

No.	Comment-	Comment Responses- Update October 19, 2011
1a	Corridor Review vs. Phased Review: Please revise the SEPA checklist to remove emphasis on "Phase 1". Although Phase 1 is likely the first to be built and is most mature in level of design completed, the SEPA checklist should be oriented at analyzing all phases equally.	<b>Comment Response:</b> The SEPA checklist has been revised to reflect only the consolidated impacts and mitigation for the entire NE 4 <sup>th</sup> Street/120 <sup>th</sup> Avenue NE Corridor Project. The construction-related, permanent and cumulative effects of the project and mitigation required to meet City land use codes and other applicable regulations will be included in the documentation in order to represent the total effects stemming from the project.
1b	SEPA Process and Project Review: Project design and engineering has progressed to an advanced level and construction permits have been submitted for two of the 5 phases. Please clarify that applications have been made with the understanding that changes may be required as a result of environmental (SEPA) review and that it is the intent of the design team to hold project level design at a point where changes to the project can be made to ensure consistency with SEPA findings.	<b>Comment Response:</b> The City has not completed design on any stage of the project. The footprint of each stage of the NE 4 <sup>th</sup> Street/120 <sup>th</sup> Avenue NE Corridor project has been established as part of this SEPA notification and the final design of all stages will incorporate all required SEPA determinations.
2a	Stream Typing and Buffers: The west tributary of Kelsey Creek should be classified as a Type F stream (LUC 20.25H.075.B.1) and should include a 50 foot buffer (LUC 20.25H.075.C.1.c). Impacts and mitigation measures taken should reflect the status as a Type F stream	<b>Comment Response:</b> The City's last stream map showed the West Tributary of Kelsey Creek as a Type N water. However, this map is outdated and has been updated to show streams with environment suitable for fish habitat such as the West Tributary in the project corridor as Type F waters. The impact and mitigation discussions in the updated SEPA now reflect this status as Type F pursuant to LUC 20.25H.075.B.2 and 20.25H.075.C.1.c.
2b	Stream Impacts: Please provide a clear site plan that includes the stream top of bank (see LUC 20.50), stream buffer, and the proposed alignment (depicted as an overlay). The site plan must demonstrate where impacts are expected with the current alignment and quantify estimated square footage of impact to the stream and stream buffer	<b>Comment Response:</b> A figure showing the stream top of bank and stream buffer overlaid by the project footprint will be included in the SEPA checklist. The square footage of impact to the stream and buffer will be tabulated separately and included in the SEPA Checklist.
2c	Stream and Stream Buffer Impact Mitigation: Please provide additional detail on how conceptual stream impact mitigation measures will comply with City of Bellevue stream mitigation preference and mitigation ratios found in LUC 20.25H.085. Please note that use of an out of basin and out of jurisdiction mitigation bank or in-lieu payment is only permitted through the preparation of a Critical Areas Report and is not considered a preferred option under LUC 20.25H.085.A. Complete mitigation details may be deferred to the point of critical areas and construction permit review, although program level details are needed at this point.	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> As outlined in the City's Land Use Code 20.25H.085, Mitigation plans for streams and stream critical area buffers shall provide mitigation for impacts to critical area functions and values in the following order of preference:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On-site through replacement of lost critical area buffer</li> <li>2. On-site, through enhancement of the function and value of remaining critical area buffer.</li> <li>3. Off-site through replacement or enhancement, in the same sub-drainage basin;</li> <li>4. Off-site, through replacement or enhancement out of the sub-drainage basin but in the same drainage basin.</li> </ol> <p>It is anticipated that the stream enhancement features currently planned to be constructed On-Site (Option #1, above) with the project will completely mitigate the stream and stream buffer impacts of the project.</p>
2d	Existing Stream Culverts: Please review and clarify the existing conditions summary for the culvert that conveys the west tributary of Kelsey Creek under 120 <sup>th</sup> Ave NE (see Fisheries, Wildlife, and Vegetation Technical Report Section 4.1.3. This section is confusing and it is unclear if there is one culvert that conveys the stream under the roadway, or two different culverts.	<b>Comment Response:</b> The previous description of the existing culverts along West Tributary to Kelsey Creek has been updated to describe the two closed culverts and manhole that currently convey the stream in the project area. One culvert carries the stream from west to east under 120 <sup>th</sup> Avenue NE from wetland D (Granger) to a manhole on the east side of the roadway. The second culvert carries the stream south from the manhole parallel to 120 <sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to an outfall into the existing stream just beyond the Safeway bakery property. Just south of the outfall, the existing stream channel turns abruptly to the east and flows away from the project.

Received

OCT 20 2011

Permit Processing

(19)

2e	<p>Proposed Culvert Improvements: Please clarify that the culvert that conveys the west tributary of Kesley Creek under 120<sup>th</sup> Ave NE is planned for replacement with a new fish passable culvert. Please also clarify if this culvert replacement will affect the entire culvert leading to a newly aligned stream channel that is day-lighted on both ends of the new culvert.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> The proposed 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE project plans include the removal and replacement of the existing two closed culverts and manhole noted above. This existing conveyance system will be replaced by two open bottom box culverts and a stretch of daylighted stream bed to convey the stream through the project area. The daylighted stream section will be constructed parallel to 120<sup>th</sup> on the east side of the roadway. A figure will be added to the SEPA checklist to illustrate how the proposed improvements will make this stretch of the stream fish-passable and will create new habitat that together will serve to fully mitigate the stream and buffer impacts of the project.</p>
2f	<p>Wetland Impacts: Please provide a clear site plan for each wetland (A-D) that includes the wetland boundary, wetland buffer, and the proposed alignment (depicted as an overlay). The site plan must demonstrate where impacts are expected with the current alignment and quantify estimated square footage of impact for each wetland.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> A figure showing the wetland and buffer boundaries overlaid by the project footprint will be included in the SEPA checklist. The square footage of impact to each wetland and buffer will be separately tabulated and included in the SEPA checklist.</p>
2.1g	<p>Wetland and Wetland Buffer Impact Mitigation: Please provide additional detail on how conceptual wetland impact mitigation measures will comply with City of Bellevue wetland mitigation preference and mitigation ratios found in LUC 20.25H.105. Please note that use of an out of basin and out of jurisdiction mitigation location is not considered a preferred option under LUC 20.25H.105.B. Complete mitigation details may be deferred to the point of critical areas and construction permit review, although program level details are needed at this point.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> A wetland and buffer mitigation approach letter report has been prepared by Shannon &amp; Wilson to summarize the specific project impacts to Wetlands A, B, C, and D and the associated wetland buffers. Information on the functions to be replaced and the ratios for replacement and commitments for mitigation consistent with City of Bellevue codes and standards will be included and/or referenced in the final SEPA document.</p>
2.2g	<p>Slope Impacts: Please provide a clear site plan for the NE 4<sup>th</sup> alignment that includes the delineated steep slope boundary, top of slope buffer, and the proposed alignment (depicted as an overlay). The site plan must demonstrate where impacts are expected with the current alignment and quantify estimated square footage of impact for the slope and associated buffer.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> A figure showing delineated steep slope and buffer boundaries and structural setbacks overlaid by the project footprint will be included in the SEPA checklist. The square footage of permanent and temporary impact to each steep slope and buffer will be separately tabulated and included in the SEPA checklist.</p>
2i	<p>Slope and Slope Buffer Impact Mitigation: Please provide additional detail on how conceptual slope impact mitigation measures will comply with City of Bellevue slope mitigation requirements found in LUC 20.25H.225.J</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> The City's mitigation strategy for steep slope and slope buffer impact mitigation is consistent with City of Bellevue steep slope performance standards found in LUC 20.25H.125. Potential mitigation meeting the requirements of LUC 20.25H.210 will be added to the SEPA checklist.</p>
	<p><b>Comment Response: TBD</b></p>	
2j	<p>Habitat Resources – Tree Removal: The primary feature driving habitat viability for many species is the structure provided by mature trees. Please clarify plans for tree removal and replanting for areas that have been identified as providing habitat, and for areas of stream and wetland buffers to be impacted. To maintain the effect of canopy succession and augment wood recruitment in areas near aquatic resources, it is recommended that all trees located within a stream or wetland buffer or within a habitat patch that are larger than 4 inches in diameter either be retained, or if removed be mitigated at an advanced ratio in an appropriate location.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> A significant tree reconnaissance letter report has been prepared by Shannon and Wilson to document tree impacts throughout the corridor and to identify mitigation required per City of Bellevue codes and standards. This information will be incorporated into the SEPA Checklist.</p>

2k	<p>Preliminary Technical Feasibility Analysis: Please prepare a preliminary program level technical feasibility analysis that follows the requirements of LUC 20.25H.055.C.2 and demonstrates that the selected alignment and identified impacts are supported through the analysis. A complete analysis of technical feasibility will be required with future critical areas and construction permit submittal. A preliminary analysis that considers impacts to streams, wetlands, slopes, buffers, and habitat features is required at this point to avoid future conflict by ensuring that the proposed alignment and identified impacts under review are consistent with applicable facilities and systems sitting requirements.</p>	<p>The NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street/120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE Corridor Project impacts “environmentally sensitive (critical) areas” as defined by the City of Bellevue’s Land Use Code (LUC) 20.25H. Allowable uses for critical areas are outlined by LUC 20.25H.055, and the NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street/120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE Corridor Project falls within the allowable use identified as “New or expanded public rights-of-way, private roads, access easements and driveways.” A <i>Critical Area Technically Feasible Alternatives Analysis Letter Report (PB 2011)</i> prepared for the NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street/120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE Corridor Project identified eight locations in the project where no alternative location or configuration outside of the critical area or critical area buffer achieves the stated project function or objective, or the cost of avoiding disturbance is substantially disproportionate as compared to the environmental impact of the proposed disturbance. These locations are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Steep Slope 1 - NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street (Stage 4)</li> <li>2. Wetland A - 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE (Stage 2 and 5)</li> <li>3. Steep Slope 2- 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE (Stage 5)</li> <li>4. Wetland B - 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE (Stage 6)</li> <li>5. Wetland C - 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE (Stage 6)</li> <li>6. Wetland D - 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE (Stage 6)</li> <li>7. Stream* - 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE (Stage 6)</li> <li>8. Habitat** - NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street/120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE Corridor Project (Stages 2, 4, 5 and 6)</li> </ol> <p>* West Tributary of Kelsey Creek                  ** Habitat associated with species of local importance (i.e. pileated woodpecker)</p> <p>Specific impacts and mitigation requirements based on City of Bellevue codes and standards for each critical area and area buffer (streams, wetlands, steep slopes and habitat associated with species of local importance) have been identified and detailed in other sections of this SEPA Checklist.</p> <p>The LUC defines sets of performance standards that must be met dealing with critical area impacts and mitigation for streams, wetlands, steep slopes and habitat associated with species of local importance. For each stage of the project where critical areas are impacted, a detailed mitigation and restoration plan based on the performance standards for each critical area impacted will be prepared in conformance with LUC 20.25H.210-225 and executed concurrent with the construction of each stage for all critical areas impacted by the stage.</p>
3a	<p>Flow Control – Flow control is identified as required in Section 5.1.2 of the Water Quality Technical Report, although there is no discussion of the actual requirement. Please clarify how flow control is applied to the project.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> The City’s use of the 40:20 rule in the development of the flow control plans is consistent with permit requirements which are also consistent with state Department of Ecology requirements.</p>
3b	<p>Water Quality Treatment - Please clarify which water quality treatment practices will be utilized. Will the entire surface (new and retrofit) be treated?</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> surface water and runoff sections have been revised in the SEPA Checklist to reflect the current City of Bellevue requirements and the drainage approach agreed upon with City staff for the project.</p>

3c	<p>Lake Bellevue – Groundwater vs. Surface Water – The project Water Quality Technical Report identifies possible impacts the groundwater (aquifer impacts) due to an increase in the quantity of impervious surface and the addition of a more effective conveyance system. Please provide additional detail on the current surface and ground water sources that support Lake Bellevue. How do these sources compare with the proposed use of bio-infiltration and natural drainage practices (LID)? Are infiltration rates estimated to be the same?</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> The new roadway is to be constructed at essentially the same grade as the existing roadway, thus the drainage of retaining walls is not expected to be any deeper than comparable facilities currently in place. Although drainage of the east-side retaining walls will be set back between 10 and 50 feet from their current alignment, further away from the lake, this is not sufficient to cause significant interception of shallow groundwater flow, were any to exist in this area.</p> <p>The available information on the groundwater régime and the presence of subsurface flows in the area suggest this scenario is unlikely. Shallow or perched groundwater does not appear to be present at the elevation of the proposed new drains, which will be installed at above the phreatic surface of the underlying body of groundwater. The deeper groundwater, which is encountered at or around lake level, is assumed to be in hydraulic continuity with Lake Bellevue so capture of this groundwater through interception by rock wall drains will not occur.</p>
3d	<p>Elevated levels of zinc and copper – impacts to fish populations. Section 5.1.2 of the Water Quality Technical Report identifies an elevated level of dissolved metals in stormwater that will flow into Kelsey and Sturtevant Creek. Both of these streams contain fish habitat and have a documented fish presence. Please clarify expected levels of dissolved metals and identify what measures are being taken to abate impacts to fish populations.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> Based on the an evaluation of current data, the City’s Biologist has not identified significant levels of dissolved metals and the Water Quality Technical report also concludes that the dissolved metals are quickly dissipated along the stream corridor.</p>
4a	<p>Sturtevant Creek Fish Presence/Absence: Please verify the point of fish presence/absence documentation in Sturtevant Creek.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> The City’s Environmental Scientists has documented that present of Sockeye and Chinook Salmon that are observed episodically in Sturtevant creek downstream on I-405. Additional documentation is available in the I-405 Corridor Report, Appendix E4, page 5-67.</p>
4b	<p>Documentation Requested: Please provide a copy of the City of Bellevue 2001 Electro-Fishing Survey.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> A copy of the 2001 Stream Typing Report is a available on the City’s web site. <a href="http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Utilities/Streamtyping_Appendix_B.pdf">http://www.bellevuewa.gov/pdf/Utilities/Streamtyping_Appendix_B.pdf</a></p> <p>Please note that there have been changes in the guidance from the State regarding the typing of streams. The City is currently reviewing each stream’s designation based on the new State standards.</p>
	<p><b>Comment Response: TBD</b></p>	
4c	<p>Treaty Rights: Please clarify if the project area is within the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe’s treaty areas.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> The Project does reside in the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe’s Treaty area as documented in the Washington Department of Transportation I-405 Corridor Report (Appendix E4, Appendix A, Appendix 11a, Appendix 11b). A Map of the Tribal area is available upon request.</p>
	<p><b>Comment Response: TBD</b></p>	
5a	<p>Inclusion of Mitigation – Best Buy Building: The alternatives report includes reliance on mitigation measures in alternatives 8, 9, and 10. The report identifies a preference for alternatives 8 and 9 and suggests mitigation measures will be included in the design of the selected NE 4<sup>th</sup> alignment. Are the mitigation measures identified with alternative 9 in the alternatives report included in the project? If so, please provide details of the mitigation effort and how it will be implemented with Phase 3 (NE 4<sup>th</sup> extension).</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> The SEPA checklist has been updated to include the proposed mitigation measures identified with Alternative 9 in the Alternatives Evaluation and Screening Technical Report. The mitigation measures include several different options depending on the property negotiation with Best Buy, The Principal Group, Mutual Materials and the School District:</p> <p><b>Option 1–</b> Modification to the existing Best Buy building with approximate 10,500sf removed, reconstruction of approximate 10,500sf of the Best Buy building to the north of existing building by purchasing a southern Mutual Material parcel, modification to the loading dock and replacement of impacted parking stalls on a new parking area to the north of the building.</p> <p><b>Option 2 -</b> Modification to the existing Best Buy building with approximate 10,500sf removed, relocation of the loading dock to the north of the existing building by purchasing a portion of Mutual Material southern parcel, and reconfiguration of the parking area within the existing Best Buy parking lot.</p>

5b	<p>Inclusion of Mitigation – NE 5<sup>th</sup> Traffic Abatement: A program intended to reduce cut through traffic on NE 5<sup>th</sup> has been referenced in documentation submitted. Please indicate the status of the NE 5<sup>th</sup> Street traffic mitigation program. Is this program being considered as mitigation for the NE 4<sup>th</sup> extension? If so, more detail may need to be included.</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> The SEPA Checklist will be updated to include discussion of potential NE 5<sup>th</sup> Street mitigation. Mitigation is being considered for potential neighborhood cut-through traffic with the extension of NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street. Mitigation measures are to be determined by a Traffic Committee consisting of representatives from neighborhoods potentially impacted by cut-through traffic. Details of specific mitigation are being worked out by the Traffic Committee and City of Bellevue Neighborhood Services Division. Proposed construction phasing is anticipated as follows: 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE - Stage 1; 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE - Stage 2; NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street - Stages 3 and 4; 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE - Stage 5; and 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE - Stage 6. The NE 5<sup>th</sup> Street mitigation is expected to be constructed along with NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street – Stage 4.</p>
	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> TBD</p>	
5c	<p>NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street Vs. NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street: Please clarify why NE 6<sup>th</sup> and NE 4<sup>th</sup> are noncomparable corridors to provide an east/west connection (difference in function – i.e. what value the connection provides). Please also provide a summary of any planned expansions within the NE 6<sup>th</sup> corridor</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street will be a HOV/Transit/Non-motorized connection across I-405 with connection to I-405 Express Toll Lanes. NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street is currently funded only for conceptual design (approximately 5%) to investigate alternatives for a 2-lane or a 4-lane roadway section, plus a 14-foot or 16-foot non-motorized facility separated by a 6-foot planter with either alternative. NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street is proposed to be a bridge structure from its current terminus at the center of I-405 to the BNSF Corridor. Preliminary estimates range from \$70 million to \$94 million. Given current economic climate, future funding for this facility has not been programmed nor determined.</p>
	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> TBD</p>	
6a	<p>With additional vehicles utilizing the 120<sup>th</sup> Ave NE corridor, an increase in the intensity of albedo from vehicles may be a factor. Has analysis of albedo been completed to date? What mitigation measures intended to reduce albedo are anticipated (i.e. landscaping)?</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> Glare from vehicle headlights and street lighting within the improvement is expected to be similar to existing conditions and consistent with urban development adjacent to the arterial streets improvements. Typically lighting is contained within the roadway prism, and would be further dispersed with comprehensive corridor landscaping, retaining walls and vehicle barriers.</p>
7a	<p>Vibration and Lake Bellevue Pile Supported Structures: Please verify that impacts to Lake Bellevue pile supported structures were considered within the Noise and Vibration Technical Report. Please summarize potential impacts to these types of structures and what measures will be taken to minimize vibration in Phase 2 of the Project</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> The following additional information has been added to the SEPA Checklist:</p> <p><b>Section 5.1.4 Existing Lake Bellevue pile supported structures that were permitted and constructed in the area should have been designed and constructed to address specific requirements for the stability of the structures. No structural review of the existing Lake Bellevue pile supported structures will be made to determine their adequacy relative to existing conditions. The City’s corridor project does not propose to modify or directly affect Lake Bellevue pile supported structures, which are located about 150 feet from the limits of construction.</b></p> <p><b>Section 5.4.4 Pile driving is not recommended for construction of the proposed project improvements between NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street and NE 12<sup>th</sup> Street. The final method of construction for the proposed retaining walls will evaluate the best method of construction for the type of wall required to minimize vibration and settlement, which may include drilled and/or drilled and cased shaft construction. Where shaft construction is recommended, casings may also be recommended to minimize risk of caving of loose soils or settlement immediately adjacent to the shafts. Monitoring points could be established to assess to what extent settlement occurred, if any, that can be attributed to construction of the improvements. Monitoring and the specific monitoring points will be implemented as needed based on the final design and method of construction proposed.</b></p>
7b	<p>Access During Construction: Please clarify how access during construction will be Managed for each Phase. Will final project plans include an private property access plan to be implemented during construction?</p>	<p><b>Comment Response:</b> Local access and circulation will be maintained during construction of the improvements. The number of travel lanes may be reduced to address project construction requirements, which may be further modified to reflect the type and method of work required or other critical needs to lessen further potential impact to access or circulation. Emergency vehicle access will be maintained at all times. The details of the final Traffic Management Plan will be developed as required for a Right-of-Way Use Permit. Further access conditions as agreed to through property commitments will be reflected in the contract requirements.</p>

8a	Lake Bellevue Community Access: Please compare expected delays at the new signalized intersection that will provide access to Lake Bellevue businesses and residents with existing conditions. Are delays due to light timing expected to increase with project implementation?	<b>Comment Response: Delay for vehicles turning left from the Lake Bellevue driveway with the project in 2030 will experience inordinate delay without the construction of a traffic signal at this location. Average vehicle delay without a signal would be &gt;300 seconds per vehicle and approximately 50 seconds per vehicle with a signal in the PM peak hour.</b>
8b	Staged Construction: The corridor project includes five phases that could be built as individual projects dependent on funding. Please clarify how each of the five phases may be built independently of each other without negatively impacting the Transportation network. Has each phase been designed to be forward compatible with the other phases? What interim measures are required to avoid negative impacts?	<b>Comment Response: As described in the Alternatives Evaluation and Screening Technical Report, the alignment of the corridor improvements and logical phasing have been developed to address forward compatibility and further allow for staged implementation. Staged implementation allows for further mitigation of impacts to the traveling public by allowing improvements to be completed before advancing to later stages. This approach will support efforts to manage traffic access and circulation, and to lessen potential impact.</b>
8c	Funding and Mobilization: Please clarify what the status of each of the phases is with funding and level of design. Are any of the phases at full design?	<b>Comment Response: City Council has noted these projects to be high priority transportation infrastructure and directed staff to move forward with project implementation. No stage is at full design at this time.  City Council is reviewing budget and revenue forecasts through the end of 2011.</b>
8d	Coordination with East Link: Please clarify if how coordination with the East Link project has been approached. Is there ongoing cross-project coordination? If so, how has this coordination influenced the project alignment?	<b>Comment Response: Please read the attached summary.  <u>Alternatives Evaluation and Screening Technical Report, Chapter 6.0 Alternative Selection - Errata:</u>  6.1 Overview of Proposed Improvements:  As provided in section 6.1 Overview of Proposed improvements, the roadway alignment of 120<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, in proximity of NE 15<sup>th</sup> St, reflects a preferred horizontal alignment, and further, vertical alignment reflecting Sound Transit's East Link light rail project D2A preferred alignment. Sound Transits D2A preferred alignment recommended a retained cut (undercrossing) of 120<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. In July 2011, Sound Transit released their Final Environmental Impact Statement and Appendices, which includes both a retained-cut and at-grade alternative. Both alternatives can be found in Appendix G1, and drawings D2AB-KP01 (Retained Cut) and D2AA-KP01 (At-Grade) of the FEIS. As provided in Sound Transit comment responses regarding coordination of their East Link Project and Bel-Red Arterial Streets, including 120<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, Sound Transit provided the following response:  "Response to Comment ELS542-12 Sound Transit has coordinated with the City's Bel-Red corridor planning staff and will continue to do so during final design."  The final Sound Transit Board decision will determine what vertical alignment may be adopted and will be implemented. The final design of 120<sup>th</sup> Ave NE will reflect a coordinated design.</b>