

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
6	General				There is no analysis of consistency with city policy for the new alignment alternatives as there was in the DEIS.	City of Bellevue	Planning
7	General				In addition, as stated in our comments on the DEIS, the SDEIS contains insufficient analysis of the alternatives' consistency with local codes, including shorelines, critical areas and essential public facility requirements. The FEIS should include an identification of the permit processes applicable to East Link.	City of Bellevue	Planning
8	General				Mitigation measures should include discussion of phasing construction and other techniques to minimize traffic and property access impacts, especially in the downtown.	City of Bellevue	Planning
9	ES				Comparison of buffer impact without discussion of wetland impacts does not provide sufficient information regarding segment B alternatives.	City of Bellevue	Development Services
10	E.S.	ES-10			Transportation impacts paragraph--Closing SE 15th St access to Bellefield Office park would close off access to the Bellefield Pump Station that currently exists, and if the relocated station remains on the east side of 112th Ave SE then this would cut off access completely from 112th Ave SE.	City of Bellevue	Utilities
11	ES	12			Wetland delineation referenced here and used for impact calculations is only an estimate given that wetland delineation and typing report has not be submitted to City or USACE.	City of Bellevue	Development Services

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
12	ES	ES-13 to ES-18		Maps	On these maps showing downtown Bellevue alignments, NE 10th St should be shown continuing from 112th Ave NE to 116th Ave NE over I-405, this was completed in 2009 (refer to page D-4, Table D-1)	City of Bellevue	Transportation
13	ES	ES-19			120th Station location - should be north of NE 15th St rather than 15th/16th Streets NE	City of Bellevue	Transportation
14	Exec. Sum	ES-19		Map	On this map and all other maps and exhibits of Segment D where streams are shown, the alignment of Goff Creek between NE 16th Street and Bel-Red Road is incorrect.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
15	Exec. Sum	ES-19		Map	On this map and all other maps and exhibits of Segment D where streams are shown, the alignment of the Unnamed Tributary of Kelsey Creek between 136th Place NE and Bel-Red Road is incorrect.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
16	Exec. Sum	ES-21			134th/16th noted as right-in, right-out - inconsistent with City plans which call for a signalized four-way intersection.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
17	2.1.2 Alternatives Eliminated	2-2	21		States that ST did not carry forward for further study a Bellevue proposed B7 alternative with a NE 2nd tunnel portal "because of issues of higher cost, high construction risk, and engineering feasibility issues." Which of these risks and/or issues were identified with a NE 2nd portal compared to a Main St. portal? Include additional NE 2nd St portal analysis in the FEIS.	City of Bellevue	Planning

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
18	2.1.3	2-2			Several references that Hospital Station or beyond could be an "interim station." This implies the station is temporary. Is the intent that the station would be permanent but function as an "interim <i>terminus</i> ?"	City of Bellevue	Planning
19	Ch. 2	2-7 to 2-9 2-12 2-19		2-6 to 2-9 2-13 2-20 to 2-23	On maps showing downtown Bellevue alignments, NE 10th St should be shown continuing from 112th Ave NE to 116th Ave NE over I-405, this was completed in 2009 (see page D-4, Table D-1)	City of Bellevue	Transportation
20	Ch. 2	2-10			In discussion of D2A at-grade design option it should also be stated that the alignment would be elevated over 124th Ave NE in addition to the at-grade crossing at 120th Ave NE	City of Bellevue	Transportation
21	2.9.2 3.2.4	2-16 3-28			Part of cost increase for B-7 is due to displacement of self-storage project on 118th. DEIS assumed partial acquisition but SDEIS assumes full acquisition of the property - was there any evaluation of the ability to acquire a portion of the property to reduce costs?	City of Bellevue	Planning
22	2.10	2-17			2nd paragraph, 3rd sentence, modify the sentence as "Construction would require temporary roadway and lane closures, relocation of existing underground utilities , permanent property..."	City of Bellevue	Utilities
23	2-10	2-18			2nd paragraph "For Preferred Alternative B2M"--the 35' construction easement to the east of the existing right-of-way would fully encompass the Bellefield Pump Station which requires COB access at all times during construction.	City of Bellevue	Utilities

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
24	2.10	2-18			"Final construction traffic plans would be determined with the City of Bellevue prior to construction." Mitigation should also involve City of Bellevue in determining location of staging areas prior to construction.	City of Bellevue	Planning
25	2	2-18			B2M construction easement description apply to entire length of B2M alignment? Why so extensive?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
26	Chap 3 and Appendix H				Bellevue's adopted ped/bike plan calls for a 10 to 14-foot off-street path along the entire length of the BNSF right of way within Bellevue (Project O-104). It is not clear whether East Link's use of the BNSF right of way can be achieved without excessive conflict with the planned path.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
27	Chap 3 and Appendix H				Bellevue's adopted ped/bike plan calls for a 10 to 14-foot off-street path along 112th Ave SE and Bellevue Way from SE 8th St to the I-90 trail (Project O-131-E). Compliance with this project is not clear in the SDEIS or Appendix H.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
28	3	3-3			In the discussion of the Peer Review Panel and the findings of the Concept Design Report, there are references to delay and vehicle travel time averaged throughout downtown Bellevue. While the Downtown average traffic congestion may show minor differences between at-grade and grade-separated alternatives, it is important to note that in the southeast quadrant of Downtown, where at-grade light rail intersects with the surface streets, there is considerable impact to level of service that can be attributed to light rail.	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
29	3	3-3			It should be noted that the peer review panel also had local experts, in addition to those from out of town who are mentioned.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
30	3	3-11			B2M-C11A at SE 15th is described as closing SE 15th. The drawings (B2M2-KP05) show right-in/right-out. Text should be updated to reflect drawings. Do not assume SE 15th could be closed without more detailed simulation model and discussion with City regarding fire, emergency, other access impacts to the parcel. Also, permit conditions would need to be reviewed.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
31	3	3-11			B2M-C9T text describes closing SE 15th Street. Drawings show open with a signal. Revise text to match. Do not assume SE 15th could be closed without more detailed simulation model and discussion with City regarding fire, emergency, other access impacts to the parcel. Also, permit conditions would need to be reviewed.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
32	3.2.2	3-11 3-31			Spillover and hide-and-ride parking impacts for Surrey Downs Park caused by the SE 8th Station were not analyzed in the DEIS (3.6.3.4, pg. 3-69) or SDEIS. There are likely impacts that will have an ongoing operational impact.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
33	3.2.2	3-11, 3-12			On 3-11, paragraph beginning "Along 112th Avenue SE, the connection..."--if the approach to Bellefield Office Park were closed at SE 15th St, this would close off the 112th Ave SE access to the Bellefield Pump Station. An alternative means of accessing the existing pump station (and proposed relocated station) would need to be provided. on 3-12, paragraph beginning "For the Preferred Alternative B2M..." it also references the closure of SE 15th St.	City of Bellevue	Utilities
34	3	3-13			Closure of one lane of Bellevue Way and/or 112th for the entire construction period would not be acceptable to the City. Further analysis and discussion of potential construction impacts is needed, and ultimately a construction agreement	City of Bellevue	Transportation
35	3	3-13			Cut-through traffic: Further analysis and discussion of potential construction impacts is needed to determine the likelihood and extent of traffic diversion and appropriate solutions.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
36	3	3-13			Phased construction of the s. Bellevue P&R would be problematic. Further analysis and discussion of potential construction impacts is needed, and ultimately a construction agreement	City of Bellevue	Transportation
37	3.2.2	3-14			B2M is not given the same level of Visual and Aesthetic Resource analysis as DEIS alternatives. DEIS Technical Appendix F4.5 offers detailed analysis of each KOP. SDEIS analysis of B2M should be brought to the level as the DEIS alternatives.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
38	3.2.2	3-14			Visual impacts and all KOPs along Bellevue Way are directed east. This does not provide a sufficient analysis of visual impacts from the park to the west. Such analysis and KOPs should be included.	City of Bellevue	Parks
39	3.2.2	3-14			Visual effects of South Bellevue parking garage are not fully described or mitigated. Garage and station represent a tall structure where none currently exist. There is a potential for visual and noise impacts to residences on west side of Bellevue Way. The garage will also be a visually imposing structure for trail users in the Slough. Mitigation to isolate the lighting onto the site and to soften the bulk and mass of the structures should be described. Vegetative screening around the structure should also be considered to mitigate impacts.	City of Bellevue	Planning
40	3.2.2	3-14			The 6' tall black vinyl fence on top of a 2' retaining wall along Bellevue Way will be subject to design review but likely would not meet city standards for fencing and screening along Bellevue Way.	City of Bellevue	Planning
41	3.2.2	3-14			Bottom of page (2nd column) appears to be missing text. Text that is there indicates no change in the visual quality. This statement minimizes the visual impacts of the project from removing a substantial amount of vegetation, including many mature trees, adding an elevated structure and fencing and guardrails compared to the existing condition of mature trees, substantial vegetation and landscape screens and a wood, split-rail fence. The conclusion of no change in visual quality is not supported.	City of Bellevue	Planning

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
42	3.2.2	3-15			Claiming that Bellevue Way north of the park and rides remains 'high' visual quality inconsistent with DEIS. DEIS analysis (F4.5-5) for B2A KOP 5 shows decreasing visual quality due to structure transitioning from elevated to at-grade, which is similar in nature and location to B2M - both occurring within the 'high' quality reach of Bellevue Way.	City of Bellevue	Parks
43	3.2.2	3-15			Including visual quality analysis of B2M from the view of sensitive users of the Mercer Slough Water Trail is appreciated - however the determination that B2M will not change the visual quality is not supported.	City of Bellevue	Parks
44	3.2.2	3-16			Noise and Vibration section should analyze possible impacts to interior, noise sensitive (Cat 3) areas of the park due to the SE 30th crossover and bells entering and exiting the South Bellevue Station. Exhibit 3-1 indicates that bell impacts above FTA thresholds may extend several hundred feet into the park.	City of Bellevue	Parks
45	3.2.2	3-16			Train bells, gate bells and crossovers along 112th at SE 15th are not analyzed for noise impacts to the Mercer Slough Water Trail, which may be noise sensitive as described in the FTA manual as a "haven from the noise and rapid pace of everyday city life."	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
46	3.2.2	3-16			Some sections indicate train bells are sounded once as train leaves the station. Other sections indicate train bells are sounded as trains leave and enter stations. Clarify and confirm when the bells are sounded, the duration and noise impacts of those occurrences and how that can be mitigated.	City of Bellevue	Planning
47	3.2.2	3-16			Identify which residences west of SE 8th intersection would have residual exterior noise impacts and the source and level of those impacts.	City of Bellevue	Planning
48	3.2.2	3-18			Noise and vibration mitigation measures to the west, into the park, should be re-considered based on additional analysis of impacts to noise and vibration sensitive uses located to the west.	City of Bellevue	Parks
49	3	3-19			What constitutes a temporary vs. permanent impact? The City has been advised that anything over a year is a permanent wetland impact	City of Bellevue	Transportation
50	3	3-19			Operation: Groundwater to Mercer Slough - sealing the retained cut does not necessarily mean that the groundwater will flow in similar patterns to existing flow conditions. They need to engineer even flow across the cut.	City of Bellevue	Utilities
51	3	3-19			Replacing blackberries with native plants at 112th and the West Channel of Mercer Slough will improve diversity. However, the reduction in buffer width in a narrow buffer already makes it questionable that this will be an overall improvement.	City of Bellevue	Utilities

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
52	3	3-19			Construction: extending storm pipes with drop structure. Will that be a full 4.5 ft drop? What will this mean for maintenance? Who will be responsible? What is the outfall pipe gradient?	City of Bellevue	Utilities
53	3	3-19			Wetland impacts estimate only and dependent on degree to which temporary impacts persist for more than one growing season. Not clear that impacts reflect necessary access mitigation for Parks facilities	City of Bellevue	Development Services
54	3	3-19			The removal of so much wetland buffer, especially of the stand age reflected here is likely to have a measurable impact on bird species especially. Mitigation not feasible in same location	City of Bellevue	Development Services
55	3	3-19			Use of pipe in open channel of Type F stream requires "no technically feasible alternative" analysis under City's critical areas code.	City of Bellevue	Development Services
56	3.2.2	3-19, 3-24			The permanent and temporary acreage totals should include vacant right-of-way within the park boundary. Per Section 4(f), these areas are protected park land and should be included in the calculations	City of Bellevue	Parks
57	3.2.2	3-19			Winters House serves as more than just offices of Eastside Heritage Center. The house includes office space for Bellevue Parks staff, hosts community events and programs as well as the historical archive of the EHC. It is also a key part of the Heritage Loop Trail, offering historical interpretation and facilities for park trail users.	City of Bellevue	Parks
58	Chap 3	3-19 to 3-24			Winters House discussion makes no mention of the need to preserve the number of existing parking spaces.	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
59	3.2.2	3-21			It is not accurate to claim the existing landscaping "does not in any way reflect the house's original landscape." Beside viewing a limited number of photographs, this statement is not adequately researched. Further, the landscaping today remains similar to the landscape in 1991, when the 50-foot buffer was proposed and approved. With no significant change since 1991 the reasons for including that area 50-feet around the house in 1991 remain valid today.	City of Bellevue	Parks
60	3.2.2	3-21			Historic and Archeologic Resources section does not disclose or analyze impacts of the reconstructed parking lot and associated retaining walls and ramps that fall within the 50' historic boundary of the house.	City of Bellevue	Parks
61	3.2.2	3-23			"The roadway would be the same distance from the house." This is technically accurate but misleading, as Exhibit 3-9 shows the sidewalk moving approximately 5 feet closer to the house due to the new proposed sidewalk.	City of Bellevue	Parks
62	3.2.2	3-23			By not disclosing or analyzing the impacts of the increased paved areas and reconstructed parking lot within the 50-foot area of significance, it is not accurate to claim no impacts to the existing landscape.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
63	3.2.2	3-23			"EHC offices would be temporarily relocated" due to closure of Winter House during construction. How would other activities within Winters House be mitigated during closure (City office space, event rentals, trail facilities, EHC/City programs, EHC archive space, etc.)	City of Bellevue	Parks
64	3	3-23			If B2M is selected as the preferred alternative, a more refined study of construction vibration at the Winters House should be conducted to ensure the methods for both construction and operation do not put this historic house at risk.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
65	3	3-23			Ground-borne noise impacts have been identified at the Winters House with operation. Analysis concludes that a floating slab would eliminate the impact. Need firm commitment from Sound Transit in FEIS that impact will be mitigated, which appears to mean a commitment to using a floating slab.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
66	3.2.2	3-24			The second paragraph under Parks and Open Space should include upland habitat, fruit and vegetable produce sales and trailered boat launch in the list of activities, features and attributes of the park.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
67	3.2.2	3-24			"The acquisition area would be less than 1 percent of the park." Mercer Slough Nature Park is highly constrained by wetland and most park features and attributes must be located at the edge of the park within the upland wetland buffer. B2M occupies or isolates much of the upland wetland buffer along Bellevue Way, which creates an impact much higher than 1 percent. A ratio comparing the project use of developable upland area to the total developable upland area of the park may be a more accurate comparison.	City of Bellevue	Parks
68	3.2.2	3-26			"Access to the Sweylocken Boat Ramp... would not be affected." Access will be limited to right-in/right-out with no u-turn to the south - a degraded level of access from current conditions since vehicles will only have entrance access coming from I-90.	City of Bellevue	Parks
69	3.2.2	3-26			"B2M would not substantially affect park use, the park's features, activities and attributes, or diminish the park's value." This is not an accurate statement. B2M does substantially affect the park. However, an appropriate combination of impact minimization and mitigation may serve to reduce impacts.	City of Bellevue	Parks
70	3.2.2	3-26			The Construction section is unclear as to whether public access will be maintained to the blueberry fields, or whether access will be limited to maintenance only.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
71	3.2.2	3-26			Parking for park access would be severely constrained during construction with loss of the Winters House lot, the park parking at South Bellevue Park & Ride and potentially the blueberry farm. Accommodation for park user parking will be necessary to decrease impacts to the park activities during construction.	City of Bellevue	Parks
72	3.2.2	3-26			In paragraph that begins "Utility relocation and light rail construction...", what utility relocation is being described here that is of particular note to mention in this paragraph? In other words, there are anticipated utility relocations throughout the project. Provide more detail.	City of Bellevue	Utilities
73	3.2.2	3-26			As an alternative to relocating the farm stand operation during construction, was phased construction explored that would allow existing access to remain while the new access is being built?	City of Bellevue	Planning
74	3	3-28			Changes to B7 since the DEIS also include Transportation (I-405/SE 8th interchange and vicinity) and justify a new traffic analysis.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
75	3	3-31			SDEIS traffic analysis does not reflect the more detailed and accurate work done by Bellevue and Sound Transit. The SDEIS information draws different conclusions, based on crude information. The Winter 2010 VISSIM analysis needs to be included	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
76	3.3.2	3-31			"The north driveway to Surrey Downs Park would be closed." There is no discussion of the impacts expected to the south driveway. Will right-in, right-out only be necessary, or gates due to rail transitioning from median to west side at this location? The driveway is narrow and constrained under existing conditions. Design improvements are needed if the north driveway is closed.	City of Bellevue	Parks
77	3.3.2 3.3.3 3.3.4	3-31 3-44 3-51			Need additional discussion of temporary parking displacement impacts and how those would be mitigated	City of Bellevue	Planning
78	3	3-32			In the Traffic Safety section - the mid-block pedestrian crossing on 108th Avenue NE is installed.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
79	3	3-33			The Mitigation section makes it sound like at-grade operations have only an incidental impact on downtown Bellevue traffic. While averaged over the entire Downtown area, this may be true, but in the area where at-grade LRT would operate, the impacts to intersection LOS are significant.	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
80	3	3-33			For alternative C11A, construction would also mean the temporary relocation of the Bellevue Transit Center. The construction of the C9T cut-and-cover tunnel will require a significant level of coordination between the City and Sound Transit. As the engineering on the project proceeds and the design becomes more refined, the City and Sound Transit will need to develop construction and mitigation agreements that address the phasing and management of the construction as well as more specific mitigation.		
81	3.3.2	3-34			Use of the acquired properties along 112th and Main for storage of equipment, building and excavation materials is in conflict with Comprehensive Plan policy TR-75.35, "...Construction staging areas should not be located in residential neighborhoods except where no practicable alternative exists." Although construction will need to occur in these areas, the other staging activities should be relocated away from residential areas.	City of Bellevue	Planning
82	3	3-35			When referring to the proposed station at 108th, use Avenue and not Street, as in 108th Avenue NE	City of Bellevue	Transportation
83	3.3.2	3-35			Visual effects of removing vegetation along 112th should be addressed through a landscaping plan that includes revegetation of existing areas, where feasible, and additional landscaped areas to offset losses. This comment applies to all other areas where existing landscaping is removed.	City of Bellevue	Planning

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
84	3.3.2	3-35			Consistency with Comprehensive Plan policy S-DT-125 will depend on the design and function of the lineal space created between the light rail and the neighborhood.	City of Bellevue	Planning
85	3.3.2	3-35			Visual impacts of the elevated structure rounding the corner of 112th/Main is not discussed in this section of the SDEIS. Previous comments in the DEIS about an elevated, curved structure at this location still apply.	City of Bellevue	Planning
86	3.3.2	3-35			There is a reference to noise from crossing gates at SE 6th - previous information indicated that there would be no need for crossing gates at SE 6th. Please confirm or clarify.	City of Bellevue	Planning
87	3	3-36			Surrey Downs Park was listed as a non-sensitive "recreational" use and therefore was not studied for impact. FTA considers Parks a special case. Additional consideration should be given to the noise sensitivity of Surrey Downs Park in consultation with the City and appropriate mitigation identified.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
88	3	3-36			KOP 5 should show NE 6th Street and 110th Avenue NE not SE 6th St and 110th Ave SE	City of Bellevue	Transportation
89	3	3-36			In the Noise and Vibration section: At-grade crossing in C11A would also occur at 110th Avenue NE and NE 6th Street	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
90	3.3.2	3-36			Inconsistent noise analysis for C11A to include Bellevue Club and Hilton hotel outdoor active recreation facilities (Appendix G) as noise sensitive outdoor uses, but specifically exclude outdoor recreation uses at Surrey Downs Park from similar analysis and mitigation. FTA noise guidance does not distinguish between privately-owned and publicly-owned recreation facilities. Further, Surrey Downs Park includes passive recreation areas, which, per FTA guidance are more noise sensitive than active recreation areas (see FTA Guide Section 3.2.1).	City of Bellevue	Parks
91	3.3.2	3-36			Noise impacts from C11A at-grade crossings and bells should be analyzed adjacent to the passive recreation areas (current and planned) at Surrey Downs Park.	City of Bellevue	Parks
92	3.3.2	3-36			Mitigation for noise and vibration impacts should include a monitoring period of at least 2 years with a commitment to address impacts above FTA and/or city levels. This should include establishing base levels at multiple locations along the alignment.	City of Bellevue	Planning
93	3.3.2	3-37			External noise impacts are identified for 72 multi-family units. The location of the units should be identified and analyzed for potential outdoor use of balconies, plazas or other common areas.	City of Bellevue	Planning
94	3	3-37			Last Mitigation bullet: should be south of NE 12th Street not NE 112th Street	City of Bellevue	Transportation
95	3.3.2	3-43			More analysis of C11A is necessary to determine temporary impacts to Surrey Downs Park.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
96	3	3-44			SDEIS traffic analysis does not reflect the more detailed and accurate work done by Bellevue and Sound Transit. The SDEIS information draws different conclusions, based on crude information. The Winter 2010 VISSIM analysis needs to be included	City of Bellevue	Transportation
97	3.3.3	3-44			Upon what traffic data analysis or LOS data was it determined that realigning SE 4th to SE 6th was necessary? No analysis of need is provided in the SDEIS, nor are consideration of alternatives that may result in less impact such as using the existing right-of-way at 111th PI SE and 112th Ave SE just south of the park.	City of Bellevue	Parks
98	3.3.3	3-44			In paragraph entitled "Construction", modify the second sentence to include "...in the 2008 draft EIS, including extensive utility relocations and maintenance of temporary services , detour routes, ..."	City of Bellevue	Utilities
99	3.3.3	3-44			Would pedestrian gates at SE 6th include bells?	City of Bellevue	Planning
100	3.3.3	3-44			The pedestrian-only phase for the light at NE 6th/110th is not assumed in Bellevue traffic models.	City of Bellevue	Planning

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
101	3.3.3	3-47			Inconsistent noise analysis for C9T to include Bellevue Club and Hilton hotel outdoor active recreation facilities (Appendix G) as noise sensitive outdoor uses, but specifically exclude outdoor recreation uses at Surrey Downs Park from similar analysis and mitigation. FTA noise guidance does not distinguish between privately-owned and publicly-owned recreation facilities. Further, Surrey Downs Park includes passive recreation areas, which, per FTA guidance are more noise sensitive than active recreation areas (see FTA Guide Section 3.2.1).	City of Bellevue	Parks
102	3.3.3	3-47			Noise impacts from C9T at-grade crossings and bells should be analyzed adjacent to the passive recreation areas (current and planned) at Surrey Downs Park.	City of Bellevue	Parks
103	3.3.3	3-47			C9T is <u>elevated</u> (as noted 2 paragraphs later) in front of Meydenbauer Center. The SDEIS should include a similar discussion of these impacts as for the C11A.	City of Bellevue	Planning
104	3.3.3	3-49			The discussion of C9T impacts to Surrey Downs park does not fully disclose impacts to the building containing the court, nor propose mitigation for the impact.	City of Bellevue	Parks
105	3.3.3	3-50			More analysis of C9T is necessary to determine temporary impacts to Surrey Downs Park.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
106	3.3.3	3-50			Proposing a linear park or open space along 112th as mitigation for park impacts to Surrey Downs Park needs further discussion. The SDEIS claims that this space can be used for a visual buffer of open space for the neighboring properties and in other areas claims it can be developed as a pedestrian trail facility. It is unclear whether pedestrian access can be provided at the north edge of the park where the re-aligned road and light rail facility are adjacent. It is also questionable whether heavily planted open space or a linear pedestrian trail is equal to the parking, building space and gardens that will be impacted at the park.	City of Bellevue	Parks
107	3.3.4 3.3.5	3-50 3-55			See previous comments on impacts and mitigation for C11A and C9T that also apply to C9A and C14E.	City of Bellevue	Planning
108	3	3-51			SDEIS traffic analysis does not reflect the more detailed and accurate work done by Bellevue and Sound Transit. The SDEIS information draws different conclusions, based on crude information. The Winter 2010 VISSIM analysis needs to be included	City of Bellevue	Transportation
109	3	3-57			If the tent structures are removed to preserve views then what weather protection would be provided? Would the substitute also block views?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
110	3	3-58			Ridership numbers vary little from the DEIS, despite apparently accounting for significant planned growth. Raises questions about the quality of the forecasts	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
111	3	3-59			D2A Overlake Village Station would also be further from the Overlake Urban Center and would provide lower quality access to the south and west	City of Bellevue	Transportation
112	Ch. 3	3-59			Discussion of City of Bellevue plans to extend NE 15th/16th Street between 116th Ave NE and 132nd Ave NE but drawings (D2AB-KP03 & BGCB-AS01) in Appendix H do not show this	City of Bellevue	Transportation
113	Ch. 3	3-59, 3-60			States that center alignment along NE 16th Street would have signalized crossings at 130th Ave NE, 132nd Ave NE and 136th PI NE. The Bel-Red Subarea plan includes 134th Ave NE as a through north-south street that crosses the light rail guideway and should be signalized	City of Bellevue	Transportation
114	3	3-61			In the economics section there is a discussion of the concept of TOD near light rail stations. Yet the planned surface park and ride is in the center of the TOD node at the 130th Ave NE Station - eliminating the economic development potential of that site in favor of parking cars. Parking may generate some ridership but probably not as much ridership as a high density mixed use development would on that site.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
115	3	3-62			Mitigation for the impacts of putting the Unnamed Tributary in a pipe should be proposed to be implemented in the Goff Creek corridor between NE 20th Street and Bel-Red Road.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
116	3	3-62			Providing a fish passable culvert for Goff Creek under the alignment on NE 16th Street should not be considered "mitigation" - it would be a permit requirement.	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
117	3.4.2	3-62			In paragraph that begins "Near 136th Place NE..." the maximum length of a storm pipe or culvert is 400 feet per COB Standards. Also, it will need to be determined whether or not placing this unnamed tributary into a culvert pipe is part of the overall stream plan for the Bel-Red area; under the "Mitigation" paragraph it looks like this is addressed.	City of Bellevue	Utilities
118	3.4.2	3-62		3-23	Noise and vibration section claims no nearby sensitive properties; however, the exhibit indicates that a track switch for the storage track could extend south of NE 12th, very near the Lake Bellevue Condos. Noise impacts for the storage track and related switches should be addressed.	City of Bellevue	Planning
119	3	62			Ecosystems: D3 alignment avoid the regional pond wetland facility, but D2A now impacts both the regional pond area and buffer. This could impact the control structure, operations & maintenance of the facility, and restoration of the wetland.	City of Bellevue	Utilities
120	3	62			Impacts to the regional detention facility should be avoided. Sound Transit will need to mitigate any loss of stormwater detention capacity. <i>(Refer also to Sheet No. D-3/Dwg No. D2AB-KP02--JFH)</i>	City of Bellevue	Utilities
121	3	62			The Utilities Department is currently initiating a design project for enhancing the function and aesthetic values of this site in accordance with the Bel-Red Corridor Plan.	City of Bellevue	Utilities

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
122	3	62			D3 alignment avoided the regional pond wetland facility. Pond facility is considered a wetland under GMA definition of wetlands and must be mitigated accordingly. D2A now affects wetland functions and habitat.	City of Bellevue	Development Services
123	3	62			There is no "paved" parking lot on this site nor is the site provided with storm drainage facilities	City of Bellevue	Development Services
124	3	3-63		3-23	Show the West Tributary as a stream crossing, as well as the wetland crossing.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
125	3	3-63		3-23	The alignment of Goff Creek between NE 16th Street and Bel-Red Road is incorrect. And also the stream crossing symbol is also in the wrong place, should be further to the east	City of Bellevue	Transportation
126							
127	A-1	A-1			"This appendix... discusses the evaluation of alternatives that would avoid Section 6(f) resources;" Appendix A does not include a discussion of avoidance alternatives. This should be included to satisfy the 6(f) prerequisites listed in A.1.2	City of Bellevue	Parks
128	Appendix A	A-9		A-2	View in photo is looking to the east, <u>not</u> to the west as stated	City of Bellevue	Transportation
129	A.3.5.2	A-11			The first paragraph under Mercer Slough Nature Park should include upland and wetland habitat, fruit and vegetable produce sales and <u>trailer</u> boat launch in the list of activities, features and attributes of the park.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
130	A.3.5.2	A-11			The permanent and temporary acreage totals should include vacant right-of-way within the park boundary. Per Section 4(f), these areas are protected park land and should be included in the calculations	City of Bellevue	Parks
131	A.3.5.2	A-11			"The boat ramp would no longer be accessible from southbound Bellevue Way. I-90, SE 8th Street, and I-405 provide adequate access to the boat ramp." The boat ramp will only be accessible from I-90.	City of Bellevue	Parks
132	A.3.5.2	A-11			"B2M would not have a noise impact to the park." This is not yet proven satisfactorily. Refer to comments on Section 3.2.2	City of Bellevue	Parks
133	A.3.5.2	A-11			"The project would not be seen from most parts of Mercer Slough Nature Park." The majority of parking and public access points are along Bellevue Way and all park users entering the park from Bellevue Way will have views of the structure.	City of Bellevue	Parks
134	A.3.5.2	A-12			"Constructing B2M would not substantially affect park use..." The project would close the majority of park parking, close the Winters House, and limit pedestrian access to the Heritage Loop Trail and trailhead facilities at Winters House and the Blueberry Farm. Per Section 4(f), these actions temporarily interfere with the protected activities and features of the park and historic resource (23 CFR 774.13(d)(3)) and appear to constitute a temporary 4(f) use. With the exception of relocating the Periphery Loop Trail, mitigation is not proposed for other temporary impacts.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
135	A.3.5.2	A-12			The activities of Winters House are not fully described. In addition to housing the Eastside Heritage Center, the house includes office space for Bellevue Parks staff, hosts community events and programs as well as the historical archive of the EHC. It is also a key part of the Heritage Loop Trail, offering historical interpretation and facilities for park trail users. The house should be considered as both a 4(f) protected historic resource and as a 4(f) protected facility within public parkland.	City of Bellevue	Parks
136	A.3.5.2	A-12			It is not accurate to claim the existing Winters House landscaping "does not in any way reflect the house's original landscape." The landscaping today remains similar to the landscape condition in 1991, when the 50-foot buffer was proposed and approved. With no significant change since 1991 the reasons for including that area 50-feet around the house in 1991 remain valid today.	City of Bellevue	Parks
137	A.3.5.2	A-16			"Bellevue Way SE and the sidewalk would remain the same distance from the house." This is not supported by A-8, which shows the sidewalk approximately 5 feet closer to the house.	City of Bellevue	Parks
138	A.3.5.2	A-16			Although the home's garage is not used for vehicle storage at the present time, vehicle access to the garage of the house has been maintained since the period of historic significance. The lid will not longer allow vehicle access to the garage. This limitation should be considered in the historic impact analysis.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
139	A.3.5.2	A-16			The reconstructed parking lot serving the Winters House and the Heritage Loop Trail trailhead is not discussed in the 4(f) analysis even though it presents a significant temporary interference to one of the primary parking areas for the park as well as extending within the 50 foot APE of the Winters House. This new structure within the park deserves analysis as a potentially a 4(f) temporary use and 4(f) historic impact.	City of Bellevue	Parks
140	A.3.5.3	A-16			"Approximately 4.9 acres of the 11.4-acre site are currently used as park..." This is not an accurate statement. Beyond the building itself and a portion of parking reserved for building employees, the remainder of the site is open and accessible to park use.	City of Bellevue	Parks
141	A.3.5.3	A-17			"The existing vehicle access at the southern end... would not be affected." It is not clear whether access would be restricted to right-in, right-out and/or require a gated crossing due to the track transitioning across the southbound lanes at this location. More analysis and engineering is necessary to determine the impact at this driveway before it is determined that there is no impact.	City of Bellevue	Parks
142	A.3.5.3	A-17			Per the definition of Section 4(f) Property at 23 CFR 774.17, the triangle of publicly owned right-of-way currently in park use at the southeast corner of the park qualifies for inclusion in the temporary acreage impact calculations.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
143	A.3.5.3	A-17			"The activities, features and attributes of the park would not be substantially diminished." The SDEIS analysis is not sufficient to support this conclusion for either temporary or permanent impacts. Refer to comments provided under Sections 3.3.2.	City of Bellevue	Parks
144	A.3.5.3	A-17			Analysis of the project's impact to the Surrey Downs Master Plan is insufficient. C11A requires revisiting the planned activities and structures. The project may preclude options considered for community center development and associated parking capacity.	City of Bellevue	Parks
145	A.3.5.4	A-17			The temporary acreage calculated for C9T should be considered a permanent impact until such time as it can be shown that the remaining property surrounded by the light rail facility and new road can provide recreational utility.	City of Bellevue	Parks
146	A.3.5.3	A-17, A-18		A-9, A-10	Removal of large trees along 112th at Surrey Downs Park <u>and removal of the embankment</u> will be a visual change. What is the level of revegetation that will occur and is there sufficient space remaining between the parking area and the guideway for mature trees for either C11A or C9T?	City of Bellevue	Planning
147	A.3.5.3	A-17, A-18			Both C11A and C9T will affect Surrey Downs Park access. C11A needs to show improvements to existing south access or 2nd access from north acceptable to City to accommodate traffic into and out of the park. For C9T, ST will need to show alternative parking and park access to mitigate for changes at NE corner of park.	City of Bellevue	Planning

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
148	A.3.5.4	A-18			For the proposed re-alignment of SE 4th to connect with SE 6th through Surrey Downs Park, please provide the data used to determine why it is necessary for Alternative C9T, but not C11A. Also, explain how the design of the realignment meets the all possible planning requirement to minimize harm to the park resource?	City of Bellevue	Parks
149	A.3.5.4	A-18			More analysis of C9T is necessary to determine temporary impacts to Surrey Downs Park.	City of Bellevue	Parks
150	A.3.5.4	A-18			"The activities, features and attributes of the park would not be substantially diminished." The SDEIS analysis is not sufficient to support this conclusion for either temporary or permanent impacts. Refer to comments provided under Sections 3.3.3.	City of Bellevue	Parks
151	A.3.5.4	A-18			Analysis of the project's impact to the Surrey Downs Master Plan is insufficient. C9T requires revisiting the planned activities and structures. The project may preclude options considered for community center development and associated parking capacity. While these impacts are acknowledged, no discussion of mitigation is provided.	City of Bellevue	Parks
152	A.4	A-21		Table A-5	The mitigation measures as described in Table A-5 are not sufficient in scope or detail to judge the appropriateness of de minimus determinations for the Section 4(f) temporary uses and permanent uses of impacted park land or historic resources within Mercer Slough Nature Park or Surrey Downs Park.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
153	A.4.2	A-21			The temporary 4(f) use of the Winters House as a historic resource is not adequately analyzed in the SDEIS. As per the FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper, in a situation where a resource does not meet all the exemption criteria at 23 CFR 771.135(p)(7), "the temporary occupancy will be considered a use of the 4(f) resource and the appropriate Section 4(f) analysis will be required." (Policy Paper, p. 11, Question C.). The third exemption criteria states that the project will not interfere with the activities or purpose of the resource on a temporary basis. This would also apply to the use of the Winters House as a Section 4(f) protected recreational facility as well as a protected historic resource.	City of Bellevue	Parks
154	Appendix A	A-21 to A-23			Need to see specific mitigation proposals, rather than general statements	City of Bellevue	Transportation
155	A.5.1	A-24			"The LWCF Section 6(f) area is just south of a portion of the water trail running west to east." This is not accurate. As shown in Exhibit A-4, the Section 6(f) boundary fully includes the west to east water trail.	City of Bellevue	Parks
156	A.5.1	A-24			"Wildlife is not anticipated to be affected by the light rail along Bellevue Way SE since this is already a transportation corridor." This is not an accurate statement. Within the 6(f) boundary, the light rail is not adjacent to Bellevue Way, but within the small area of upland forest habitat that will be converted."	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
157	A.5.1	A-25			"Native vegetation will replace invasive blackberries, which could be considered a visual improvement..." While the vegetation itself might be a visual improvement, introduction of a light rail facility into an area where none existed before will remain a visual impact.	City of Bellevue	Parks
158	A.5.1	A-25			Analysis of the visual and noise impact of the light rail facility from the Mercer Slough Water Trail is not sufficient - more analysis is necessary to determine if the replanted area will balance out the visual and noise impact of the rail facility and the loss of forested upland areas.	City of Bellevue	Parks
159	A.5.1	A-25			The project precludes the ability to connect the Section 6(f) protected parcel to Bellevue Way with planned Trail T-100 from the Pedestrian & Bicycle Transportation Plan. This may impact the recreational utility of the parcel.	City of Bellevue	Parks
160	A.5.1	A-25			Considering the fact that the project uses the majority of upland habitat of the impacted 6(f) parcel, permanently isolates the parcel from planned trail connections to the west and north and introduces a visual element not previously present - it cannot yet be determined that the 6(f) impact consists solely of the permanent and temporary footprint of the project.	City of Bellevue	Parks

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
161	A.5.1	A-25			As previously commented on Section A.1 - the 6(f) evaluation of avoidance alternatives does not appear to be included in the SDEIS. As such, the prerequisites for conversion approval may not yet be met.	City of Bellevue	Parks
162	A.5.2	A-25			Do the RCO impacted acreage calculations include the vacant right-of-way around the blueberry farm? If not, this area should be included as an eligible Section 4(f) Property.	City of Bellevue	Parks
163	A.5.2	A-26			The analysis states that farm operations would be allowed to continue during construction, but it is not clear if public access will be included, or just maintenance of the fields. If no public access or parking will be available during the 3-year construction period, development of mitigation measures for park users during this time should be considered.	City of Bellevue	Parks
164	A.5.2	A-26			Considering potential construction closures and potential permanent noise and or visual impacts not fully studied in the SDEIS, it cannot yet be determined that the project will "not impact the uses of the park's interior."	City of Bellevue	Parks
165	Appendix C				Additional photo simulations of B7 are desired to better show the context and proposed alternative	City of Bellevue	Transportation
166	Appendix D				Changes to B7 since the DEIS also include Transportation (I-405/SE 8th interchange and vicinity) and justify a new traffic analysis.	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
167	Appendix D				SDEIS traffic analysis does not reflect the more detailed and accurate work done by Bellevue and Sound Transit. The SDEIS information draws different conclusions, based on crude information. The Winter 2010 VISSIM analysis needs to be included	City of Bellevue	Transportation
168	D	D-9		Table D-1	<i>South Lake Union Streetcar</i> should be italicised because it is currently in operation	City of Bellevue	Transportation
169	D	D-4		Table D-1	<i>Northrup Way project 120th to 124th</i> is complete - should be italicised	City of Bellevue	Transportation
170	D	D-5		Table D-1	120th Ave NE should be included in 2020, and described as 5-lanes to planned NE 15th Street	City of Bellevue	Transportation
171	D	D-5		Table D-1	130th Avenue NE project description listed twice - the shaded one supercedes the unshaded one - the unshaded one should be removed	City of Bellevue	Transportation
172	D	D-5		Table D-1	NE 15th/16th Phase II - project description should reflect that the planned cross section has been reduced to one lane in each direction east on 124th Avenue NE	City of Bellevue	Transportation
173	D	D-11		Table D-4	How can there be essentially stagnant ridership growth in Segment D between 2020 and 2030?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
174	D	D-12		Table D-6	Daily boarding the same at the 120th and 130th stations in 2020 and 2030?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
175	D	D-13		Exhibit D-2	Labeled 2030 in legend, 2020 in title block at bottom	City of Bellevue	Transportation
176	D	D-15		Exhibit D-4	Data source for traffic volume (2005) and the resulting intersection LOS should be updated to the same standard used for the Concept Design Report.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
177	Appendix D	D-15, D-16		D-4 and D-5	Clarify that LOS figures assume no transit signal priority	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
178	Appendix D	D-15, D-16		D-4, D-5	Maps have Ashwood/Hospital Station labelled but without the proposed station symbol; the alignment alternatives that included this station (C3T, C4A, C7E and C8E) are no longer being considered	City of Bellevue	Transportation
179	D	D-16		Exhibit D-5	Data source for traffic volume (2005) and the resulting intersection LOS should be updated to the same standard used for the Concept Design Report.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
180	D	D-16		Exhibit D-5	Labeled 2020 in legend, 2030 in title block at bottom	City of Bellevue	Transportation
181	Appendix D	D-16		D-5	Map legend title is incorrect; should be 2030 Level of Service, <u>not</u> 2020	City of Bellevue	Transportation
182	D	D-17		Exhibit D-6	Data source for traffic LOS should be the Bel-Red FEIS.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
183	D	D-18		Exhibit D-7	Data source for traffic LOS should be the Bel-Red FEIS.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
184	D	D-18		Exhibit D-7	Labeled 2020 in legend, 2030 in title block at bottom	City of Bellevue	Transportation
185	Appendix D	D-18		D-7	Map legend title is incorrect; should be 2030 Level of Service, <u>not</u> 2020	City of Bellevue	Transportation
186	D	D-24		Table D-12	Middle of the page: Pedestrian crossing the planned NE 16th Street would cross only one lane of traffic in the current planned configuration of this roadway.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
187	Appendix D	D-24		Table D-12	D2A at-grade design option should mention that crossing of 124th Ave NE would be grade separated with light rail over 124th	City of Bellevue	Transportation
188	D	D-25		Table D-12	Where are the 30 on-street parking spaces in Segment D?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
189	Appendix D	D-27		Table D-16	Substantiate the "Neighborhood Traffic Intrusion" claims (low, medium, etc.)	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
190	Appendix D	D-27		Table D-16	Closure of lanes or entire streets will be problematic. Further analysis and discussion is needed, and ultimately a construction agreement	City of Bellevue	Transportation
191	D	D-27		Table D-16	Segment D: In addition to the streets listed, the LRT alignment crosses 132nd Avenue NE which is a collector arterial and NE 20th Street which is a minor arterial.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
192	Appendix D	D-29		Tables D-17 and D-18	Why are so many bicycle racks and lockers needed (200) in excess of projected demand (130)?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
193	D	D-30 to 35		Exhibits D-10 to D-13	In the legend, why call out "Mall" and "Town Center" as points of interest?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
194	D	D-30		Exhibit D-8	Sidewalk gap projects are not consistent with projects in the 2009 Bellevue Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan	City of Bellevue	Transportation
195	D	D-31		Exhibit D-9	118th Avenue SE - south of the 118th Station - currently has bicycle lanes not shown on the map.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
196	D	D-31		Exhibit D-9	Bike route gaps shown not consistent with 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan - planned bicycle facilities not shown, for example on 108th Avenue SE and 112th Avenue SE.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
197	D	D-34,35		Exhibit D-12 and D-13	Show existing bicycle lanes on NE 24th Street Show SR 520 Trail as an existing multi-purpose facility Show BNSF Trail as a planned multi-purpose facility	City of Bellevue	Transportation
198	Appendix D	D-34, D-35		D-12, D-13	Maps have Ashwood/Hospital Station labelled but without the proposed station symbol; the alignment alternatives that included this station (C3T, C4A, C7E and C8E) are no longer being considered	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
199	Appendix D	D-36 - D-40		Tables D19 - D-21	SDEIS traffic analysis does not reflect the more detailed and accurate work done by Bellevue and Sound Transit. The SDEIS information draws different conclusions, based on crude information. The Winter 2010 VISSIM analysis needs to be included	City of Bellevue	Transportation
200	App D	D-36		Table D-19	Results of analysis not consistent with City's understanding of project impacts. According to the footnote, these results are before mitigation. Should the footnote say after mitigation? Mitigation will be required to bring conditions back to No Build.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
201	D	D-36 to D-43		Tables D-19 - 23	Document the source data and date and LRT priority assumptions for delay and LOS. For Segment C use VISSIM analysis done for the Concept Design Report (February 2010)	City of Bellevue	Transportation
202	App D	D-43		Table D-23	Add mitigation LOS analysis for all roads with design revisions consistent with plans. For example, drawings on Appendix H p.B-3 and B-4 show revisions to Bellevue Way. These intersections need to be included in this analysis and table.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
203	F	F-1		F.1.1	Document the Peer Review Panel process and outcome. Itemize the components of traffic operations specifically addressed	City of Bellevue	Transportation
204	Appendix G	General			Once an alignment is selected, a complete noise model to should be completed to predict the level of construction noise.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
205	Appendix G	General			Sound reflected off of barriers (noise walls), retained cut walls, and bridges should be reflected in the analysis.	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
206	Appendix G	General			Traffic noise impacts are identified for Alternative B3 only. Road widening bringing travel lanes closer to sensitive receptors is also part of Alternatives C11A and C9A. Traffic noise impact analysis should be performed on these alternatives as well.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
207	Appendix G	General			Noise analysis methodology which averages the impact of gate bells and train bells does not fully reveal the potential impact to receptors. Analysis of maximum impact with bells should be included.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
208	App G	General			Include wheel squeel in noise analysis methodology.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
209	Appendix G	General			Where track curvatures do not exceed 600', creating an opportunity for potential wheel squeel, review the design for a gentler curve to eliminate potential noise impact.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
210	Appendix G			G-1 to G-8	Multiple sound walls are used in Segment B and southern portion of Segment C that potentially create a "canyon" effect. What other comparable, effective techniques could be applied to minimize the visual and social effects of the sound walls?	City of Bellevue	Planning
211	Appendix G	G-64		G-2	Why is no crossover is proposed between S. Bellevue P&R and SE 8th. ST has stated a need for crossovers between all stations.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
212	Appendix G	G-66		G-4	Could the crossover near the I-90/I-405 interchange be relocated away from residences and other sensitive receivers?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
213	Appendix G	G-67 - G-69		G-5, G-6, and G-7	Why are no crossovers proposed between downtown stations? ST has stated a need for crossovers between all stations.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
214							

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
215	Appendix H	B-3		B2M_-KP02	Is there a RT Lane to SE 30th?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
216	Appendix H	B-4		B2M_-KP03	Remove most of the island SB approaching the main entrance, for storage	City of Bellevue	Transportation
217	Appendix H	B-4		B2M_-KP03	Check sight lines for right turns leaving blueberry farm driveway	City of Bellevue	Transportation
218	Appendix H	B-6		B2M2-KP04	What is the radius of the road curve near/at the grade crossing on 112th Ave SE? Does it meet the standard for 40 mph design speed?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
219	Appendix H	B-6		B2M2-KP04	Should the gate be a traffic signal with gate instead of just gate	City of Bellevue	Transportation
220	Appendix H	B-7		B2M2-KP05	How do vehicles from the west side of SE 15th St (driveway) get to the north?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
221	Appendix H	B-7		B2M2-KP05	Reshape island at SE 8th St so both the NB and SB u-turn and WB to SB left turn can overlap with SB thru	City of Bellevue	Transportation
222	Appendix H	B-7		B2M2-KP05	Is the radius on the NE corner of SE 8th St the same as existing with the new double RT?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
223	Appendix H	B-7		B2M2-KP05	Need more storage for the double LT at SE 8th. Widen to the west of ust up some of the island area.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
224	Appendix H	B-7		B2M2-KP05	Move reverse curve at sta 3000+00 further north. This will lessen the amount of clearance time for SB thru vehicles across the tracks (time to get out of the way when a train is approaching and the gates need to go down)	City of Bellevue	Transportation
225	Appendix H	B-10		B2M1-KP05	Concerned that vehicles leaving SE 15th St will queue back across tracks. Would a signal be better?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
226	Appendix H	B-18		B2MI-KZX03	No dimensions on drawing. Proposed roadway section shows reduced median but no landscaping.	City of Bellevue	Planning

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
227	Appendix H	B-19		SBEB-AS01	Driveway for house across from south park & ride entrance on Bellevue Way shows additional or relocated driveway - which is it and why?	City of Bellevue	Planning
228	Appendix H	B-25		B3_-KP05	What are the intersection improvements near sta 2110+00?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
229	Appendix H	B-28		B7_-KP05	What are the intersection improvements at SE 8th St/118th Ave SE for traffic mitigation?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
230	Appendix H	C-3		C11A-KP02	Can the staging area at the corner of Main Street and 108th Ave NE be reconfigured to avoid the Tullys and some of its associated parking?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
231	Appendix H	C-3		C11A-KP02	Existing mid-block crossing and pedestrian signal on 108th Ave NE @ NE 2nd Place is not in the correct location - should be further north.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
232	Appendix H	C-12		B08A-AX01	How do pedestrians cross the tracks on the east side of 108th Ave SE and the south side of Main Street - will this crossing be allowed? Why is a gated pedestrian crossing needed at the east end of the platform? Show pedestrian crossings on both ends of the platform.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
233	Appendix H	C-13		B08A-AX01	On the Main Street side of the platform, why create a bermed area with a concrete wall between the sidewalk and the station platform, essentially walling it off from the street...it would be better to grade the slope toward the platform to create better visibility.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
234	Appendix H	C-14		BTCB-AS01	Indicate no EB left turn at 110th Ave NE per VISSIM analysis	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
235	Appendix H	C-16		LABA-AS02	Who are the intended users of the parking island between 118th and the station - local business patrons or park & ride users? Also, the pick-up/drop-off area for the station is not indicated.	City of Bellevue	Planning
236	Appendix H	C-20		C9T_-KP02	Location of TPSS at Main & 112th is highly visible, should be relocated or at least designed/landscaped to be less obtrusive.	City of Bellevue	Planning
237	Appendix H	C-20		C9T_-KP02	Staging area at city hall site appears to consume a substantial portion of the city hall visitor garage and police garage. This would have greater impacts on city hall and police operations than previously discussed as part of preliminary engineering.	City of Bellevue	Planning
238	Appendix H	C-25		C9T_-KX01	11' min on proposed roadway lane widths	City of Bellevue	Transportation
239	Appendix H	C-26		C9T_-KX02	Graphic indicates train running at approximately same grade as pedestrians, as opposed to the existing grade. The difference in grade will have implications for visual and noise impacts which should be addressed in the SDEIS.	City of Bellevue	Planning
240	Appendix H	C-30		B10T-AS01	The north station entry would be preferred on the Bellevue Transit Center side of 110th....if it is on the city hall side it forces most east link riders to cross at 110th and 6th which will end up in much delay that isn't necessary if the north entrance is located correctly.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
241	Appendix H	C-30		B10T-AS01	Per VISSIM modeling effort, there is no ped scramble at the intersection of NE 6 St and 110th Ave NE with C9T.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
242	Appendix H	C-34		C9A_-KP02	Concerned that vehicles egressing from 110th PI SE will be stuck on tracks when the train comes	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No./Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
243	Appendix H	C-35		C9A_-KP03	Why aren't the crosswalks shown in the intersection?	City of Bellevue	Transportation
244	Appendix H	C-37		C9A_-KX01	Note that straddle bents will have visual and aesthetic impacts that may require additional analysis through the city's design review process. This comment applies to any straddle bents in all of the alternatives.	City of Bellevue	Planning
245	Appendix H	C-43		BTCA-AS01	Show crosswalks on north, west, and south sides of 110th intersection	City of Bellevue	Transportation
246	Appendix H	C-43		BTCA-AS01	Proposed midblock crossing on NE 6th St needs approval by COB traffic	City of Bellevue	Transportation
247	Appendix H	C-43		BTCA-AS01	Station Entry at NE 4th Street (west entry to station) is incorrectly labeled, should be NE 6th Street	City of Bellevue	Transportation
248	Appendix H	Sheet C-43		BTCA-AS01	Misleading/incorrect labelling of station entrances, the station entrances are on NE 6th St, at 110th Ave NE and 112th Ave NE, not at NE 4th St	City of Bellevue	Transportation
249	Appendix H	Sheet D-3		D2AB-KP02	Light Rail would transition to median of proposed NE 15th/16th St, City's preference is for the westbound lanes to go under the LRT guideway	City of Bellevue	Transportation
250	Appendix H	D-4		D2AB-KP03	Between 130th Avenue NE and 132nd Avenue NE, Bellevue is planning for an extension of NE 16th Street with bicycle facilities, landscaping and sidewalks. This street should be shown as "by others" with the 130th Avenue Station in the median of the roadway.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
251	Appendix H	D-4		D2AB-KP03	There should be a signal at the intersection of the extended NE 16th Street and 130th Avenue NE.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
252	Appendix H	Sheet D-4		D2AB-KP03	Proposed traffic signal not shown at 130th Ave NE - referred to in text on pages 3-59, 3-60	City of Bellevue	Transportation

East Link Supplemental Draft EIS; November 12, 2010							
Reviewing Agencies: FTA; Sound Transit; WSDOT; FHWA; Seattle; Mercer Island; Bellevue; Redmond; King County; USACOE; USCG							
Comments Due to Sound Transit EAS Staff: January 10, 2011							
Bellevue Staff Review Comments							
Row ID	Section/ Chapter No.	Page No.	Line No.	Exhibit No. /Drawing No.	Comment	Agency	Reviewer
253	Appendix H	Sheet D-4		D2AB-KP03	NE 16th St roadway not shown between 130th Ave NE and 132nd Ave NE, NE 16th roadway extension is mentioned in text on page 3-59	City of Bellevue	Transportation
254	Appendix H	Sheet D-4		D2AB-KP03	134th Ave NE at NE 16th St shown as a right-in, right-out 'T' intersection. Bel-Red Subarea Plan indicates this to be a through north-south street that would require a traffic signal	City of Bellevue	Transportation
255	Appendix H	D-13		D2AB-KX02	Ballasted track guideway shown - COB requests embedded track as appropriate for the intended urban character of NE 16th Street	City of Bellevue	Transportation
256	Appendix H	Sheet D-13		D2AB-KX02	Cross-section shows a terraced profile for NE 16th St with eastbound and westbound lanes at different elevations. This profile would very difficult to retrofit to accommodate future north south streets such as 134th Ave NE	City of Bellevue	Transportation
257	Appendix H	D-16		BKCD-AS01	What is the purpose of the new bus stop shown to the north of the service parking - it is just a short distance north of the bus stop at the station.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
258	Appendix H	D-18		BGCB-AS01	Crosswalk needed on the west side of the LRT crossing at 130th Avenue NE.	City of Bellevue	Transportation
259	Appendix H	D-18		BGCB-AS01	Show the westward extension of NE 16th Street from 132nd Ave NE to 130th Ave NE, with the station in the median.	City of Bellevue	Transportation