 1 is intended to list the type or 'name' of the permit. There are over 50 types of street use permits - it is too lengthy to list them all here. Parking permits are also issued under street use permit. Will move recommended text to column 3.
80	11	Table 1	column 5 row 6 - buildings more than 25? years old may qualify? That seems awfully recent - when the federal and state standard is 50 years.	2	Stenberg	SG	SMC 25.12.350 Standards for designation. "An object, site or improvement which is more than twenty-five (25) years old may be designated for preservation as a landmark site or landmark if it has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage or cultural characteristics of the City, state, or nation, if it has integrity or the ability to convey its significance, and if it falls into one (1) of the following categories: ... "
81	11		Seattle Noise Code - In addition to work outside certain hours, would any specialized equipment be a triggering activity?	2	Tracy	KF	Possibly, allowed daytime noise levels range from 50 dcb to 60 dcb.
94	12		Last row of Table 1 - Move to previous page with other Side Sewer Permit items.	2	Tracy	KF	Yes. Thank you. Will modify accordingly.
102	13	1 through 7	Few of these listed items actually have numbers. Will they be inserted now? You speak of "validating" the sequence. How about "On-going coordination. . . will confirm this sequence, or the sequence will be adjusted accordingly." or something similar.	2	Kling	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering
104	13	9 to 28	The text states "the order in which the applications could be submitted to agencies is denoted by the number in parentheses at the beginning of each item" There are no numbers in parentheses shown.	2	Sax	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
107	14	6	What type of DPD noise variance is the project team planning on obtaining?	2	Baggs	SG/KF	A technical noise variance - that would be allowed under pending code revisions.
111	14	25	"These contract permits would all be issued by the City of Seattle." Which of the permits listed are contractor permits?	2	Sax	KF	All of the ones listed in the sentence preceding, which lists all contractor permits. Elevator permits are issued by both Seattle and the DLI. Plumbing is issued by Seattle/King County Health.
114	14	8,9	Here and elsewhere, Shoreline Substantial Development Permit is listed as a separate permit when, in fact, it is a Master Use Permit. I'd suggest putting the Shoreline Permit first, then listing "Other Master Use Permits" wherever this issue arises. Again, many of these reviews would be part of a MUP review, not separate applications--although they could be.	2	Kling	KF	Document will be clarified.
115	14	foot note	Add, "See Section 3.1 for definition of Permit Core Team."	2	Tracy	KF	Document will be clarified.
116	14		This document as well as the contract documents should recognize that the contractor needs to obtain permits for temporary contractor facilities including contractor-designed structures needed to construct the scope of work, temporary utility services to contractor site offices, and dewatering systems.	2	Baggs	KF	OK
122	15	11	Permit # is missing	2	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Information was to be provided by the City on this round of review. Info was received and will be added to the document. OK. Thank you.
123	15	16	Permit issuance date for NPDES is missing	2	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Information was to be provided by the City on this round of review. Info was received and will be added to the document. OK. Thank you.
128	15	30	Does maintenance responsibility for the tunnel determine who applies for the tunnel NPDES permit?	2	Baggs	KF	Not necessarily. Will discuss and confirm.
131	15	31	Delete last paragraph.	2	Tracy	KF	No change made.
132	15	13 to 18	Which version of the NPDES permit will be used? What is the timeline for negotiating the new permit?	2	Sax	SG	The project is assuming it will be permitted under the City's 'new' operating permit that will be issued this month.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
136	15	2 through 4	On behalf of the NPDES uninitiated, it seems to make no sense to say two permits are required, and then to say that the City already has them. Does this mean that the permit(s) will be extended to cover the new structure? Or changed in some way to include it? Some suggested revisions are attached.	2	Kling	SG	Noted. Will revise.
138	15	5 thru 18	Would you also want to mention her WSDOT's NPDES permit as noted in the foot note on Page 9?	2	Tracy	KF	Not sure what more information needs to be provided. Let's discuss.
143	16	14	Add, "Project Permit" before the word "Team."	2	Tracy	KF	OK
145	16	17	Replace the phrase "this appendix" with "Appendix B."	2	Tracy	KF	No change made.
168	19	33	"to inform the permitting process." What does this mean? Should it be "Facilitate and manage the permitting process."	2	Sax	KF	The IPT will not facilitate or manage the permitting process. The section will be revised to reflect the technical input role of the IPT in obtaining permits.
180	20	20	Where is MAP defined?	2	Tracy	KF	MAP team will be added to the list of acronyms and the document will be revised to add more description of the team.
181	20	20	Change "Assuming that the Permit Forum operates similarly" to "assuming that the Permit Forum adopts a similar process used by WSDOT's MAP team."	2	Sax	KF	MAP team will be added to the list of acronyms and the document will be revised to add more description of the team.
205	22	7	Street Use Division of SDOT	2	Chu	KF	OK
219	23	fig 2	Figure 2 - The 180 days between ROD and appeal is not actually triggered by the ROD, but by a separate notice in the Federal Register.	2	Mattern	KF	Yes. Thank you.
223	24	10	This milestone is now known as "WSDOT Design Approval."	2	Graves	KF	Thank you. Document will be revised.
226	24	21	Insert "the SEPA EIS process" before "will be complete" instead of simply "SEPA." The former is more precise.	2	Kling	KF	OK
228	24	22	"Once the SEPA EIS process is complete"	2	Kling	KF	OK
229	24	26	double check state appeal period against information Laura sent from WDFW	2	Stenberg	KF	Will confirm. Thank you.
243	25	1	The project wide permitting process will require negotiations with resource. For example the NPDES general construction permit is only good for 5 years. It may not be possible to get all the permits for the life of the project.	2	Sax	SG	Verbiage addressing this will be added to the diagram's assumptions.
244	25	1	The second approach is only for permits issued by the City of Seattle. It does not include state and Federal permits. Is this really an approach? It seems like you will be using all three approaches not just one.	2	Sax	SG	Will review the text and revise for clarification.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
247	25	5	What are discrete "permits?"	2	Sax	KF	Discrete (individual or distinct) permits are identified in Table 2. Clarify issue.
250	26	Footnote	This is a requirement of the NPDES project. Is it necessary to include in the footnote?	2	Sax	SG	Will delete text
253	26	Table 2	MUPs and Street Use Permits will also likely be needed to authorize discrete work.	2	Baggs	KF	Will review and revise as needed.
255	26	Table 2	The footnote is confusing - the SWPP is typically a condition of the NPDES permit - are you presupposing what the conditions are? Seems terribly out of place.	2	Stenberg	KF	It is reasonable to assume that a SWPPP will be required for a project of this magnitude. The discussion of the SWPPP was intended to convey that one NPDES permit could be issued for the entire project, but that the SWPPP would need to be submitted in a phased fashion. Footnote will be revised or may be removed.
260	27	11	Project-wide permits also present a risk of delaying the implementations of the entire project given an outstanding regulatory issue inherent to just a portion of the project.	2	Baggs	KF	Yes, will add. Thank you.
261	27	29	Specify "can be long" i.e. 12 months, 36 months.	2	Sax	KF	OK
263	27	32	"several"?	2	Stenberg	KF	Item will be revised to be specific or 'several' will be deleted.
266	27	13-14	Has anyone explored securing exceptions to typical lifespans for permits? Are administrative or legislative action needed and appropriate for increasing these lifespans.	2	Baggs	SG	The project is in the process of evaluating this.
271	27	39-40	Who is representing SPU Drainage and Wastewater on the IPT?	2	Baggs	SG	Will ask Joy Keniston Longrie for this information.
277	28	8	Substitute "law" for "standards."	2	Kling	KF	OK . Thank you.
287	29	12	The PCPs were rarely issued for a specific activity. Again, of all the permits issued for light rail construction, the PCP were the most comprehensive.	2	Baggs	SG	Noted.
292	29	15-16	Yes, PCP-style permits could be based on contract packages or geographic areas. The team should also recognize that the design and the letting of contracts will require construction permits to be issued in phases.	2	Baggs	SG	Noted.
295	29	28	Confirm what is meant by benefiting the City? Be sure that the overall intent is to assure project moves forward as efficiently as possible.	2	Stenberg	SG	Item will be revised to clarify intent of statement. Intent was to reference the efficiencies to be gained on the city side.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
300	30	22	How does the compliance team fit in Fig.1; are they part of IPT or the Permit Forum?	2	Althaus	SG	
311	31	11 to 22	Does the Permit Core Team also negotiate permit conditions?	2	Sax	SG	The Permit Core Team will be working with permitting agencies in obtaining permits - including attendance at pre-application meetings and Permit Forum Team meetings. Permit conditions will be designated by the permitting agency.
312	31	13 sec03.4.1	The paragraph introduces the Environmental Compliance Team Lead and by implication the Environmental Compliance Team. Yet these roles are not identified on the organization chart. A "next level up" organizational chart of the Project environmental functions would be very helpful. This would also clarify where NEPA/SEPA and Cultural Resource issues reside.	2	Powell	SG	Will develop another org chart figure showing the relationship between the various teams.
392	31	3	The following management strategies or tools will be employed to conduct this task: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compliance communication plan and staff coordination; • commitment tracking database; • use of contract specification documents; and • coordination and support of permit timing and design. Implementation of the above bulleted strategies is the responsibility of the Project Compliance Team. The Permit Core Team will coordinate with the Environmental Compliance Team in the development of procedures to best integrate the project's compliance and permitting needs. WSDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual (EPM), M31-11 March 2006, Part 5 outlines the process whereby mitigation and permit conditions are incorporated into contract documents and tracked through project construction. The project will be using EPM procedures as a guideline for various activities.	2	McCullough	KF	Document will be revised to address. Thank you.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
320	32	34	What does "involving mean"	2	Sax	KF	This remains to be defined by the Permit Forum as they develop their charter. The intent is for the Permit Core Team to collaborate with the Permit Forum in developing the contract. the most likely scenario is for Permit Core Team staff to develop language to take to the forum for discussion.
327	33	11	Consider creating a more limited Permit Deliverable from the Designer that is not as large as a full Design Submittal. The Permit Design Deliverable then becomes the basis of permit application and therefore any subsequent Design changes will require permit modifications.	2	Jeffrey Paul	KF	This may be an option, thank you. Specific design deliverables are not being addressed by this document.
329	33	17	shouldn't this be "Developing a communication plan and identifying the correct people to involve?" Maybe rewrite it as "Developing and establishing a communication plan for interactions between all members of the Project Permit team to assure information on project changes is conveyed as early as possible and disseminated to the correct people".	2	Sax	KF	Item will be revised.
339	33	3 to 4	Change "Due to the long time frames and the complex nature of the project, it is necessary to create a process for managing these changes, ..."	2	Sax	KF	OK
340	33	36-38	Given the length of the project construction timeline - you can't count on having the same dedicated staff working on the project to provide the benefits described.	2	Stenberg	KF	Dedicated staffing was intended to refer in part to the position. It is acknowledged that turnover cannot be prevented. It would be ideal to retain the same staff over the life of the project or minimize turnover. Document will be revised to note that change in staff should be minimized if possible.
342	34		The team can also lessen the impacts of scope changes by asking for more during the environmental permitting process than is strictly proposed by the project design. For example, if the project anticipates disturbing 8000 SF at a particular location, scope the permit for 12,000 SF.	2	Baggs	KF	Agreed. Thank you. Item will be revised to reflect.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
348	34	22 to 29	Will the Permit Core Team be responsible for negotiating permit conditions with the resource agencies? This is not clearly explained.	2	Sax	SG	The Permit Core Team will be working with permitting agencies in obtaining permits - including attendance at pre-application meetings and Permit Forum Team meetings. Permit conditions will be designated by the permitting agency.
350	34	9 sec 4.0	In that the WSDOT Environmental Procedures Manual is described as a key source document, either source information should be provided or relevant sections included as an appendix.	2	Powell	KF	Logistically speaking it will not be possible to attach the referenced manual to this document as an appendix. Where additional text can be added, it will be.
351	34	9 to 13	Rewrite as "WSDOT's <i>Environmental Procedures Manual, M31-11 March 2006, Part 5</i> outlines the process for incorporating mitigation and permit conditions into contract documents and tracking them through project construction. This project will be using these procedures."	2	Sax	KF	No change.
399	35	2	Commitments identified during initial design, the FEIS, subsequent project phasing, and in all stand-alone mitigation documents, will be incorporated into the overall project Commitment File and maintained for the duration of the project by the ECT Lead. In addition, conditions associated with each permit will be included in Commitment File measures along with correlated contractor commitments. The developed Commitment File will be based on protocols established in WSDOT's EPM.	2	McCullough	KF	Document will be revised to address. Thank you.
433	35	18	Members of the Core Environmental Compliance Team will be involved in final inspection of contractor compliance activity completion and closeout in order to assure environmental issues have been resolved. Members of the Permit Forum may also participate in final inspections or perform separate inspections, the results of which will be communicated to the Compliance and Permitting Groups for evaluation.	2	McCullough	KF	Document will be revised to address. Thank you.
356	37	2nd Risk	Method to Address-Alternate approach is to create a separate Permit Design Milestone (see comment #13 above) not requiring full Design plans at say 60 or 90% but still provide sufficient details to support the permit applications requirements.	2	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Will revise to add this item. Thank you.
357	37	3rd Risk	Status-Alternate approach is to use DRAFT permit conditions from the agencies in Construction contract documents as basis for bid.	2	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Will add, thank you.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
360	37	Row 4	The City is in the process of adopting Comprehensive Plan changes and drafting proposed ordinance language that may impact permitting. These are "legislative" changes. If you mean State legislative changes, say so.	2	Kling	KF	Item will be revised to clarify.
363	38	table 3	Table 3 - add risk that permit applications do not meet agency requirements. The method to address, of course, is advance coordination and the permit forums.	2	Mattern	KF	OK, thank you.
364	38	3rd row	What about work stoppages such as shortage of concrete or labor strike? (not "environmental conditions" but need to look at risk)	2	Althaus	KF	Will add, thank you.
366	38	Row 1, Column 2	Consider legislative changes to extend dates.	2	Kling	KF	Clarify intent of comment.
368	38	Table 3	Third column, row two: Permit writers and reviewers is redundant. Use permit application reviewers.	2	Stenberg	KF	Item will be revised.
372	39	18, 19	If the QA/QC Plan is being referenced here, please add QA/QC	2	Kling	KF	OK
379	41	30	The requirement for development of as-built drawings should be part of the upcoming construction contracts. Suggest describing the need to include such requirements in the construction contract specifications.	2	Tracy	KF	Delivery of as-builts is critical and is a standard part of WSDOT contractor requirements. Coordination of as-built issues will be addressed by Construction staff and Compliance staff.
388	43	24	It is possible to read the term "project success" as a verb followed by a noun. To avoid this, substitute "success of the project."	2	Kling	KF	OK
391	43	31	Seems to assume permit issuers have no regulatory distance; they are not there just to "support" the project	2	Althaus	KF	That was not the intent. Item will be revised to clarify. Thank you.
403	45	26	Tasked out "all permits needed for construction" and insert "in issuing certain permits in coordination with other City regulatory departments."	2	Kling	KF	OK. Thank you.
405	45	25,26	DPD? SDOT? Risky to just leave this statement as is without further explanation	2	Althaus	SG	Will modify or delete.
407	46	5-6	The intent should be to maintain an accurate schedule for the project, NOT to avoid being on the critical path. It may well be that at times permitting on the critical path as a matter of fact.	2	Mattern	KF	OK
410	47	8	Should we mention the Monorail Project since we did not get to implement the process for it?	2	Chu	KF	We believe it is OK to mention it here since it was evaluated as part of this process, regardless of final status of agreements.
416	47	35	Add bullet to make sure sufficient design detail (separate Permit Design Submittal) is available to support application/issuance schedule.	2	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Item will be revised to include coordination with design team to obtain information.
419	48	16	add"draft permit conditions where needed and possible"	2	Jeffrey Paul	KF	Clarify

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
421	48	25	Be careful of language such as "staff who negotiated permits"...	2	Althaus	KF	Yes, thank you.
424	48	31	What is this referring to?	2	Stenberg	KF	WSDOT standard processes. Item will be revised to clarify - intent is to not reinvent the wheel.
429	48	41	First bullet -- How about "create a clear record in the event of subsequent questions or challenges."	2	Kling	KF	Item will be revised.
432	1 / i	19	What does risk management have to do with mitigation measures?	2	Stenberg	KF	The term 'mitigation' was used generically here (not referring to permit or SEPA/NEPA processes) as in risk avoidance or mitigation. Item will be revised to clarify.
438	29,30	30 -33 and 1 to 9	This section doesn't recognize that the permit team is part of the IPT - we are all working on different aspects of the the project and need to support each other - this section makes it sound like the designers are a group outside of the project somehow that we need to make a special effort to interface with. The tone is a bit off.	2	Stenberg	SG	Will revise.
446	App.B		Street Use permit for underground storage tanks not listed--listed earlier in document.	2	Kling	KF	All street use permits have not been listed. Document will be revised to clarify that not all are listed and to assure consistency between sections.
469	General	Cell 5-e	At beginning of second sentence, add "Includes, for example, activities. . ."	2	Kling	KF	Unable to locate comment in document. Please confirm location.
471	General	Row 4	Haven't they switched to a different code?	2	Kling	KF	Unable to locate comment in document. Please confirm location.
472	General		This strategy should elaborate on the scope and resources (Environmental Compliance Team) necessary to monitor permit compliance during construction.	2	Baggs	SG	Will revise with addition of additional figure and description of the ITP.
478	Table 1	2nd page	Replace Katherine Casseday. Replace "Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas, Inc." with "PB"	2	Tracy	LV	Will work on
480	Table 3		Under risk 1, method to address, change last paragraph to "follow the Integrated Project Team QA/QC Plan process to assure permit applications are complete."	2	Chu	KF	Change not made here, but the section on QA/QC will be revised to clarify that permitting QA/QC will use project protocols.
486	Through out		The Construction Lead is Tom Madden	2	Graves	LV	Will work on

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
376		13	13 The Environmental Compliance Team (ECT) Lead, will have the responsibility of tracking the Commitment File which consists of proposed mitigation measures, permitting authority resource agency commitments, and other environmental or design commitments made on behalf of the project. The ECT Lead has the following responsibilities within the Permit Team: coordinating permit conditions with the rest of the mitigation measures in the project Commitment File; translating permit conditions into contract language; and participation in permit development effort.	2	McCullough	KF	Document will be revised to incorporate this detail.
492			Correct the spelling of Elliott	2	Tracy	LV	Will work on
1	1	10	"stays off of" is confusing. Shouldn't this be "stays on or does not impact the project's critical path."	3	Sax	KF	item will be re-written
3	1	29	First word should be "This."	3	Tracy	KF	agreed - will change
4	1	7,8	Here and elsewhere, "between" should be "among." "Between" should refer only to two persons or things, not more.	3	Kling	KF	agreed - will change
5	2	21	Change "facilities" to "facility".	3	Boch	KF	At the time of this document preparation, it is unknown whether a tunnel or elevated structure will be built. If an elevated structure is chosen, the seawall would be a separate facility. Item has not been modified.
6	2	27	Include built environment	3	Kling	KF	The rest of the paragraph dealt with the built environment. Will review to determine if this can be clarified.
7	2	29	Other places as well. Be consistent in number format. Low numbers (up to ten under some rules) are generally spelled out, higher ones given in numeric form. Check text in tables as well, e.g., p. 8, cell 1-c	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
8	2	32-33	Include "the" before names of agencies. Note: not sure if you spell out and put acronyms in parentheses for all the terms you later present only as acronyms. Please check. A list of agency abbreviations might be useful at the outset; some folks will read only portions of the report and miss the place where the name is first spelled out.	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
15	3	1.2	Please add "construction techniques" after design concepts,	3	Ng	KF	Item will be revised.
17	4	36	Hydraulic Project Approval (HPA)	3	Chu	LV	Will work on
19	4	12 sec 2.0	Please add "Clean Water Act" to "Section 404", this will enhance the example.	3	Ng	KF	OK

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
21	4	27,28	Appendix A needs to be included in document, and Appendix B needs to be labeled.	3	Kling	KF	The Permits and Approvals Guide is a stand-alone document; will be available as a reference as needed; has already been distributed to everyone who is reviewing this document, and it has been determined that it will not be appended to this document. The reference to it as an appendix will be removed.
22	4		Permit Responsibility Matrix - page 4 - Aquatic Lands - Prerequisite. Is it really all other permits?	3	Mattern	KF	Yes WAC 332-30-122(1)(c) requires copies of all required permits be given to DNR prior to a use/lease being authorized.
31	5	23	Insert "the" after "necessitate".	3	Boch	KF	OK
33	5	18-22	Provide a better explanation why NEPA/SEPA, Sec. 106, and ESA are not included here. The reader should be know what each covers and where they can find this information.	3	Mattern	KF	Item will be revised.
35	6	1	The last General condition box has an extra period at the end of the last sentence.	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
36	6		Permit Responsibility Matrix - Page 6 and beyond - Narrative. "Project decryption" is a much more accurate term, but isn't what we normal call that part of a permit.	3	Mattern	KF	Will correct. Thank you.
37	6	Cell 1-a	Hyphen in wrong place. Same on page 7	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
38	6	Cell 4-c	Two periods	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
40	6	Table 1	Please add USC to the acronyms list	3	Ng	KF	Will do.
42	6	Table 1	Insert BPA after Bonneville Power Administration	3	Sax	KF	OK
43	6		Footnote 2 has the missing characters.	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
45	7	Table 1	Under Temp Water Quality Mod - delete "of some kind" in first column. Issued by Administrative Order is sufficient.	3	Stenberg	KF	OK
48	8	Rows 2 and 3	Are these NPDES permits? If so, please identify.	3	Kling	KF	Yes, these should be referred to as "NPDES Wastewater Discharge Permits," not "State" wastewater permits. The state program defers to the NPDES program for discharges to surface waters. Will also evaluate whether any additional corrections to NPDES permits on this table are warranted.
54	10	1	For Arch. Excavation - add a footnote that this is also covered by Sec. 106 and that isn't included here.	3	Mattern	KF	OK

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
55	10	Row 1	Archaeological Investigations should be listed under State permits, not local.	3	Kling	KF	Yes. Thank you.
57	10	Row 2	Liquefaction prone and landslide prone areas are proper terms. Shorelines are also critical areas.	3	Kling	KF	Item will be revised. "Liquefaction-prone" is the correct term. Shorelines waterward of OHW and used for migration by priority species can be critical areas, although it is undetermined if areas near the project are so designated.
61	10	Row 7	And elsewhere. Once upon a time DPD was trying to get away from the term "building" permit and start calling them "construction" permits. Or perhaps "construction" was a generic term to include building and other permits--worth asking.	3	Kling	SG	DPD (on their website) lists building permits as a type of construction permit. No change.
68	11	Last Row	This seems to be a repeat of an earlier side sewer reference, and more complete than the other.	3	Kling	KF	Yes. Thank you. Will modify accordingly.
69	11	Note	There's a number without text.	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
74	11	Row 6	Chapter 25.12 is the correct statutory reference	3	Kling	KF	OK. Thanks. 25.12 is the appropriate reference for Landmarks.
76	11	Table 1	Confirm that elevator permits are issued by DPD. I thought State L&I issued elevator permits.	3	Baggs	KF	Elevator permits are issued by the city of Seattle (See Seattle building code chapter 30) however permits are also issued by the Dept. of Labor and Industries (WAC 296-96-01000). Information will be clarified.
77	11	Table 1	Seattle/King County Health Department permits and inspects plumbing permits. I didn't see this on the table of permits.	3	Baggs	KF	If needed, plumbing permits are issued by the Seattle/King County Health Department, although they are processed at DPD. Information will be added.
78	11	Table 1	SDOT does not actually permit construction traffic approvals. Change this to "temporary lane and sidewalk closures." Approved traffic control plans are a pre-requisite to obtaining a permit for lane and sidewalk closures.	3	Baggs	KF	Item will be revised.
88	12	12	after the second phase just say "and so on" it is not necessary to explain that 3 follows 2 and 4 follows 3, and so on through all the numbers. And where are these numbers anyway?	3	Stenberg	KF	Item will be revised.
89	12	9, 10,11,1 2	This sentence describes the order of permit submittals and refers to "numbers in parentheses". The "numbers in parentheses" should be added to the permits or this sentence should be deleted.	3	McKillop	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
90	12	9,10,11,12	This sentence describes the order of permit submittals and refers to "numbers in parentheses". The "numbers in parentheses" should be added to the permits or this sentence should be deleted.	3	McKillop	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering
91	12	sec 2.2.1	The application sequence numbers are not incorporated in the permit listings. Bullet points are shown instead.	3	Ng	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering
93	12	Table 1	DPD issued Side Sewer Permit is also listed on page 11.	3	Baggs	KF	Yes. Thank you. Will modify accordingly.
96	13	8	This section heading refers to "...Timing of Submittals" but there is no timing identified in the section.	3	McKillop	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering
98	13	26	Suggest using the word "lengthy" in place of "timely."	3	Tracy	KF	Change will be made.
99	13	28	Instead of "aspects are encountered" how about "artifacts are encountered" or "issues arise"?	3	Kling	KF	Item will be revised.
101	13	1 & 2	This sentence describes the order of permit submittals and refers to "numbers in parentheses". The "numbers in parentheses" should be added to the permits or this sentence should be deleted.	3	McKillop	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering
103	13	1,2	This sentence describes the order of permit submittals and refers to "numbers in parentheses". The "numbers in parentheses" should be added to the permits or this sentence should be deleted.	3	McKillop	KF	Section was accidentally altered during final formatting and will be corrected to include numbering
106	14		Why is there blank space at the end of this page - it's not a section break.	3	Stenberg	LV	will fix
108	14	10	The superscript 1 is not appropriately coded.	3	Stenberg	KF	Will do.
110	14	25	Not all the permits listed as contractor-obtained permits are issued by the City. Elevator and plumbing permits are issued by other jurisdictions.	3	Baggs	KF	Elevator permits are issued by both Seattle and the DLI. Plumbing is issued by Seattle/King County Health.
112	14	27	Add "those" before "permits".	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
119	15	5	System in NPDES needs initial capital letter 'S'	3	Jeffrey Paul	LV	Will work on
121	15	11	Fill in permit number or re-write to omit need	3	Stenberg	KF	Information was to be provided by the City on this round of review. Info was received and will be added to the document. OK. Thank you.
126	15	27	delete the word "alternative" after "tunnel"	3	Stenberg	KF	Clarify reason for request. At time of this document's preparation there are two alternative designs.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
127	15	27	replace "control" with "dispose of"	3	Stenberg	KF	No change made.
139	15	sixteen	Fill in date or re-write to omit need	3	Stenberg	KF	Information was to be provided by the City on this round of review. Info was received and will be added to the document. OK. Thank you.
141	16	3	Pick "team or "staff" but not both	3	Stenberg	KF	OK
142	16	4	replace "on" with "of"	3	Stenberg	KF	OK
144	16	14	"Team staff permit lead" reads like there is one word too many	3	Stenberg	KF	No change made.
146	16	18	period at the end of sentence.	3	Stenberg	LV	Will work on
148	16	22	drop the word "staff" - I don't think Tim and Rick etc. would care to be referred to as "support staff"	3	Stenberg	KF	Document will be revised.
152	16	6 And 7	Insert a blank line between lines 6 and 7 as it is a new paragraph.	3	Sax	LV	Will work on
154	17	line 25	"It is hoped" does sound like much of a commitment. Reword with "Our intent is."	3	Sax	KF	Agreed. Document will be revised.
156	17	2	The org chart that follows on page 18 suggests that the Permit Team consists of City and WSDOT staff and consultants. Revise this line to reflect this.	3	Baggs	KF	Item will be revised.
157	17	4	"Lead" should be "led."	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
158	17	4	Change "lead" to "led."	3	Sax	LV	Will work on
163	18	fig 1	Figure 1 - add legend explaining the difference between solid and dashed lines.	3	Mattern	KF	Figure is being revised.
165	19	7	Change "to" to "for".	3	Boch	KF	Yes. Thank you.
166	19	7	Change "to" to "for"	3	Stenberg	KF	Yes. Thank you.
167	19	8	Extra parenthesis	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
174	20		Would the Permit Core Team also be the ones who help "smooth the way for obtaining permits, getting it done, and settle disputes?"	3	Tracy	SG	Yes. Will add verbiage on this role of the Permit Team.
176	20	14	Take out "that will be"	3	Kling	KF	Paragraph will be revised.
178	20	20	Substitute "it would coordinate" instead of "that team concept works to coordinate."	3	Kling	KF	Sentence will be revised.
179	20	20	Give some background/description of MAP team, since "assuming..it will be similar"	3	Althaus	KF	Paragraph will be revised.
182	20	25	"by all agencies." Change to "by all permitting agencies."	3	Sax	KF	OK
183	20	31	Delete "when needed"	3	Sax	KF	OK
185	20	1,8	"Matrix" and "convey out" are both verb forms I wouldn't use.	3	Kling	KF	No change made.
189	20	sec3.1.4	Please define the acronym MAP	3	Ng	KF	MAP team will be added to the list of acronyms and the document will be revised to add more description of the team.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
195	21	22	It seems to me that Dedicated Staff would be the key to the entire success of the Permit Strategy. It may make sense to note this early on in the report, say on page 3. It would be great if an integrated, project-specific, multi-agency hit squad could be put in place to "grease the skids" of the permit process. This Dedicated Staff could be looking for ways to make permit approvals happen and keep the project's applications separated from all of the miscellaneous other permits coming into the system.	3	Tracy	KF	We agree that use of dedicated staff is one of the most important strategies to be employed. However, it appears that mentioning this earlier in the document as it is currently organized would require significant re-write. No change made.
196	21	23	"permitting efforts to use" change to "permitting is to provide."	3	Sax	KF	OK
197	21	24	remove "type of"	3	Stenberg	KF	OK
198	21	31	period at the end of sentence.	3	Stenberg	LV	Will work on
203	22	2	Insert "entirely" between provided and for.	3	Sax	KF	No change made.
217	23	fig 2	Figure 2 - General comment - it would be useful to distinguish between time periods that are fixed by law or regulation and those that are estimates.	3	Mattern	KF	Agreed. Document will be revised.
218	23	fig 2	Figure 2 - The 90 days from FEIS to ROD is very approximate - note this is an estimate and could vary greatly.	3	Mattern	KF	OK
220	24	Figure 2	Adjust per RALF discussion	3	Stenberg	KF	Figure 2 is being revised.
224	24	16	delete "packet"	3	Stenberg	KF	OK
227	24	21	Rewrite as "At this point, barring an appeal, the SEPA process will be complete.."	3	Sax	KF	Thank you. Section is currently grammatically flawed and will be corrected.
234	24	18 to 19	Rewrite as "City and state permits cannot be issued until the SEPA environmental review process has been completed."	3	Sax	KF	Thank you. Section is currently grammatically flawed and will be corrected.
235	24	25-26	Consider substituting something like "City permits typically have a 10-(??) to 21 day appeal period, but some have a 30-day appeal period."	3	Kling	KF	Item will be revised. Thank you.
237	24	8 to 9	change "application" to plural and delete "packets"	3	Stenberg	KF	OK
269	27	19 thru 20	It would be beneficial if City Permits for this project did not expire. Explore "Life of Project" for ALL permits. Otherwise, develop a simple permit extension process.	3	Tracy	SG	Will evaluate.
270	27	33 and 34	Rewrite as "...potentially delaying the federal and state permit approvals."	3	Sax	KF	OK
279	28	11	Typo on "terms".	3	Baggs	LV	Will work on
284	29	5	typo "project"	3	Althaus	LV	Will work on
288	29	15	change "to" to "into"	3	Stenberg	KF	Will do.
289	29	35	Change "The Board" to "Each Board"	3	Stenberg	KF	OK

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
298	30	10	Will the Project Permit Team provide any assistance for a Contractor to facilitate procurement of Contractor permits?	3	Tracy	SG	The current strategy is for the project to obtain a number of permits typically obtained by the contractor (i.e. Grading permits, noise variance) due to the risk of appeal and potential schedule slippages associated with these appeals. The project is helping set in motion, streamlined review processes so that contracting permitting efforts can move forward in a coordinated fashion.
303	30	11, 12	...responsible for permits for which they are responsible.. Language is circular.	3	Althaus	KF	Item will be revised. Thank you.
325	33	28 sec 3.4.3	Please list a few permitting agencies which have extensive experience relying on performance standards.	3	Ng	KF	Agencies will be added to the text as requested.
326	33	6	Substitute "action" for "approval."	3	Kling	KF	OK
328	33	17	Substitute "among" for "between."	3	Kling	KF	OK
330	33	20	Rewrite as "Forms for recording design changes that affect permit applications or conditions."	3	Sax	KF	Item will be revised.
332	33	23	Rewrite as "Using the project commitment database to track responsibilities by the Environmental Compliance Team."	3	Sax	KF	No change.
333	33	26	Rewrite as "Most of the permits for this project have a regulatory time frame with an expiration date."	3	Sax	KF	No change.
334	33	28	Change "more fully" to "further"	3	Sax	KF	OK
335	33	30	Comma after "frames"	3	Kling	KF	Will do.
336	33	31	Change "that" to "this"	3	Sax	KF	OK
337	33	37	Delete "in this regard"	3	Sax	KF	OK
338	33	11,14	Substitute "Design Team" for "design"	3	Kling	KF	Clarify intent of change.
345	34	31	This paragraph would be easier to read in two sentences. Change to ".. In a timely manner. That group will be.."	3	Sax	KF	OK
346	34	32	Substitute "into" for "to"	3	Kling	KF	OK
347	34	7-9	Is the Project Compliance Team and the Environmental Compliance Team the same? Does either exist yet?	3	Graves	KF	None. Document will be revised for consistency.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
393	34	15	FEIS mitigation measures (approved by the lead and other regulatory agencies), and applicable permit conditions will be included in the contractor's specification package for implementation and compliance under established project guidelines and protocols. Established environmental commitments and conditions will be translated into the contract special provisions sections and will then become conditions of contractor performance. Under construction contract terms, the contractor will be responsible for complying with all federal, state, and local rules, regulations, and permit conditions related to environmental protection and worker health and safety.	3	McCullough	KF	Document will be revised to address. Thank you.
358	37	3rd row	Under status column: why include "...work not requiring permits" in row concerning "permits not issued at anticipated time"? Paragraph is repeated.	3	Althous	KF	The item should have been under Method to Address. The issue comes up under 2 scenarios: 1) permit issuance takes longer than anticipated and 2) legal challenges extend final permit approval timelines.
362	37	Table 3	Third column, third row: Duplicate phrase - please delete	3	Stenberg	KF	Will do, thank you.
370	39	9	Relate this discussion to the overall project QA/QC program	3	Mattern	KF	OK
371	39	20	Add a space after "2)".	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
380	41	36	Comma after "as-builts."	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
389	43	25	Change "writers" to "reviewers."	3	Kling	KF	Item will be revised.
397	43	line 25	Instead of permit "writers" (which could be confused with writing a permit application), how about "reviewers"?	3	Althaus	KF	Item will be revised.
398	44	10	documentation of interactions between permit team and whom?	3	Stenberg	KF	Item will be revised to clarify.
400	44	4,5	Not clear how design "supports" permits...better to discuss how design and permits need to be in sync with each other	3	Althaus	KF	Item will be revised to clarify. Intent was to refer to documents that will be needed from the design team in order to apply for permits.
404	45	26	Add a period at the end of the line.	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
409	47	5,6	Define "critical path"	3	Althaus	KF	No change made.
411	47	10	The ERP did their evaluation this year - 2006	3	Stenberg	KF	Will revise. Thank you.
412	47	21	Missing "o" in "to"	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
413	47	21	Typo "to" the MAP team	3	Althaus	LV	Will work on
414	47	21	"t" should be "to"	3	Stenberg	KF	Yes, thank you.
415	47	30	Change "specifying" to "specific".	3	Boch	KF	Item will be revised for clarify.
418	48	9	"...to confirm" what? where standards practices won't achieve the schedule	3	Althaus	KF	Clarify comment.
420	48	25	To assure review of contract conditions by staff who worked on permit applications to make sure conditions are properly included and stated.	3	Kling	KF	Item will be revised.
422	48	25	Delete "To" at the beginning of this bullet.	3	Boch	KF	Item will be revised.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
423	48	25	"To Use of staff" - please remove words to make clear	3	Stenberg	KF	Item will be revised.
427	48	35	"...assurance measures to assure..." could be phrased better	3	Althaus	KF	Item will be revised.
428	48	37	Use a tense that is consistent throughout this bulleted list. "use" "using" "for" etc. it is confusing to read.	3	Stenberg	KF	Noted
430	49	32-33	Change to "Use contract documents..."	3	Stenberg	KF	Noted
431	49	2	Instead of "memorialize", a simple "record" seems more appropriate	3	Althaus	KF	Item will be revised.
437	19 and 20		Permit Responsibility Matrix - page 1 - 401 certification - review duration - I don't understand how the EIS/ROD can be "submitted late in the permit process". Please explain.	3	Mattern	KF	The concept of submitting permit application materials prior to completion of the SEPA/NEPA process (submitting an incomplete application) was discussed in a previous document section. Item will be revised to clarify.
443	7 to 12	Note 2	Initial letters missing on two words.	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
444	7 to 9		Fix alignment of Table headings with columns	3	Tracy	LV	Will work on
445	App.B		Table headings aren't lined up with text.	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
453	Appendix C		PMAC stands for Project Management Assistant Consultant	3	McKillop	LV	Will work on
454	Appx A		PMAC stands for Project Management Assistant Consultant	3	McKillop	LV	Will work on
455	Appx B		The cover sheet should be numbered A-1.	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
456	Appx C		Insert a cover sheet for Appendix B	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
457	Chart		The cover sheet should be numbered C-1.	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
458	cover		There is a "1" at the top of all pages that should be removed.	3	Kling	KF	Will do.
466	Figure C 1		This figure also has the missing characters throughout.	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
475	iv	1	Here and in the footer throughout the document are missing characters. David Mattern told me this is a problem with pdf conversion.	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
476	iv	9	Add another space after "figure 2".	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
477	Table C-1	2,3,4	Use the same punctuation between the Table and the explanation	3	Boch	LV	Will work on
483	Table C-1		Dan McKillop's office phone 2062673823, Alt phone - 2068493818, e-mail mckilld@wsdot.wa.gov	3	McKillop	LV	Will work on
484	Table C-1		Dan McKillop's office phone 2062673823, Alt phone - 2068493818, e-mail mckilld@wsdot.wa.gov	3	McKillop	LV	Will work on
487	V	Footer	No "V" in "Viaduct."	3	Kling	LV	Will work on
488	V	6	Capitalized "combined sewer overflow"	3	Chu	LV	Will work on
489	v	between 13 & 14	Insert "HPA - Hydraulic Project Approval"	3	Chu	LV	Will work on

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
13	2	appb	Permit Name: Transmission Clearance Approval-Transmission Line #4. Issuing Agency: BPA/SCL. Agency Liaison: Tbd. Permit Lead: SCL. Application Form: SCL will submit appropriate forms. Narrative: Outage schedule and rationale. Exhibits: N/A. Expected Permit Review Duration: Application should be 12 months in advance. Minimum needed for disruption of transmission. Prerequisite: None. General Triggering Act.: Transmission line relocation, substation modification. Potential Project Act: Transmission line relocation, substations modification.		Powell/ Cunningham	KF	Change will be made. Thank you.
14	2	appb	Permit Name: Distribution feeder and Transmission Lines 1,2 and 3 Clearance Approval. Issuing Agency: SCL Agency Liaison: Tbd. Permit Lead: SCL. Application Form: SCL will submit appropriate forms. Narrative: Outage schedule and rationale. Exhibits: N/A. Expected Permit Review Duration: Application should be 6 months in advance for distribution and 12 months in advance for transmission. Minimum needed for disruption of transmission and distribution. Prerequisite: None. General Triggering Act.: Transmission line relocation, substation modification, distribution feeder relocations/modifications. Potential Project Act: Transmission line relocation, substations modification and distribution feeder relocations/modifications.		Powell/ Cunningham	KF	Change will be made. Thank you.
20	4	26,27	Some permits, for example, MUPs, may cover both construction and operation. This needs to be noted somehow.			KF	Issue will be evaluated and document revised where necessary. More specific information on this issue would be helpful.
27	5	14	"Projects" should be "permits."			KF	Yes. Thank you.
34	5	line 6	Remember to cover if groundwater is being discharged to SPU's drainage system - we have an NPDES permit.		Patterson	KF	Item will be revised to address drainage changes.
39	6	Street Use Permit - ROW7	We may need to add Keith Miller for Shoring permit issuance, Angela Steel for the Renewable permit issuance, and Cathy Abene for Term (pedestrian skybridge/tunnel) permit issuance. Rex's section perform permit issuance for utility work and capital improvement projects.		Neal	KF	Wrong page number? Please confirm location for comment.
41	6	Table 1	Title - Remove the term "Environmental" as they are not all environmental permits.		Patterson	SG	Will change
44	7	Table 1	The title columns do not match up with the columns below.		Patterson	KF	Will do.
46	7		Last row of table: Insert "Act" after "Management"		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
47	8		Need to align the columns in header row with the columns in the body of the table.		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
49	9		Check font in last row; appears different from rest of table.		Rigsby	LV	Will work on

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
50	9	Row 5	Aquatic Lands, not Use, authorization			KF	According to our information, DNR and Ecology refer to this permit as an "Aquatic Use Authorization" or "Aquatic Lands Use Authorization."
51	9	Table 1	In footnote, replace the term "combined sewage overflow" with "combined sewer overflow"		Patterson	KF	Will do. Thanks.
52	9	table 1	"Aquatic Use Authorization": under column titled "Project Triggering Activities" and the word "outfalls" to the description.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Will do. Thanks.
53	10	table 1 footnote	Not all of this footnote may be true, e.g. if drainage from the tunnel (e.g. groundwater seeping into the tunnel) is pumped and piped directly to Elliott Bay, then the groundwater will never enter the SPU system. In this case WSDOT would get their own NPDES stormwater permit.		Lee	SG	This footnote is in the wrong place. It applies to the City's NPDES Stormwater permit above. The table will be revised.
56	10	Row 10	SMC 22.100 this is just the reference - don't know what Joyce ment		Kling	KF	Not clear on location of comment?
58	10	Row 5	Doce section is SMC 22.804.		Kling	KF	Yes, thank you.
60	10	Row 6	add in column 2, "or all discharges of surface waters that drain into drainage systems and certain surface waters." The chapter is 22.802.		Kling	KF	Discharges to drainage systems and certain surface waters do need to comply with many of the substantive provisions of the Grading and Drainage Control subtitle (see SMC 22.800.030), however information we have reviewed notes that only land disturbing activities over 750 sf requires Drainage Control Review (see SMC 22.802.020)
64	11		Street Use will also need to be in the loop in regards in any review and approval for existing structures such as pedestrian skybridge and/or tunnel that are located in or over Seattle r-o-w. Contact person is Cathy Abene*, Manager ROW Section		Neal	SG	A single point of contact will be named. Coordination processes for issuance of City approvals and permits are expected to provide for appropriate/applicable staff. Thank you for the contact name.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
65	11		Street Use will also need to be in the loop in regards in any review and approval for the following any new structures mention in #2 that plan to be located in or over Seattle r-o-w. Contact person is Cathy Abene, Manager ROW Section.*		Neal	SG	A single point of contact will be named. Coordination processes for issuance of City approvals and permits are expected to provide for appropriate/applicable staff. Thank you for the contact name.
66	11		Street Use will also need to be in the loop in regards in any review and approval for the existing areaways will removed/filled/abandon encroaching Seattle r-o-w. Contact person is Angela Steel, Senior for the Annual Section.		Neal	SG	A single point of contact will be named. Coordination processes for issuance of City approvals and permits are expected to provide for appropriate/applicable staff. Thank you for the contact name.
67	11		Street Use will also need to be in the loop in regards in any review and approval for any structures installed in Seattle r-o-w to satisfy our 1% art goal. This will require a Street Use permit with an idemnity agreement. Contact person is Angela Steel.		Neal	SG	A single point of contact will be named. Coordination processes for issuance of City approvals and permits are expected to provide for appropriate/applicable staff. Thank you for the contact name.
79	11	Table 1	Side Sewer Permit refers to discharging dewatering water to the sanitary sewer system, what is the permit or approval for discharge to the storm system?		Patterson	KF	A Side Sewer Permit for Temporary Dewatering applies to discharges to a storm, sanitary or combined system. Language will be modified.
82	11		Check how some of the last letters in words in the table wrap to the next line. For example, "Construction" and "Neighborhoods".		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
92	11	Street Use Permit	Note: Although current contact names are given, a designated sigle point of contact is expected to be named. Street Use needs to be in the loop in regards in any review and approval for Shoring work that is adjacent to Seattle r-o-w. Contact person may be Keith Miller, Senior for the Shoring Section		Neal/Kling	SG	A single point of contact will be named. Coordination processes for issuance of City approvals and permits are expected to provide for appropriate/applicable staff. Thank you for the contact name.
83	12		Check globally for this correction: When writing "e.g." a comma needs to be inserted after the last period, as in "e.g.,"		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
95	13		Same comment as above, comment number 8. this has been done		Rigsby	KF	Item will be revised.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
105	13		Under "State Permits/Approvals", add the following 2 bullets: 1) City of Seattle CSO NPDES Permit; and 2) City of Seattle Stormwater NPDES Permit		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Let's discuss.
204	13	8	Line 8, states that "... Relative Timing of submittals" there is no timing stated in the listing			KF	See response to B.
118	15	2	Replace "will require" with "may affect".		Lee	KF	Sentence will be revised to separate need for NPDES coverage from compliance with City's NPDES permit.
120	15	11	Permit # is WASM 23003		Mirabella	KF	Thank you.
124	15	25	Add the following sentence to this paragraph: "SPU will also continue to coordinate with King County on these issues."		Keniston-Longrie	KF	OK
125	15	26	Change "an " to "a."		Sax	KF	Revision will be made.
129	15	30	Modify the sentence which currently reads: "The project would apply for this permit." to read: "The project needs to coordinate and get approval from SPU regarding stormwater and groundwater treatment associated with tunnel." Note there is still an outstanding policy issue on who will own, operate and maintain. Until formally agreed to in writing, SPU is assuming all stormwater and drainage facilities must meet SPU standards and regulations, as well as SPU Operations and Maintenance requirements, for design, access and safety standards.		Keniston-Longrie	SG	Will revise this sentence.
130	15	30	Check globally for this correction: Change "Elliot" to "Elliott"		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
133	15	14-15	Delete, "The City is in the process of negotiating a new NPDES permit with Ecology."		Mirabella	SG	Will do
134	15	15-16	Replace sentence beginning with, "That permit..." with "That permit will be issued December 6, 2007 and will be in effect 30 days later."		Mirabella	KF	OK. Thank you.
135	15	15-18	Check font type in these rows.		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
137	15	21-22	Modify, the sentence beginning with: "City staff...relocation or replacement." To read as follows: "Seattle Public Utilities (SPU) will be the lead point of contact for communication and coordination with Ecology for these two existing NPDES permits." (Delete the rest of the sentence)		Keniston-Longrie	SG	Will revise as stated.
140	16		This section is not written correctly. We already have a CSO NPDES permit. This project does not "require" it. The project must be carried out "in accordance" with the permit. Any Project activities which impact the permit, e.g. changing outfall locations, increasing CSOs, must be coordinated with Ecology.		Lee	SG	This language was correct when the draft Strategy Document was written. However, it will be updated to reflect the current condition.
147	16	19	Insert "Organization" after "Team"		Rigsby	KF	No change made. Section 3.1.1 is Organization.
149	16	26	Change "hoped" to "envisioned". Hope is not a method.		Rigsby	KF	Sentence will be revised. Agreed. Document will be revised,

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
151	16	20,25,27,28	Avoid using acronyms, just write the whole thing out. Acronyms do not add clarity or help communicate.		Keniston-Longrie	LV - see KF prior to making changes	All project-specific acronyms will be spelled out.
153	16	22	Line 22, add the following to "...support staff form the Integrated Project Team, refer to Figure C-1. "		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Will do.
155	17	1	Change "Team Organization" to "Strategy Team"		Rigsby	SG	
159	17	5	Line 5 should be Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)			KF	Clarify comment. Line already contains this reference.
161	18	7,8	This list and the org chart following are not consistent--e.g., DPD is not on the org chart, but Police and Fire are.			KF	Text or figures will be revised appropriately.
169	19	12, 24	Be consistent--Permit team lead or manager?			KF	Permit Team Manager is correct. Entire document will be reviewed and corrected as needed.
170	19	20, 21	"Coordinating with" the IPT is not entirely accurate; the Permit team is part of the IPT, so it coordinates with other teams that are part of the IPT.			SG	Will provide clarification in the text.
172	19	footnote 1	Footnote 1: after the word engineering, insert <i>policy, environmental and cultural resources</i>		Keniston-Longrie	KF	OK
173	19	sec 3.1.1	After line 29, add the following bullets: 1) Identify issues which need to be resolved; 2) Elevate issues which are not resolved in a timely manner; 3) Ensure monitoring and compliance with permit conditions; 4) Ensure close out and acceptance items associated with permit and/or permit conditions are performed in a timely manner.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Items 1 and 2 are generic tasks that are included in the other bullets. Will review to see if existing bullets can be expanded on. Items 3 and 4 are not the responsibility of the Permit Core Team
175	20	4	Spell out "IPT" the first time it is used, such as "Integrated Project Team (IPT)"		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
188	20	26-28	There needs to be a better explanation of the MAP team, and the statement that the team takes responsibility for things the staff developing applications would otherwise do doesn't seem to make sense without more explanation.		Kling	KF/SG	Paragraph will be revised.
190	21		Lines 20, 21 and 26: Spell out MAP and explain a little about what MAP is. Do not use jargon more than necessary.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	MAP team will be added to the list of acronyms and the document will be revised to add more description of the team.
191	21	16	Add SPU to the list of city departments who will be represented on the Permit Forum.		Keniston-Longrie	SG	Will add.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
192	21	16	Modify the sentence which currently reads: "Some of the representatives are WSDOT liaison staff that work at the various federal and state agencies" to "Some of the representatives are WSDOT liaison staff <i>or City of Seattle MOU staff</i> that work at the various federal and state agencies." (Jim Muck is USFWS/NMFS who works under City MOU and charges his time to City 100% (i.e. not just this project))		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Paragraph will be rewritten.
193	21	19	Add the following bullet to section 3.1.4: 1)Serve as a point of contact for a given agency and provide internal coordination with a given agency.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Change will be made.
194	21	21	Add the following so the last sentence reads: "It is anticipated that the forum will continue to meet during construction to keep the permitting agencies up to date on construction details, <i>permit conditions, monitoring and compliance, as well as potential permit issues which may arise.</i>		Keniston-Longrie	SG	Will add this language.
199	21	33	Modify 1st sentence in Section 3.2.1. to read: WSDOT and the City of Seattle (via SPU) has provided staff....project review. (Again both USFWS and NMFS agencies are reviewing utilizing City of Seattle MOU, with SPU as lead City Agency.)		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Paragraph will be revised.
200	21	12,13	Add "and conditions" after "mitigation measures." Some make a distinction between a mitigation measure, which is something proposed by the applicant; and the "condition" which is imposed by the agency. This would cover both.		Kling	KF	In is our understanding that WSDOT and FHWA will propose mitigation measures under SEPA/NEPA and the City will have the prerogative to include permit conditions based on SEPA/NEPA findings. The next bullet deals with permit conditions specifically. No change made.
201	21	18, 19	And in general. Consistency in verb forms in lists: All in this list should begin with an "ing" ending verb for proper parallel construction. This is an issue in other lists as well; in most of those, all verbs ought to be in infinitive form. For the bullet that's different in this one, I'd suggest "visiting sites as needed" or something similar.		Kling	KF	Agreed. Document will be revised. Thank you.
206	22	7	Change "Street Use Division" to "SDOT".		Baggs	KF	OK
207	22	12	Use a term other than "negotiation."		Kling	KF	OK
209	22	16	Section 3.2.2: Last paragraph, add the following sentence: " <i>The City is also providing funding via pre-existing MOU, support for required staff at both NMFS and USFWS for federal consultation, review and support.</i> "		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Thank you for the specific language. Document will be revised.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
212	22	8 to 9	We need to discuss organizational structure within the City. WSDOT currently believes we need a lead point of contact in Street Use and one in DPD, not an additional level of contact in the form of one person coordinating and managing the AWVSRP work of those two departments.		Stenberg	SG	Will discuss and revise document as needed.
214	23	Assumption 2	Time may be one year, but only if not appealed further.		Kling	KF	Item will be revised to clarify this.
215	23	City permits	After permit applications are complete, state law requires public notice and comment. That process alone takes longer than 30 days. In addition, some of the approvals, e.g., landmarks and review district approvals, have a 30-day time frame. Those approvals must be obtained before MUP decision can be written. Shoreline permits are appealed to the Shoreline Hearings Board, not the City Hearing Examiner. There is a 30 day time-limit for appeals to court from the Shoreline Hearings Board.		Kling	KF	Document will be revised as needed.
216	23	fig 2	1)Add box and flow to this figure about SPU coordination with WDOE. Work with Joy to develop this. 2)What about Section 106? 3)Why show appeals when plan on beginning utility work in 2008 or sooner?		Keniston-Longrie	SG	Figure 2 is a generalized process flow diagram developed to provide a visual on the complexity of the permitting process - for obtaining major new projects. It was not designed to show the level of detail associated with coordination of other related permitting issues such as SPU's existing permits or code revisions required to obtain shoreline permit. The SPU coordination issue will not be added. However, a fifth assumption will be added stating that this diagram only addresses major 'new' permits required by the project. The section 106 process was not included in this document because it is being pursued separately - as part of the NEPA process.
221	24	2.3	Line 11 Fill in Permit Number			KF	Noted
222	24	4	Insert "complex technical evaluations," in front of "numerous"		Rigsby	KF	OK

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
225	24	18	Substitute the following: "City and State applications are not complete until completion and submission of the SEPA environmental review documents."		Kling	KF	Section will be revised. The first sentence is correct and it may be retained.
230	24	32	How do phased construction permits fit into the three permitting options? Are they discrete permits or are they project-wide permits issued in phases for various reasons?		Baggs	KF	Table 2 gets into that distinction. Item will be revised to add reference to phasing earlier in the section.
231	24	32	Section 3.3.2: Modify line 32 to read, "It is anticipated that permits will be obtained in one of four ways : 1) The first...		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Three main methods have been identified. Permitting process is proposed to be similar to that followed by Sound Transit. Methods will be numbered as requested.
233	24	10 to 26	Incorrect assumption--Even after SEPA documents are submitted, there are still public notice, comment, and sometimes hearing requirements that also must be met before the permit can be processed. In the City process, when that is completed, the decision authorizing and conditioning a project is written; that decision is typically appealable. Only after appeal periods have passed, or appeals are complete, can the permit be issued.		Kling	KF	Thank you. Document will be revised.
238	24	footnote 1	Modify footnote one to read: "The Design Concurrence....WSDOT, City , and FHWA." (i.e. replace SDOT with "City".		Keniston-Longrie	KF	OK
239	24	Note	Explain what "Design Concurrence Milestone" is.			KF	Will revise footnote.
240	24		Line 4: Insert " 3) A third....		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Three main methods have been identified. Permitting process is proposed to be similar to that followed by Sound Transit. Methods will be numbered as requested.
241	24		Line 10: Insert " 4)Renewals and/or Change Management: Due to both the complexity and duration of this project, it is anticipated that many of the permits will need to be renewed and/or modified throughout the project life due to either expiration of permit (i.e. 5 year NPDES Construction Permit) as well as expected field condition changes which may trigger change management associated with permits, approvals and/or permit conditions."		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Three main methods have been identified. Permitting process is proposed to be similar to that followed by Sound Transit. Methods will be numbered as requested.
242	25		Line 16, Fill in date			KF	Noted
246	25	3	It's not clear to me what the "Commission" is.		Rigsby	KF	This is an error and will be corrected. This should be a reference to the City of Seattle Council.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
249	26		Line 1: Insert "2) The second approach....		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Three main methods have been identified. Permitting process is proposed to be similar to that followed by Sound Transit. Methods will be numbered as requested.
251	26	footnote 1	The statement "Note that the Individual NPDES Construction Permit is listed as a life of the project permit. WDOE has already gone on record stating that they will issue NPDES Construction Permit for only 5 years (or until conditions change)....so this footnote is incorrect and misleading. Need to correct footnote.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Table will be modified. Thank you.
252	26	Table	Some of the MUPs--for example, the Shoreline Development Permit--could be for the life of the project. Some City legislative change might be necessary. Also, under city code language, environmentally critical area review is always a part of the permit for which it is sought--it can't be gotten separately.		Kling	KF	Confirm issue and recommended change. Second issue - ECA review - Understood - will consider how to revise the document.
254	26	table 2	SPU also has an approval involved with Construction Dewatering, prior to project submitting to King County. Modify Table 2 to reflect this. See Joy if you have questions.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Table will be modified. Thank you.
257	27	5	Revise the sentence to read "One advantage of obtaining one permit. . is a reduction in the number of appeals."		Kling	KF	Clarify - can we really say that appeals would be reduced? The thought was that if the number of permits were reduced, the opportunities to appeal would be reduced.
262	27	31	Change "CZM" to "CZMA"		Rigsby	KF	Will do, thank you.
264	27	37	Take out "variance"		Kling	KF	OK
265	27	38	Take out "will be amenable to providing" and substitute "may allow." "Updated" should be "amended."		Kling	KF	OK
273	28	1	Substitute "is currently expected" for "presumed."		Kling	KF	OK . Thank you.
274	28	1	Spell out IPT. This document needs to facilitate communications, this acronym does not facilitate communicate, just spell out what you mean.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	All project-specific acronyms will be spelled out in all locations in the document.
275	28	5	The use of any "master" or other agreement would be limited; any changes in law or procedure would require some action by the City Council. In some instances, language in an agreement could effect changes, but the agreement would have to be approved by Council.			KF	Clarify - Recommending deleting or altering?
278	28	8	Modify the last sentence in Section 3.3.2.1 to read: "The facilities (and the utilities impacted by the project) are defined essential public facilities by both state standards and city ordinances.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	OK
280	28	13	Proper term is to "enter into an agreement" or "execute an agreement"		Kling	KF	Item will be revised. Thank you.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
281	28	18	Add SPU to the list of city departments who perform concurrent review of permit submittals.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Yes. Thank you.
283	28	7	Line 7 delete ")"			KF	OK
284	28	3.1.2	Line 10, should the word consultants be Consultants?			KF	Don't believe so unless the term is used in a contract or agreement.
284	29	footnote 1	Modify footnote 1 to "An Essential Public Facility includes those facilities that are need to protect public health, and safety or are typically difficult to site, such as airports, state education facilities, state/regional transportation facilities, state/local correction facilities, solid waste facilities, wastewater and drinking water systems.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Item will be revised.
291	29	1 and 3	Substitute "required" for "issued." Batch review process needs to be better described with examples.		Kling	KF	OK
293	29	3.1.4	Line 20, what is MAP? Spell out, not listed in the acronyms. Also sentence is confusing shouldn't it read:"...WSDOT's MAP team, which is a team concept that works to coordinate agency..."			KF	MAP team will be added to the list of acronyms and the section will be revised.
296	30		Drop use of PCP, does not add value to communication, just spell it out.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	All project-specific acronyms will be spelled out in all locations in the document.
297	30	1	Landmarks. Not "landmark buildings"		Kling	KF	OK, thank you.
299	30	15	Modify line 15 to read: "...with permits previously issued, and complied with."		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Clarify request in the document's current context.
301	30	25	"Contract" environmental issues?		Kling	KF	Item will be clarified. Intended to reference the contractor requirements that relate to environmental issues.
304	31	11,12	"Responsible" used twice in one sentence.		Kling	KF	Will revise.
305	31	9	"into" design plans		Kling	KF	OK
306	31	11	Note that the Permit Core Team has the responsibility of properly incorporating mitigation measures into the permit application as part of its work; this is a larger responsibility than being a resource to the Permit Forum.		Kling	KF	That was the intent. Item will be revised to clarify.
307	31	14	Why isn't the "Environmental Compliance Team" on Figure 1 or Figure C-1? Need to be consistent, I don't understand how this all fits together.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Team should be on Figure 1 and Figure 1 is being revised.
308	31	16	Section 3.4.1, line 16, modify sentence to read: "The Environmental Compliance Team....will also participate in this permit development effort and permit compliance monitoring .		Keniston-Longrie	KF	OK
309	31	18	"into" the project plans		Kling	KF	OK

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
313	32	28, 29, note 1	Again, the team concepts seem to be confused. Perhaps it would be good to say earlier on that permit team and environmental compliance team and NEPA/SEPA team are all part of one super-team (the Environmental Team) that in turn is one of the seven teams in the IPT. Otherwise, the reader might be left with the impression that the responsibility for compliance is somehow being handed off by the project to someone else. Also, use terminology consistently. The Environmental Compliance Team is also called the Project Compliance Team.		Kling	SG with KF to correct nomenclature	Document will be revised for clarity.
319	32	32	"Project Permit Team" is not on Figure 1. What is it?		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Figure 1 and the entire document will be revised for clarity.
322	32	35	Add to the end of the sentence, "The Project Permit Team may also.....portion of the construction contract, as well as future asset owners (SCL, SPU, SDOT, WSDOT) .		Keniston-Longrie	KF	OK, thank you.
323	32	37	Substitute "a fuller understanding of the constraints and issues being addressed by the project team" or something similar for "a sense of buy-in."		Kling	KF	Item will be revised.
324	32	25-27	Who is responsible and accountable to ensure development and monitoring of "performance standards"? Clarify and clearly state in the text here.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Document will be revised to clarify.
341	33	sec 3.5.1	Line 19: Add bullet: It is essential that communications between the leads on AWVSRP as well as between WSDOT, City and FHWA will be critical to successful implementation and compliance with permits/approvals. (this needs to be emphasized as this is an area that needs improvement now).		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Document will be revised to reflect need for communication among all parties.
344	34	29	Add at the end of the sentence, "This activity will also require close coordination with the NEPA/SEPA team lead, as well as utilities lead (SPU) for impacts to city facilities/assets .		Keniston-Longrie	KF	OK. Thank you.
349	34	34-37	City (& SPU) want to review and approve contract language specific to SPU assets, so SPU needs to be part of the "Environmental Compliance Team, which is not defined in text or Figure C-1. This needs work.		Keniston-Longrie	SG	SPU was inadvertently off Figure 1 and will be included.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
353	34	8	SPU would like to get a copy of the "WSDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual" to see how it compares to City requirements. This sentence needs to be revised to ensure that City of Seattle Environmental requirements are also met.		Keniston-Longrie	SG	WSDOT's Environmental Procedures Manual is available online - on the WSDOT Environmental Services webpage. The environmental commitment file referenced in the Permit Strategy Guide is specific to federal NEPA requirements (42 USC 4371 et seq., Presidential Order 11514, 23 CFR 771.109(6), 40 CFR 1505.2(C), 1505.3, The project is developing a database to meet these requirements. No change to the sentence.
352	35		Lines 7-10: What is the difference between the "Project Compliance Team" and the "Environmental Compliance Team"?		Keniston-Longrie	KF	None. Document will be revised for consistency.
355	37	sec 5.1	Why not also include risks associated with environment and/or permitting identified in CEVP process? SPU was not involved in the identification of risks, and feel several have been left out.		Keniston-Longrie	SG	The City of Seattle provided input into the CEVP process. The risks listed here were included in that process. Others listed here were recommended by the Expert Review Panel. We will take another look at the CEVP and Expert Review Panel recommendations. Let us know ASAP if there are others we should be including.
361	37	table 3	Second row, "Method to Address": Add, "Pre-Application / Scoping meeting to define how rules will be applied."		Mirabella	KF	OK, thank you.
367	38	Table 3	Add the risk of construction errors causing a violation of an existing permit, e.g. increased CSO's as a result of a poorly installed or managed temporary system. Method to address might start with strong performance requirements, enforcement ability, contract specifications.		Patterson	KF	Will add, thank you.
374	39		Suggest developing another "Figure" which visually shows the Permit QA/QC process described in Section 5.2.1.1.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	This type of graphic may be prepared as part of the project implementation plan. This document is currently not proposed to be altered to include it.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
375	40		Is the "Permit Team Lead" the same as the "Permitting Team Manager"? It is not clear when you look at Figure 1. Consistent terminology needs to be used and Figure 1 needs to reflect this.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Yes. Document will be revised for consistency.
378	41	28	Add at end of sentence: "The Environmental Management will provide notification of completion of monitoring of the resource agency, for issues which impact City Lead (SCL or SPU) the appropriate City agency shall provide notification of completion of monitoring as required in permits. "		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Item will be revised to clarify original intent of following City and all regulatory agency protocols.
381	41	9-Aug	PERMIT CLOSEOUT: out procedures need to meet City of Seattle standards as well. Where there is conflict between City and State procedures and guidance, needs to be elevated to "Permit Strategy Team" to develop and implement approach. If "Permit Strategy Team" unable to agree, it will be elevated to PMT.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Permit Authority (line 2) includes City of Seattle. Item will be revised to add detail on conflict resolution.
382	41	17-Oct	PERMIT CLOSEOUT: FHWA and/or WSDOT do not have authority to give final acceptance on any City Asset without concurrence from City Department which will own, operate and/or maintained asset which is being accepted.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Item will be modified to clarify.
383	41	22-28	MITIGATION MONITORING: Drop acronyms, they do not add value in communicating .		Keniston-Longrie	KF	All project-specific acronyms will be spelled out in all locations in the document.
384	41	30-31	Delete the word SDOT and replace with City (for permitting issues, there may be both an SDOT, as well a utility legal staff involved).		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Clarify - currently reads as 'City'.
385	41	30-36	AS-BUILTS DRAWINGS: Timelines and timeliness of updating on-going changes to utilities will be required and are essential to protect public health and safety. Required timelines and submittals need to be developed between the City and the project.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Concur; however, it appears that this issue needs to be primarily addressed with construction staff, rather than the permitting Strategy Document. No change made.
401	45	4	Delete the words NMFS, and USFWS, as these agencies are utilizing existing agreements between the City and the Services.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	WSDOT and the City both have existing agreements and coordination is currently occurring under the WSDOT agreement. Document will be revised to add City agreement information.
402	45	5	Add the following sentence to this paragraph" "Existing agreement between the City (SPU) and the Services (NMFS & USFWS) will be used to assure adequate federal agency staffing for permitting and consultation associated with this project.		Keniston-Longrie	SG	WSDOT and the City both have existing agreements and coordination is currently occurring under the WSDOT agreement. Document will be revised to add City agreement information.

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
417	48	4 & 5	In the sentence, "The authors used....AWVSRP." Delete the word "SDOT", and insert " City " as much of SPU and SCL environmental permitting procedures and guidelines are also used as baseline.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Item will be revised.
435	11,12		Title didn't print correctly. Make sure it does when document is finalized.		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
440	37-28 - 30?	8-Jan	Line 8, anticipated misspelled			LV	Will work on
441	47-48	table 3	For Risk 1(Permit App not submitted on time), add to method of address, for permits on which SPU expresses need to be involved with, ensure SPU is involved early and consistently in the process, to ensure QA/QC as it relates to SPU assets and facilities; STATUS: disagree that teams, staff and procedures are in place. Modify to read significant progress made to ensure teams, staffing and procedures are developed.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Item will be revised to add. Thank you.
442	7 9		Use verb forms starting with "To" consistently throughout all these lists.		Kling	KF	Item will be revised.
448	Appendix A		Page 3: NPDES Municipal Stormwater General Permit Lead, delete Robert Chandler and insert Joy Keniston-Longrie; NPDES CSO Wastewater Discharge Permit, delete ? Under permit lead and insert Joy Keniston-Longrie. For both of the above insert Terry Swanson as Agency Liaison.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Will do.
449	Appendix A		Page 5: under Stormwater and Drainage Control Review; under Permit Lead, delete tbd and insert SPU		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Will do.
450	Appendix A		Page 6: Under Side Sewer Permit, delete black under Agency Liaison and insert Gavin Patterson		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Will do.
451	Appendix C		Page 7: Discharge of Construction Dewatering, delete King County and insert City of Seattle. If any construction dewatering goes through the sanitary sewer, it must first be approved by City of Seattle (SPU) prior to obtaining discharge permit from County.		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Document will be revised to reflect all agency responsibilities.
452	Appendix C		Why is the "Project Permit Team" not the same title that is Figure C-1? If the "Project Permit Team" is the same as the "Integrated Project Team Support" use the same name. Also for utilities, each utility must be a member of the "Project Permit Team", therefore, SPU and SCL being on critical path and with permits on critical path of critical path, both utilities need to be part of the "Project Permit Team".		Keniston-Longrie	SG	Will revise.
459	cover		The final report titles should be "Permit Strategy Report" not "Final Permit Strategy Report."		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
460	Fig 1		Under "Prepared by", insert Parametrix in place of Parsons Brinckerhoff.		Rigsby	LV	Will work on

No.	Page #	Line #	Comment	Comment Level	Reviewer	Responsibility	Action Taken
463	Figure 1 & Figure C-1		Delete the duplicate box stating "Design Team Lead"		Rigsby	SG	Will revise.
464	Figure 2		Both Figures need to support each other. The following teams are referred to in the document, but are not found on either of these Figures. Be sure that words and teams referred to in the report are referred to with the same names in Figure 1 and Figure C-1. Specifically: Who is "Project Permit Team" (page 32 & 33)?; "Environmental Compliance Team" is not on Figure 1 or Figure C-1, but is referred to on page 31 of report; "Project Compliance Team" is not on Figure 1 or Figure C-1, but is referred to on page 34. Please use consistent terms and reflect all teams in Figure 1 so we can all be on the same page. Also need to add under Permit Forum : City of Seattle, SPU, Side Sewer & Dewatering		Keniston-Longrie	KF	Figures will be reviewed and revised as necessary.
465	Figure C 1	23	Assumptions, item 1: This is not valid for NEPA.		Rigsby	KF	Item will be revised.
467	Figure C 1		Change "athy Fendt" to "Kathy Fendt"		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
468	General		There are a number of boxes that have missing letters in the text. For example, in Rick Conte's box. In Todd Hudak's box (and need to spell Todd's last name correct as well), in Steve Pearce's box, in Sandy's box, etc.		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
481	Table C-1		Be consistent with formatting in title of tables. Is there a dash or colon after the table number?		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
482	Table C-1		My phone number is 684-0126. Email is gavin.patterson@seattle.gov		Patterson	LV	Will work on
485	Table C-1		1) Be consistent with using all caps or title case with titles of table. 2) Need to finish adding contact info in this table, for all rows. 3) Check the row heights in this table, e.g., "Parsons" is missing from in front of "Brinckerhoff"		Rigsby	LV	Will work on
490	v		Add following acronyms: MAP; PPT; PF		Keniston-Longrie	KF	All project-specific acronyms will be spelled out everywhere in the document.
491	Various		Add "CZMA - Coast Zone management Act"		Rigsby	KF	Yes, thank you.
9			Lines 7&8, contractor should be capitalized whenever			KF	Location of comment not found. In general, will confirm correct protocol and correct if needed.

13	2	Lines 7&8, contractor should be capitalized whenever
----	---	--

		KF	Location of comment not found. In general, will confirm correct protocol and correct if needed.
--	--	----	---