

CITY OF BELLEVUE
LIGHT RAIL STUDY:
B7-REVISED ALTERNATIVE

June 29, 2011 Public
Meeting #3

Final Report

July 22, 2011

Prepared by:



ARUP

Prepared for:



Table of Contents

Project Overview	1
Public Meeting Overview	2
Outreach and Advertising	3
Written Comments.....	4
Comment Summary.....	4
Route Alignment.....	4
Stations and Park-and-Ride	4
Environmental Conditions	5
Private Property Issues	5
Traffic Analysis.....	6
Other Comments.....	6
Appendix A: Postcard.....	7
Appendix B: Questions Received from Public.....	8
Appendix C: Comment Form Comments.....	9

Appendix A: Postcard

Appendix B: Questions Received from Public

Appendix C: Comment Form Comments

PROJECT OVERVIEW

The City of Bellevue is conducting a study to determine if further development of Sound Transit's B7 alternative will improve performance, reduce costs, and reduce impacts of the East Link Route in South Bellevue. This alternative, referred to as B7-Revised, is a variation of the B7 alternative studied in Sound Transit's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) for the East Link project. The study consists of conceptual engineering, environmental screening, ridership analysis, and cost estimating, to provide an objective "apples to apples" comparison to the Sound Transit B7 alternative.

B7-Revised includes a new transit station and park-and-ride near the Bellevue Way/I-90 Interchange. The route then parallels I-90 to cross the Mercer Slough, and runs adjacent to I-405 within a segment of the former Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) right-of-way. North of the BNSF right-of-way it transitions to viaduct through to north of SE 6th Street where it transitions back to at-grade at the Red Lion site, and then to a downtown tunnel portal near NE 2nd St and 112th Ave NE. The study analyzes these modifications to the Sound Transit B7 alternative to determine potential impacts and benefits to surrounding neighborhoods, traffic, ridership, the Mercer Slough, and construction costs.

The City has held three public meetings to provide information and to get input on the B7-Revised alternative, its analysis, and its design. This report summarizes the results of the third and final public meeting.

PUBLIC MEETING OVERVIEW

The third public meeting on the study included a presentation and an open house; it was held on Wednesday, June 29, 2011, from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. at the Bellevue City Hall. The purpose of the public meeting was to share the final results of the work on the B7-Revised route, the South Bellevue Station/Park-and-Ride facility, environmental conditions, traffic analysis, and private property issues. Approximately 142 people attended the meeting, which was staffed by representatives of the City's Transportation Department and the Arup consultant team. Attendees who signed in at the open house indicated that they were from the following neighborhood: Surrey Downs, Bridle Trails, Snoqualmie Ridge, Yarrow Point, and Newport Hills.

The meeting consisted of the following elements:

1. A **sign-in table** where participants signed in, picked up comment forms and handouts; sign-in table staff informed attendees about the format of the meeting and how they could participate.
2. A thirty minute **presentation** (given at 5:30 p.m.) that provided a summary of the work conducted on the B7-Revised route, the South Bellevue Station/Park-and-Ride facility, environmental conditions, traffic analysis, and private property issues.
3. A **Question & Answer Session** where the community was able to direct their study-related questions to City of Bellevue staff and the Arup consulting team.
4. An **open house** where participants viewed display boards that depicted the B7-Revised alignment and the A-2 Station layout; the display boards were staffed by city and consultant team representatives.
5. **Comment tables** where participants could sit down and write their comments on the provided comment forms.

The consultant team recognizes and values the strong viewpoints about light rail and the location and design of the alignment, stations, and park-and-ride in South Bellevue. All previous comments were considered for the study and reported to the City Council for their review. The comments made by all Bellevue citizens have shaped the study and improved the work done on the B7-Revised alternative. The input gathered at the June 29th public meeting will be reported to the City Council.

Outreach and Advertising

The City of Bellevue conducted a number of outreach activities to inform the public about the public meeting. These consisted of:

1. Mailing a postcard to approximately 15,400 residential addresses within the project area; the postcard is included in Appendix A of this report.
2. Posting event information on the project web site.
3. Distributing a press release to multiple media outlets, including the *Bellevue Reporter*.
4. Reaching out to community groups and neighborhood organizations via the City's Neighborhood Newsletter.
5. Sending news releases to the Seattle Transit Blog and Build a Better Bellevue.
6. Placing public meeting information in the Community Calendar of the Bellevue's *It's Your City* publication which goes out to all households in Bellevue.
7. Placing advertisements in the *Bellevue Reporter* on June 17th and June 24th.
8. Sent a Gov_delivery Advanced Bulletin to the E-Alert self-selected distribution list.
9. Videotaping the presentation and posting it on the project's website after the meeting.

WRITTEN COMMENTS

Participants provided written comments in three different ways: on comment forms during the public meeting; verbal comments and questions during the public meeting; and in emails sent after the public meeting.

Nineteen comment forms, 13 emails, and 1 voicemail were received. The verbal questions and comments received at the meeting as well as email questions are provided in Appendix B of this report, and comment form submissions are provided in Appendix C. Questions included in the comment form submissions have also been included in Appendix B.

Comment Summary

The following section summarizes comments received on the comment forms and emails.

Route Alignment

Similar to the last public meeting, the comments generally indicated support for the B7-Revised alternative route alignment. Those making comments in favor of this alignment said that it:

- Is less disruptive to neighborhoods.
- Reduces impacts to Bellevue Way and 112th Avenue SE.
- Uses an existing rail bed and keeps transportation in transportation corridors.
- Has fewer traffic and noise impacts (concentrates noise along already noisy I-405 corridor).

Those who do not support the B7-Revised alignment said that it:

- Has extensive environmental and business impacts and a high cost.
- Is not consistent with Building a Better Bellevue.

Stations and Park-and-Ride

Most comments about the Stations and the Park-and-Ride focused on the A-2 Station and Park-and-Ride. Comments were typically about the park-and-ride and its location, design, and potential impacts to the Enatai Neighborhood. There was a roughly equal mix of positive comments, negative comments, and questions about its design. In summary, commenters said:

- They are concerned about traffic and noise impacts to the Enatai Neighborhood and residential buildings close to the B7 revised alignment.
- The Park-and-Ride does not fit in the neighborhood.

- The location makes sense and the design will help ease traffic on Bellevue Way.
- That it is laid out well, with buses on top and most parking below grade.
- They like the low profile and traffic routing.

Those commenting about the East Main Station said that it:

- Is not needed due to lack of passengers in the area and proximity to the downtown station.
- Has too high an impact – demolition of Red Lion and Sheraton hotels.
- Should have a curved design closer to I-405 to minimize impacts to the hotels.

Environmental Conditions

Those commenting about environmental conditions focused almost exclusively on the Mercer Slough. Approximately two-thirds of the comments indicated a belief that B7 alignment environmental impacts could be mitigated, weren't significant, or were less harmful than B2 alignment environmental impacts. Some said that impacts could be minimized by building next to or off of I-90 where it crosses the slough. Others felt strongly that the Mercer Slough should be protected and said that regardless of how it is crossed that environmental impacts and necessary mitigation will not be worth the cost. Other commenters said that:

- Environmental impacts are everywhere on large infrastructure projects and that avoiding Mercer Slough will create other impacts elsewhere.
- Environmental impacts for B7 aren't any greater than those for B2, and that those impacts can be mitigated.
- Any impacts are worth the cost of preserving the neighborhoods.
- The community needs reassurance engineering can make seismically sound structures on peat soil conditions.

Private Property Issues

Those making comments about private property issues made a number of comments about residential and commercial property. Those making comments about residential property covered a range of issues, from concerns about the need to acquire property in the Enatai neighborhood, to confirming plans for mitigation, to B7 having fewer property acquisition and other private property issues than B2. Other issues raised by participants included:

- Impacts to private property immediately adjacent to the A-2 Park-and-Ride.
- Any impacts to private property need to be compensated for.
- Impacts to private property along the I-405 corridor need to be mitigated.

Those making comments about commercial property said that it did not make monetary sense to tear down two hotels, and that the hotel properties can be redeveloped after light rail is built.

Traffic Analysis

Comments about the traffic analysis expressed a general opposition to additional traffic through neighborhoods. Specific comments included a wide range of viewpoints, from concern about 113th Avenue and Bellevue Way and how much additional traffic they would carry, to concerns about exiting the A-2 Station and Park-and-Ride and the design of the proposed roadway facilities, to concerns about cut through traffic on SE 108th and SE 104th.

Other Comments

Participants made a number of other comments. The most common comments included the following:

- The City should focus its efforts determining the East Link route rather than spending time and money on other alternatives that have their own significant problems.
- Information about cost estimates and how the B7 alternative compares to the B2M alternative needs to be itemized.
- The community needs to see quantitative data as well as mitigation plans for environmental, noise, and traffic impacts.
- Further traffic studies at the A-2 Station and Park-and-Ride are needed to ensure traffic signals do not create back-ups on the I-90 ramps.
- Make sure the A-2 Station is easy for the handicapped to access.

APPENDIX A: POSTCARD



CITY OF BELLEVUE
Department of Transportation
 PO Box 90012
 Bellevue, WA 98009-9012

PRSR STD
 U.S. POSTAGE
 PAID
 PERMIT #61
 BELLEVUE, WA

**You are Invited to a Presentation about the
 Light Rail Study: B7-Revised Analysis Report
 Wednesday, June 29, 2011
 5:30 to 7:00 pm (presentation starts at 5:30)
 Bellevue City Hall, Council Chambers**

**ECRWSS
 Postal Patron**

如欲獲得更多資訊，請致電425-452-6800洽詢第一服務處 (Service First)。

Для получения дополнительной информации просьба связаться с
 отделом обслуживания (Service First) по телефону 425-452-6800.

Para más información, por favor, comuníquese con "Servicio Primero"
 (Service First) al 425-452-6800

Ñeá bieát theám chí tiéát, xin lieán laic vôi Dòch Vui Høng Ñaàu (Service
 First) òu soá 425-452-6800.

Title VI Notice to the Public It is the City of Bellevue's policy to assure that no person shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin or sex, as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise discriminated against under any of its federally funded programs and activities. Any person who believes his/her Title VI protection has been violated may file a complaint with the Title VI Coordinator. For Title VI complaint forms and advice, please contact the Title VI Coordinator at 425-452-4270.



CITY OF BELLEVUE
Department of Transportation
 PO Box 90012
 Bellevue, WA 98009-9012

PRSR STD
 U.S. POSTAGE
 PAID
 PERMIT #61
 BELLEVUE, WA

**You are Invited to a Presentation about the
 Light Rail Study: B7-Revised Analysis Report
 Wednesday, June 29, 2011
 5:30 to 7:00 pm (presentation starts at 5:30)
 Bellevue City Hall, Council Chambers**

**ECRWSS
 Postal Patron**

如欲獲得更多資訊，請致電425-452-6800洽詢第一服務處 (Service First)。

Для получения дополнительной информации просьба связаться с
 отделом обслуживания (Service First) по телефону 425-452-6800.

Para más información, por favor, comuníquese con "Servicio Primero"
 (Service First) al 425-452-6800

Ñeá bieát theám chí tiéát, xin lieán laic vôi Dòch Vui Høng Ñaàu (Service
 First) òu soá 425-452-6800.

Title VI Notice to the Public It is the City of Bellevue's policy to assure that no person shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin or sex, as provided by Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, be excluded from participating in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise discriminated against under any of its federally funded programs and activities. Any person who believes his/her Title VI protection has been violated may file a complaint with the Title VI Coordinator. For Title VI complaint forms and advice, please contact the Title VI Coordinator at 425-452-4270.

B7-Revised Analysis Report Presentation

The City of Bellevue invites you to a final presentation on the B7-Revised alternative. It will start at 5:30 pm and be followed by a one-hour open house. The presentation will provide a summary of the Analysis Report for the B7-Revised Alternative. It will be an opportunity to ask questions and make comments.

For your convenience, the presentation, the report, and a comment form, will be available on the project website:

www.bellevuewa.gov/b7-revised-light-rail-route.htm.

For more information, contact Maher Welaye, project manager, at 425-452-4789 or mwelaye@bellevuewa.gov.

Wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation available upon request. Please call at least 48 hours in advance. Assistance for the hearing impaired: dial 711.



B7-Revised Analysis Report Presentation

The City of Bellevue invites you to a final presentation on the B7-Revised alternative. It will start at 5:30 pm and be followed by a one-hour open house. The presentation will provide a summary of the Analysis Report for the B7-Revised Alternative. It will be an opportunity to ask questions and make comments.

For your convenience, the presentation, the report, and a comment form, will be available on the project website:

www.bellevuewa.gov/b7-revised-light-rail-route.htm

For more information, contact Maher Welaye, project manager, at 425-452-4789 or mwelaye@bellevuewa.gov.

Wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation available upon request. Please call at least 48 hours in advance. Assistance for the hearing impaired: dial 711.



APPENDIX B: QUESTIONS RECEIVED FROM PUBLIC

Questions Received During Open House Q&A Session

Q: Who did the legal analysis work on the rail banking status? And was that counsel retained by your firm?

A: That element was kept out of Arup contract. The City of Bellevue legal department did the work and provided it to Arup.

Q: Did Sound Transit provide the cost estimating for the mitigation of the B2M route? Was it a per unit mitigation?

A: They had a general number for mitigation and we prorated it along the alignment. The team hasn't gotten to the cost of mitigation. No, we are currently using lump sum mitigation.

Q: For the north section of the elevated rail near the train trestle, can you please give us an understanding of the elevation related to I-405? Will it be level with I-405 or taller?

A: There isn't a lot of grade change up near the BNSF rail corridor. I-405 is five to six feet higher than Greenbaum Storage and Public Storage. The highway viaduct has to be higher than the road - at least 18 feet and it has to clear the road and buildings. Therefore, the top of the rail is at about 30 feet.

Q: When you talk about business displacements and employees does that include Red Lion, Sheraton, and Greenbaum Storage.

A: Yes, it does.

Q: When you talk about the BNSF corridor does that mean you will be on those tracks that exist? Does that mean using heavy tracks?

A: No, we will have to construct other tracks for freight. We will provide enough width for light rail. We will allow room for freight tracks at a later date. The freight tracks have not been priced yet. Yes, the current tracks will be going away. *Supplemental note: The old freight rail tracks within the BNSF corridor have been abandoned and the corridor now falls under a rail banking agreement which requires that the Right of Way be maintained such that heavy rail could be reactivated if a future railroad company identified a need for it. The City of Bellevue requested that this be looked at in two ways. Firstly to provide two tracks on the assumption that a future freight operator will run on the shared LRT tracks (operating at different times of the day), and second, that an alternative be developed which provides space for an additional freight track alongside LRT in the future. The existing tracks would be removed and replaced with two LRT tracks. Space would be allowed between the LRT tracks and I-405 sufficient to re-lay a single new freight track. The freight track would not be built at the same time as the LRT tracks.*

Q: What is the number from Sound Transit for mitigation and what did that include?

A: I [John Eddy] don't have it in front of me. Please submit this question to the City of Bellevue for posting. *The mitigation cost for Sound Transit mitigation on the B7 alternative is approximately \$1.62m.*

Q: You mentioned there is great ridership potential at the A2 Park and Ride. Will that affect ridership of buses? Does that mean Sound Transit's light rail and bus ridership will be duplicated? Does that mean that the 550 bus goes away?

A: Some of the direct routes from Bellevue into downtown will be duplicated to Sound Transit's light rail so those services will be reduced or cut. Four routes will feed that station and four routes will terminate at the A2. Correct, the 550 will go away.

Q: Regarding the East Main Station, what is the rationale for including this station? Why was it included? Is there a plan for more transit-oriented development?

A: It was originally part of B7 to have a station in that area so we wanted to include it as part of the study for comparative analysis. There are no provisions for a Park & Ride facility. The plans are predicated upon existing zone and as a comparison to the B7 alternative. There is no plan to change the zoning in that area.

Q: From the point of view of a potential rider, in terms of the amount of time to go from the City of Bellevue's Transit Center to the east channel bridge, how does the B7 revised alternative compare with the other alternatives? Also, I notice a lot of curves on the alignment. Will trains have to go slower for the safety and comfort of standing riders?

A: The comfort of the ride is important; therefore, trying to balance speed, comfort, and delivery is critical. Sound Transit's goal is to balance those criteria. For the B2 alignment, leaving I-90 to downtown Bellevue takes 5 minutes and the B7 alternative takes about the same. The ridership model reflects the same amount of time for each alignment.

Q: What are the impacts to the Brookshire condominiums? What are the noise impacts? Will the trains run all day and night? And is the light rail elevated at that point?

A: I will have to look up the noise report. I believe there will be a 4-6 hour break in services but I am not entirely certain if service is 24 hours a day. There might be night owl service. The noise report does talk about receptors. As the project continues, Sound Transit and the team will have to mitigate sound with future work whether its improvement to the properties to quiet the noise or deflecting the noise away from the properties but that would be part of the environmental assessment. I don't know where your condo is but if it is at the BNSF corridor between the I-405 the elevation is at grade but up above the properties. *Noise impacts and specific mitigations are described in technical memo TM09 Noise.*

Q: Under option 2, how wide is that option? I cannot read the dimensions on the screen. What is the buffer between the highway and the right of way? It's confusing.

A: There is about 60 foot right of way. The BNSF corridor width has 100 feet for right of way. Where we position 60 feet within the 100 foot right of way varies along the alignment but the freight line and the rail fit within 1-405 or 60 feet. The BNSF corridor and I-405 corridor overlap in some of their rights of way so you are right.

Q: Arup prepared plans for the A2 parking garage that originally had a landscape treatment. Why were those plans withheld from public at meetings and in the report?

A: We do not have a landscape architect on the team so it would be insincere to render the plans as having a landscape treatment. It is important that the community is engaged in the process when we are at the design phase of this project in the future.

Q: Where is the quantitative data in the analysis for the concept report?

A: The quantitative data is not yet ready. We aren't there yet.

Q: We have heard from neighbors in the Brookshire and we are in the Mercer Park Condominiums in a narrow corridor. Are there any residential properties slated to be condemned along 118th? If not, what would sound mitigation look like? A sound wall?

A: No, there are no plans to take residential properties along 118th. Typical sound mitigation measures are sound walls, swapping out windows or adding insulation to homes for better noise canceling.

Q: I have a traffic question. I live in Enatai. Currently, people use 108th as a cut-through when Bellevue Way backs up. When I look at this Park and Ride, 113th looks like a convenient cut-through for drivers to get to and from the Park and Ride to take 108th. Is that correct? And if yes, why would people NOT do that?

A: The 113th access point is only an exit. Our modeling found that significant cut-through traffic would not be generated by the station. Also, the peak flows at the station during the morning traffic are inbound towards Bellevue going northbound. But people living north of the station would be going southbound against congestion and would be less likely to use the cut-through. And in the afternoon, it would be the reverse situation.

Q: The acquisition costs of the hotel takings of the Main Street station are immense. Why was the idea of using a curved station not considered to avoid taking those properties? Are there curved stations in around the world?

A: Sound Transit criteria does not allow for curved stations due to operational issues and sight lines. We did not challenge Sound Transit's criteria for the study. Yes, you will find curved station in congested, built up cities where it is the only way to make it work.

Q: The Arup cost estimate for the A2 station is 11 million more than the cost estimate done by KPFF. Why was there a difference?

A: In our view, KPFF was missing some pieces so that's why the numbers differ.

Q: If we are going to Issaquah in the future, why is Sound Transit resisting building through the Mercer Slough right now?

A: No analysis has been done studying the route to Issaquah. There are discussions about the Eastlink extension in the Master Plan to go to Eastgate in Issaquah and north to Totem Lake. We have taken a high level look at the vertical profiles might look but the analysis was not part of this study. There is very challenging engineering involved that will require closer study.

Q: What part of the work scope changed to increase the cost of study? How big is the area of the station at 113th and what is the elevation of the A2 station?

A: When we started the study, we assumed the BNSF alignment analysis as Option 1. When the legal department looked at it, they discovered that King County has a legal easement right to a trail in this corridor. Therefore, we had to add a second alternative which carried a change order to contracts driving up off the cost of study. The other reason for the increased cost was a need to extend the analysis of the different alignments to the common point in downtown to the north. The maximum exposure of the side of the parking facility is fifteen feet. In the station

rendering, we dug into the hillside to put the five levels of parking facility below 113th intentionally to try and mitigate its visual presence along 113th.

Q: On segment C, was there consideration to going over I-405, following the corridor up to NE 6th and then going along the spur to Transit Center?

A: Over the years, there have been a lot of different alignments analyzed. That route was previously studied. The route was removed as an alternate because it was not seen as providing significant benefit. We were tasked with studying B7.

Q: Do you have a schedule for key decision points? And when will Eastlink start running?

A: Sound Transit is planning to release the final EIS for the Eastlink project in the next few weeks (early July). The Sound Transit Board will then make a decision probably in late July about the preferred alignment. The Federal Transit Administration then adopts a ROD (i.e. record of decision) in the fall. That is the final decision the Federal government has to make to approve the specific alignment. Then, Sound Transit has the legal authority to move ahead with design plans for that alignment. Sound Transit has a target service start date of 2021.

Q: What is the elevation from the BNSF corridor to 118th? How can the rail be at same elevation as the freeway? How can that be and not have rail at steep grade?

A: The existing corridor is higher. Tech memo 6 shows the precise heights.

Q: Regards to crossing Mercer Slough, the crossing is also at the Seattle fault line. It seems like getting approval will be difficult?

A: Sound Transit and Washington State design criteria and guidelines have built similar structures on similar terrain in the past. We are confident we can address seismic and moving peat conditions in the design. Cost estimates reflect the robustness of the construction of a highway viaduct.

Q: I live in South Bellevue. In the evening it looks difficult to get from the A2 station to eastbound I-90? Is it a realistic possibility given the back-ups on southbound Bellevue Way? Won't there still be stopped traffic southbound up Bellevue Way to the Chevron?

A: We propose a partial signal at southbound Bellevue Way so cars can pull out. We are also proposing putting in a second right turn lane to allow cars to exit right at the station intersection. The I-90 ramps and the ramp metering were out of our scope of work as we were tasked with circulation around the station. Any future work should study the I-90 ramps and metering.

Comment: I am the President of the Surrey Downs Community Club and a founding member of the Surrey Downs Eastlink Committee. We have decided to go outside of the box and suggest that Bellevue can be served with light rail with the B7R and an elevated track north of Main Street – no tunnel. We ask you to consider who is going to pay for the \$150 million tunnel? That's a lot to barter with Sound Transit. We need to figure out the C section to help pay for the B section. Thank you.

Q: How does all of this effort tie into the fact that Sound Transit's preferred route is Bellevue Way and 112th? How do we come to a decision and compare routes when neighborhoods and the Slough are likely to be affected? Can Sound Transit change their mind?

A: The Arup study is a response to looking at the B7 alignment since what the Sound Transit previously provided was inadequate to the community. The decision on the route is now in the policymakers' realm.

Q: If you move the current Park and Ride to the new one and eliminate the traffic lights at the current Park and Ride, is there a study describing if it will improve Bellevue Way traffic flow?

A: By removing the signal at the South Bellevue Park and Ride, you save about a minute from SE 10th to SE 30th. Adding a signal at SE 30th and Bellevue Way adds about 16 seconds to travel time according to the model. There needs to be a signal at this junction to give a satisfactory Level of Service.

Q: For the A2 station, has WSDOT made any comments about the feasibility of the station? What is the height of the station? Is it embedded in the Mercer Slough?

A: WSDOT has seen the plans and has not noted any fatal flaws. The station is 80-90 feet in air over the Slough to get over traffic on I-90 westbound. One of the risks with B7 alignment is getting construction done over I-90 ramps which I listed as needing mitigation.

Q: Why do they insist on having a double trail added to the alignment as part of this project? We already have a trail on the other side of 118th.

A: King County has purchased an easement for a trail. This project has to respect that there is an easement; we do not need to build a trail. We need to provide a place for freight rail in the future.

Q: It is my understanding that the mitigation for the condos has already been done due to the existence of the current rail line. Is that correct?

A: I don't know. We have not been in contact with residential properties about mitigation.

Q: Can you speak to cost and ridership model uncertainties?

A: We have contingencies in place at this early stage (1 to 5% completion of the design) – 40% is the contingency amount that is included. This is the contingency figure included in the current cost estimates. For the ridership model, being off by 500 to 1000 riders is a normal error range and not a huge aberration. We used the Sound Transit data for the model.

Q: When does the environmental data move from being qualitative to quantitative? It hasn't performed yet? When will it? Will the work exceed the \$670,000 contract?

A: Step 2 will be much more quantitative. The initial funding was only for qualitative concept report, Step 1. We are stopping the work where we are today. There will need to be future funding to move ahead for Step 2.

Q: With the concurrent involvement of the City of Bellevue and Sound Transit for information and data, how can this report be an independent study?

A: The data and methodology studies are the same. However, this does not mean they are not independent. The method we used is a linear way to take the model (which is accepted

regionally as a way of measuring ridership), and put in our input in (*Note: derived independently*) to check the output. We did this to make sure the modeling was done correctly and so allow comparison to previous work. The major differences in the B7-Revised alternative for ridership were to take out the 118th station and add the A2 station. We used the same tool but applied our own independent thinking to get to where we are today.

Q: You indicated opportunities for savings including eliminating the Main Street station. Have you attempted to put a number on your opportunities savings? Sound Transit says to our community that the B7R is \$140 million more than their alignment. If your opportunities savings amounts to \$140 million that information is important to share.

A: We haven't priced it all out. There is some pricing information in the report.

Q: Looking at the cross section of the freight rail and light rail, does your light rail cost estimates include sub-grade grading and drainage to help the freight rail? Are we adding costs in there we don't need to? Will there be space for the trail from Renton and Bellevue?

A: The design covers drainage for operation of the light rail but it does not specifically address a separate cost of utilities for light rail. We are creating more flat area to create more right of way for the light rail. We need to create a reservation of space for retaining walls and to create space for two tracks. We can accommodate either freight rail or a trail but not both.

Mayor Don Davidson: Talks with Sound Transit and City of Bellevue are ongoing. Discussions are over both segments B and C. The final EIS is up for review and should be out on July 8th but I don't want to promise for Sound Transit. Thanks for coming.

Claudia Balducci: Council has voted not to approve funding for further study of the B7. This is the final plan for this phase. Please get your comments in as soon as you can. The Sound Transit Board plans to have a decision by July 28th.

Questions at Open House

Alan Smith

Q: Three and a half years ago at an open house meeting, I stressed using the existing BN track – glaringly obvious. Are the managers of Sound Transit guilty of unprofessional conduct in the engineering studies on B2 versus B7 and the conclusions they come to that biased the Sound Transit report in favor of the B2 alignment. How is it that a local resident in his own time can discover flaws in the B7 Sound Transit study that must have been obvious to the managers of Sound Transit when they priced the B2 routing?

A: There are multiple factors which determine a transit agencies selection of a preferred alignment.

Sheryl Stillwell

Q: What were the issues that raised your cost of the A2 stations as compared to KPFF's analysis?

A: In Section 4 of technical memo TM05 A-2 Station Cost Estimate, Arup presents a detailed line-by-line comparison against the earlier work by the City of Bellevue's consultant. The Arup study followed the Sound Transit cost estimation methodology.

Sheryl Stillwell

Q: How can this be an independent study if you used Sound Transit data and City of Bellevue information? City Council asked for an independent study. As a tax payer, I was expecting an independent fact check study! Have you, Arup, done previous work for Sound Transit? And do you have any RFP?

A: The data and methodology used in the study are the same. However, they are not lacking independence. We did this to make sure the concept design results could be compared directly with previous work. We used the same tools, but applied our own independent thinking to get to where we are today. In certain elements, our engineer's came to different conclusions to Sound Transit. Arup does not have a contract with Sound Transit.

Susan Anderson

Q: How have the risks been estimated by cost for WSDOT issues with peat/ settlement/traffic around I-90? What are foundations in slough envisioned to be? How deep do they go and what do they bear on?

A: Arup's designers developed foundation solutions for the LRT guideway crossing of the Mercer Slough. Both driven steel pipe piles and drilled shafts are considered feasible for the proposed bridge structure. To resist potential pressure imposed by the peat flow, the deep foundation will penetrate through 60ft of peat and 60ft of soft clay to rest on the glacial till deposit.

Unnamed

Q: Do B7 costs include any grading or subgrade work that can be considered as applying to the freight rail?

A: No.

Frances H. Edgar

Q: Why are you creating this expensive nightmare in a time of decreasing revenues? What do the people of Bellevue get from this mess? Why are we not coming up Bellevue Way from I-90 which is the way people want to come? This obviously is a big gift to Kemper Freeman & Wallace who hone their own grandiose ideas from Bellevue. This is a grotesque piece of planning!

A: Arup cannot comment on the study scope.

Kris Liljeblad

Q: What are the seismic design challenges of the B7 crossing of Mercer Slough? Are there any unusual operation risks associated with seismic events?

A: The B7 crossing of the Mercer Slough is in a region of high historical seismicity in terms of earthquake magnitude and the frequency of earthquake occurrence. Four earthquake hazards were previously considered and three were determined not to impact the site. These included surficial ground rupture from the Seattle Fault, seismically induced landslides, and soil liquefaction. However, seismically induced ground motion must be considered in the design and the Sound Transit Link Light Rail Design Criteria Manual provides design earthquake parameters.

Due to the significant depth of soft soils, ground amplification may occur with associated large deformations. The seismic response of the Light Rail structure will be a major engineering consideration.

JP Paquette

Q: You mentioned the BNSF right-of-way is 100 feet and that it overlaps I-405. If it overlaps I-405, won't this be unavailable for use (unless the I-405 Master Plan is renegotiated)?

A: Arup has laid out the light rail track corridor and allowed sufficient space to the east of the light rail track for a potential future single heavy rail line with the constraints of the BNSF right-of-way and the I-405 Master Plan.

January Marie Colacurcio

Q: Does the cost (page 1: 50 million less than Sound Transit) include the construction of and maintenance of the A2 station? What about disable without wheelchairs getting to and from the A2 station? Will there be a mechanical sidewalk like SeaTac? How did you find room next to Store house storage? They have wine storage – isn't there vibration from the light rail? If Sound Transit chooses B7R, will we avoid potential litigation? (Kemper, Freeman, & Wallace) Phase 1 concept report cost more than \$670,000 yet did not complete all items in concept 1. I know they did additional work authorized by staff but why wasn't all concept 1 done first?

A: The cost includes the construction, but not life cycle costs such as maintenance. The concept design assumes that the station would be designed to relevant legislation and codes including ADA requirements. There are no plans for a mechanical sidewalk. The Arup team looked carefully at the constraints at the Stor-House Storage facility to determine the feasibility of the proposed solution. Mitigation issues including vibration would be addressed at a later stage of design.

As the work progressed, it became evident that certain additional elements of scope were needed to complete the study, and other existing elements of scope were not. This is not unusual for a concept design.

Renay Bennett

Q: What is the amount that Sound Transit gave you for mitigation and what specifically was the mitigation for and for each mitigated issue and where? I would also like to see the noise reports.

A: At this stage of design, the approach taken by Sound Transit is to quantify general mitigation quantities and categories. The Arup study followed the same approach. Specific mitigations were not determined. The noise report is available as technical memo TM09 Noise on the City of Bellevue's webs-site.

Matt Mathes

Q: Arup consultants prepared a version of the A2 parking garage with landscape design treatment. However, city staff and the consultant staff confirmed this version was not to be shown at public meetings to date or in the report. Why?

A: We do not have a landscape architect on the team so it would be insincere to render the plans as having a landscape treatment. It is important that the community is engaged in the process when we are at the design phase of this project in the future. Additionally, the intent of the renderings was to show the massing and features of the A-2 Station and Park-and-Ride. With vegetation these features were obscured.

Peter Marshall

Q: Section 3.1 of Arup's May 11 Draft Report said initial screening had looked at "qualitative" analysis of environmental impacts. And that the "final concept report" would include "quantitative" analysis of these impacts, and of visual impacts and constructability. Where are these quantitative data in this report? (In particular, the impacts of the A2 traffic on Enatai, and visual impacts).

A: The quantitative analysis of ecological environmental impacts was not included in the final scope of work. Visual impact renderings of the A-2 Station and Park-and-Ride were produced as part of the study. Traffic impacts in Enatai and adjacent to the A-2 Station are studied in technical memo TM04 South Bellevue Traffic Impacts. Additional visual impact renderings along the alignment and constructability assessment were removed from the scope of the study.

Q: Eventually light rail will go to Issaquah. Why is the light rail transit resisting building through the Mercer Slough right now?

A: This is a question best directed to Sound Transit. It is not something that Arup was tasked to look at.

Q: What parts of the work scope changed to increase the cost of the study? How big is the area required for the A2 station? How high above grade?

A: Arup was directed to perform the following additional items of work:

- Conceptual engineering and environmental screening for a second alternative B7-Revised alignment within the BNSF Corridor which provides an additional 18ft corridor for a trail and future freight rail use.

- Two additional photo-composite renderings on 113th Avenue SE showing street level views of the A-2 Station.
- Additional meetings required by the City
- Conceptual engineering and environmental screening from the portal location to tie-in on C9T from B7 alignment

The area required totals 6.39 acres. The parking facility is within the 30 foot height restriction stipulated in Bellevue City Codes along 113th Ave SE. The greatest height above the ground is just east of the A-2 Station, at about 80-feet. The A-2 Station is located over the I-90 ramps.

Questions from Public Received by City of Bellevue

A-2 Station

Sherwin Lee

Q: I would like to know why Arup chose not to add a connection from the A-2 Station platform to the I-90 trail below, since the trail is right underneath the station. An elevator/stairwell could facilitate easier access from Newport Shores and Factoria.

A: A connection to the Mountains to Sound Trail system could be made in this area. The study team used the planned B2 alternative South Bellevue Station program to determine requirements of the A-2 Station and Park-and-Ride.

Q: What happens to the existing South Bellevue Park & Ride with the new A2 parking facility?

A: The existing park-and-ride facility land is understood to be in the ownership of WSDOT. The future disposition of this property has not been determined.

Q: Is Washington DOT on board with the A2 plan since it will be on their freeway right of way?

A: The plans and concept report for the A-2 Station have been presented to WSDOT for their comment and input. Their comments have been included in the final versions of the report.

Q: What happens to the bike path across Mercer Slough on the north edge of I-90?

A: There were no plans to close the bike path, though there might be temporary disruption during construction of the Mercer Slough crossing.

Geoffrey Bidwell

Q: Will the proposed A2 station with transit park & ride as shown in the concept design for the B7R of the report require integration with the existing park & ride on Bellevue Way or is it a standalone functioning facility?

A: It is a standalone facility.

Geoffrey Bidwell

Q: Will the concept A2 station with transit and park & ride essentially make the existing park & ride on Bellevue Way redundant?

A: Yes.

Wendy Jones

Q: With buses on the top level of the A-2 structure, what mitigation would be available for both exhaust fumes and noise? I'm thinking of this in relation to those who would live across from and above the structure.

A: If the A-2 Station and Park-and-Ride were to be progressed, it would be designed in accordance with applicable codes, and mitigation measures would be addressed as part of the environmental permitting and design process.

Wendy Jones

Q: I am aware that the majority of property owners who would be displaced by the A-2 Park & Ride are more than willing to be bought out versus live across the street from the elevated rail

line which the B2M alignment would bring to southern Bellevue Way. What about the property owners on the west side of 113th Ave. SE? Could there/would there be the possibility of any compensation for them?

A: This would be an issue for individual property owner's to address with the transit agency. It is not possible at this stage to make comment on specifics of mitigation.

Wendy Jones

Q: I asked last night about the actual need for a Main Street station with the B7R alignment--especially given its proximity to the main station, lack of parking and its high cost. If I understood the answer correctly, the reason it was included in the study's suggestions was mainly because it had been in the earlier design by ST and was included for comparative reasons. Does this mean it "has" to happen, or could it be successfully eliminated?

A: The Main Street station could be removed from the B7-Revised alternative reducing the capital cost of the alternative at the expense of some reduced ridership. Assessing the impacts of removing the Main Street station was not part of the task given to Arup.

Wendy Jones

Q: At what point will the mitigation costs for B2M be available? I continue to be concerned that costs of mitigation for noise will be far greater than anticipated (as experienced in the Rainier Valley). In addition I am aware that there will be a great number of foundation piles needed for part of the B2M alignment. Since much of the construction will parallel the slough and require appropriate drainage, etc., I have concerns that costs will develop that are far greater than those in the current cost estimate for B2M. Will those costs be available from Sound Transit before final alignment decisions are made?

A: This is a question best directed to Sound Transit. Arup was not tasked with looking at B2M.

Alignment

Q: What is the greatest height of the East link line, at any given point, when the line enters into the City of Bellevue limits, including flyovers on I-90??

A: The greatest height above the ground is just east of the A2 Station, at about 80-feet. This is to ensure adequate clearance above all of the ramps on and off I-90.

Q: Sound Transit says that uncertainty in the stability of the support structure required to cross the Mercer Slough poses a risk that they do not want to take. How much risk is there in this uncertainty?

A: The risks lie within the potential to impact the I-90 structures. We believe we have a technical solution to overcome the impacts of the pulsating peat on the LRT structure; however, the risks lie in being able to quantify the potential additional impacts to the WSDOT structures directly attributable to the LRT viaduct. The risk is included in the cost estimate contingency (derived using Sound Transit's methodology).

Q: Explain what "the B7 route is feasible" means. Is off-the-shelf technology available for all facets of the B7 route? Is there a proven in-service light rail transit line that encounters the design challenges posed by crossing the Mercer Slough?

A: There are no two systems, or even segments of the same system, that present the same engineering challenges. Mercer Slough has been studied extensively by WSDOT and there are still uncertainties as to why the peat behaves the way it does. However, we believe we have developed an approach that adequately addresses these challenges. The proposed B7-Revised alternative can be constructed with available means and methods.

Kristi Weir

Q: What are the two greatest engineering challenges of B7-R?

A: There is nothing in the B7-Revised alternative that presents engineering challenges that are out of the ordinary for a project of this type. The design and construction of the Mercer Slough crossing and of the A-2 Station platform across the I-90 ramps both present interesting engineering issues that are well within the capability of engineering firms to resolve.

Approach

Kris Liljebald

Q: This is perhaps a question for ST: Given the difference in the level of design development between Route B7 and ST's preferred alternative, could you summarize the likely cost and schedule consequences for East Link implementation if the ST Board were to change course and adopt the B7 route? (How much added cost and time would be involved, and would the City of Bellevue be responsible for any part of that cost?)

A: This question is outside of the project team's scope.

Dick Applestone

Q: I support the *Vision Line* approach (presented by Councilman Kevin Wallace) including NO TUNNEL.

A: Comment noted.

Cost

Q: What is the estimated cost difference between the B-7 alignment and B-2 alignment?

A: This comparison was not part of the study scope.

Q: In the briefing given to the City Council by Arup a few weeks ago, Arup identified an increase in the operating cost for the B7-revised alignment compared to the B2m alignment resulting from the added travel time to service the “A-2” station. Using a present value analysis, how much does the present value of this increased operating cost add to the total budget of the B7-revised alignment. Assume the same number of riders in the 2030 model year for both alignments and increase the number of buses required to maintain the same travel times for the riders. The analysis should cover a period of at least 50 years after initial operation with a discount rate of 3% to 5% based on the Sound Transit typical financial models.

A: Allowance for increase (or decrease) in other transit agency operating costs is not provided for in the Sound Transit cost estimating methodology. Nor is inclusion of other life-cycle costs. We met with Sound Transit bus operations and King County Metro and have reported the conclusions from that meeting. We did not carry out a separate analysis of these costs, nor of other life-cycle costs.

Dick Applestone

Q: Does your cost comparison between B2M and B7R include ALL mitigation costs?

A: Consistent with the level of design, mitigation quantities were extrapolated quantities based on area and route length. For the alignment, three levels of mitigation were applied based on pro-rated route length against the B7 alternative. For the A-2 Station, wetland mitigation was included.

Cost Estimate

Q: “My name is Frank Paddock. I am a 54 year resident of Bellevue and combat veteran, and I would like to - regarding the light rail project - I would like to know how much would be saved if union members weren’t required to do the job and also, if the prevailing wage law was suspended. I’ve read in one of the magazines that suspending the union members only, you would save 18% on the construction project. Regarding the prevailing wage law, if you suspend that you would save another 17% on the construction projects. Would you please answer how much would be saved on the light rail project if these were happening? Thank you. Appreciate your help. Bye now.”

A: These were not factors used to develop the cost estimate as they are not considered in the Sound Transit methodology and data (or other similar agency methodologies). Sound Transit has a “price book” that was shared with the project team and used to generate the costs.

Ecology/ Environment

Q: Can someone please explain to me how the B7/C9T project can be justified economically based on the environmental impacts? It seems that bisecting a wetland would be environmentally costly (i.e. Environmental permits, delays due to environmental regulation, lost wetland experience to the community, degraded Park environment) and thus cause the B7/C9T alignment to be more costly compared to the alternative that runs up 112th and Bellevue Way. Please explain how the B7/C9T alignment could be the preferred alternative for Bellevue when it seems that these costs would make it prohibitive compared to the 112th/Bellevue Way alternative?

A: Arup was directed to study the costs of the B7-Revised alignment to provide information to support a range of selection criteria, including cost, ridership and environmental impacts.

Q: Does the Arup study address the possibility, potential, likelihood, or the difficulty or the possibility of NOT getting acceptance by the Eastlink project, getting permits from the any of the following sources if needed, DOT, WSDOT, Corp of Engineers, Wetland mitigation permits for the Slough, Federal or State, or the mitigation of having the line on the old train bed, not shared with other users?, Or a revision agreement disallowing any future use, of the Old Train bed line, by other sources?

A: The Arup team is familiar, and experienced, with the above noted permitting issues, none of which was considered “fatal flaw” to the Bellevue B7-Revised alternative. The team identified the permitting issues at the Sturtevant Creek as an environmental issue and worked with the City of Bellevue to develop a conceptual solution that addressed these issues. The BNSF Corridor has a number of entities which have rights to it's use, including Puget Sound Energy.

Q: Is the Mercer Slough a “Federally designated Wetland” designation and are there any special requirements or mitigation for impacting this area?

A: The Mercer Slough is regulated by the Federal Clean Water Act. The Arup team understands that mitigation under Federal requirements is different to City's, and that the City also regulates the wetland buffer. The City's requirements are more stringent, and mitigation would be required. However, if the crossing was unachievable from an environmental perspective, it would not have been included in the Sound Transit DEIS and SDEIS.

Q: Does the Arup report differ from the Sound Transit Draft EIS on the extent of impact on the Mercer Slough Nature Park habitat? If so, how, and what mitigation plan would you implement?

A: Impacts did not differ significantly from Sound Transit assessment. However, the proposed gantry technique would have somewhat less impacts.

Q: Is this alternative really feasible? Considering the fact that the wetland (fill) and park (4f?) impacts are higher with B7-Revised and B7 and there are feasible alternatives (B2) that provide similar ridership will the federal resource agencies really consider B7-Revised? Remember how the Council majority's previous B-section alternative that crossed the Mercer Slough was determined to not be feasible.

A: Impacts across the Mercer Slough did not differ from Sound Transit assessment. The proposed gantry technique would have less impacts. If the crossing was unachievable from an

environmental perspective, it would not have been included in the Sound Transit DEIS and SDEIS.

Geoffrey Bidwell

Q. Can the park & ride on Bellevue Way be returned to a vegetative condition to add to the Mercer Slough Nature Park and enhanced?

A: The disposition of the existing South Bellevue Park-and-Ride is an issue for WSDOT as the owner's of the site, and the community to determine.

Geoffrey Bidwell

Q. What is the existing surface area of the existing park & ride on Bellevue Way and what increase in impervious surface area will occur with Sound Transit's B2M concept?

A: A study of the existing park & ride and comparison with B2M was outside of the consultant's study scope.

Geoffrey Bidwell

Q. Will returning the existing park & ride on Bellevue Way to a natural vegetative state provide for mitigation?

A: A study of the existing park & ride and it's future disposition was outside of the consultant's study scope.

Geoffrey Bidwell

Q. Are the mitigation calculations in the report consistent with those used by WSDOT on the Interstate 90 Bellevue Access Environmental Assessment L-6678 of May 1987 and as revised and implemented in August 1990?

A: Mitigation quantities are based on the approach taken by Sound Transit for the B7 alternative.

Ridership

Kris Liljebald

Q: Regarding the new South Bellevue Park and Ride station in the B7 Alternative – Could you identify any comparable walking distances for other existing or planned ST Link stations?

A: The maximum walking distance for the Mountlake P&R is around 750 feet. For the Eastgate P&R from the parking structure to the bus stop at the direct access ramps on I-90 is 900 feet, and for Canyon Park P&R is around 1,100 feet.

Dick Applestone

Q: Have you viewed the updated age distribution within Bellevue's Planning Subareas as a result of the 2010 Census? Have you included this data in any of your findings?

A: This information was not an input to this study.

Dick Applestone

Q: Have you done a breakdown of Sound Transit ridership by age group, and by time of day?

A: No.

Dick Applestone

Q: Has Sound Transit done a breakdown of projected East Link ridership by age group? (Note: ST has failed miserably to meet their projections on the Central Link)

A: The project team is not aware whether such an analysis has been performed by Sound Transit.

ROW/Property impacts

Q: The Arup report key findings note that Station A-2 would displace 12 residences in the Enatai neighborhood. But how would you describe the station's impacts (visual, traffic, air quality, noise) on residences immediately west of 113th Ave. SE?

A: There are evident impacts to these properties. As part of the second part of the study we would have looked to characterize these impacts.

Q: What is the total acreage or square footage that Eastlink would need to acquire only with the park and ride site, including the roadway, flyovers and the mitigation with the adjacent property owners in that area.

A: 6.39 acres

Traffic

Q: As one looks at the siting of the ramps for the proposed A-2 Park & Ride that would provide access for vehicular traffic into and out of the facility via I-90 and Bellevue Way, it would appear that they would require some purchase/agreement with WSDOT as they would be located on state land/right of way leading up to the I-90 interchange lanes. Have any conversations taken place with WSDOT and what was the result of them?

A: The proposals for the A-2 Station have been presented to WS-DOT with a view to identifying "fatal flaws". No significant issues were identified.

Q: And was there any discussion with WSDOT of the potential traffic impact related how these I-90 ramps would be metered as to not result in traffic backup into the facility, Bellevue Way or I-90?

A: Traffic issues were discussed in detail with WS-DOT. The access ramps are located beyond the WSDOT highway limit. The main issue, was in fact, the southbound traffic signal which was discussed with WSDOT and determined that it was acceptable in principle.

Q: How will you mitigate the traffic that will funnel through Enatai with the new Park N Ride at 113th and Bellevue Way? What's going to happen when the Mariners play?

A: While some cut-through traffic may occur, our modeling did not find significant cut-through traffic generated from the A-2 Station alone. In the morning, the predominant direction of travel on Bellevue Way is NB, however vehicles heading to A-2 Station would be headed SB and would not be impacted by this congestion. In the afternoon, this situation is reversed where the predominant direction of travel is SB out of Bellevue, while vehicles would leave A-2 Station and head NB.

Q: As a citizen of Enatai, I am extremely concerned about the increase in traffic that will be going through our neighborhood when you build this new P&R at the south end. When you add a destination like the P&R to a neighborhood, you will affect far more than the people whose houses you buy out, and even more speedsters will cut through on 108th. Re-purposing and improving the current P&R leaves the hustle and bustle of traffic down on a major road that is built to handle it. I find this new structure and the redesign of the project to be extremely frustrating since the original design cost less and was on major streets.

A: The A-2 Station location was part of Council direction to the project team.

Q: The Station A-2 concept allows vehicle access to and from 113th Ave. SE at Level 3. How do you conclude this won't generate significant pass-through traffic in the Enatai neighborhood?

A: While some cut-through traffic may occur, our modeling did not find significant cut-through traffic generated from the A-2 Station alone. For A-2 Station trips, Enatai cut-through traffic would be small as these trips travel in the opposite direction to the peak direction of travel and congestion on Bellevue Way (i.e., towards Bellevue in AM peak and towards I-90 in PM peak). In the morning, the predominant direction of travel on Bellevue Way is NB, however vehicles heading to A-2 Station would be headed SB and would not be impacted by this congestion. In the afternoon, this situation is reversed where the predominant direction of travel is SB out of Bellevue, while vehicles would leave A-2 Station and head NB.

Q: The Station A-2 technical memo says there will be access from southbound 113th Ave. SE to serve Enatai and areas west of the station. The Traffic technical memo (p.3) says the likelihood of cut-through traffic is "relatively low", but also that the extent of such traffic would require additional study. What are the unknown factors that might be explored in such further study?

A: The extent of I-90 related cut-through traffic would require additional study to assess I-90 related cut-through traffic and the ramp meter, which is out of the scope of this study. If cut-through traffic is found to be significant, this would be studied and then appropriate measures would be proposed.

Q: The configuration of Station A-2 is long and narrow, requiring some late-arriving transit patrons to walk 1300 ft. (1/4 mile) to the station platform. What will this do to internal garage traffic, as frantic drivers try to find spaces as close to the platform as possible?

A: We would envisage that the parking structure would have way-finding signage to enable drivers to find spaces and minimize search drive distance and time.

Q: Does the Station A-2 concept address the cost of eliminating the existing South Bellevue Park-and-ride east of Bellevue Way SE? (including site restoration to public open space).

A: The future disposition of the existing South Bellevue Park-and-Ride site is as yet undetermined. Costs connected to the existing park-and-ride are not included in the cost estimate.

Q: Considering the daily bus and automobile trips up and down ramps to the pedestrian bridge level of station A-2, won't transportation energy requirements be significantly increased, compared to B-7 and B2M alternatives?

A: This was not a screening criteria.

Q: The SDEIS states that at least 1 lane of Bellevue Way would likely be closed during the East Link construction period for the B2M alignment. What type of closures would be anticipated, and for how long, with the construction of the A-2 Park & Ride?

A: This is a question that should be asked of Sound Transit.

Visual impact

Q: Can you at least verbally describe the visual impacts of the 380 ft. elevated rail platform and 300 ft. pedestrian bridge over I-90?

A: It is difficult to verbally describe visual impacts. The scope study recognized this, and a rendering of the A-2 Station platform is included in the study in technical memo showing the height of the light rail station.

APPENDIX C: COMMENT FORM COMMENTS

Bellevue's Light Rail Study B7-Revised Analysis Report June 29, 2011 – Comments

Name	What City Council should consider from the report?	Other
Michael Maros	Minimize traffic and noise impacts on the south Enatai Neighborhood. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic. Prevent access to A-2 station for autos traveling through Enatai. Access from Bellevue Way only. - Noise. Light Rail makes more noise at curves in the tract. Minimize curves. 	
Matt Mathes	The more credible cost estimate for B7-R is \$1,223 million as outlined by BBB. The B2M/C11A is estimated at \$1,175 million. There is no substantial difference in cost of construction, given these factors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sound Transit's change order experience (Rainier Ave). - Pre-design stage - Lack of definitive legal opinion on BNSF rail lands. - Predicted year of operation at year 2021 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Select B7R as preferred alternative. 2. Eliminate downtown tunnel for "C" section 3. Eliminate east main station from the proposal.
Carolyn Wood		I strongly prefer B7 Revised route to Sound Transit's route. Bellevue Way is a beautiful entrance to our city – A train would destroy its' ambiance and the historic Winter's House.
Dick Applestone	See my Email to Welaye – 6/29/11 which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does/is ridership numbers based on 2010 census? - Has this been broken down by age group? - Does ARUP include ALL mitigation costs for both routes? - Is there any review of "Assessor dwelling units"/ "transit-oriented development?" NOT DESIRABLE. 	I favor the Vision Line (to minimize financial & political impacts). No tunnel Implement the circulator bus system.
Bill Smith	I would like the B7-Revised.	
Gabriella Metzger	Any rail going through the Mercer Slough will pretty much destroy it. Sound Transit's ridership estimates have been overstated in the past. Why do we have to take out a rail line only to be replaced/possibly in the future?	Based on Seattle's experiences, only light rail came in, many bus routes were discontinued. Apparently, that will be the case in Bellevue. Getting to light rail stations will have to be done by private vehicles.
Jinda Rosmann	Please consider quality of life for residents. How do you balance this value again the profits of those who stand to gain from the Transit Oriented Development and of course, the long term effect on our residents' quality of life once all that T.O.D. gets built up. Not a nice improvement for residents.	
Bellevue Resident	Is this alternative really feasible? Considering the fact that the wetland (fill) and park (4f?) impacts are higher with B7-Revised and B7 and there are feasible alternatives (B2) that provide similar ridership will the federal resource agencies really consider B7-Revised? Remember how the Council majority's previous B-section alternative that crossed the Mercer Slough was determined to not be feasible.	You have spent enough money on this and other independent analysis – none of them have produced any facts to support B2. You continue to raise more questions at increased expense and us of mitigation resources. Stop this waste of tax payer money.
Marlene Meyer	This is a citizen's non-technical reaction. Disruption of Mercer Slough is disruptive to so many of us who enjoy the wildlife and natural habitat of this park. Consider environmental impact of noise factors and other changes will affect the birds, wildlife and peacefulness for walkers and children taking programs at the park. Bellevue prides itself on beautiful, peaceful parks. I do not see the major benefit of a new plan.	I shop downtown and will continue to do so. Leave the slough alone. Use the research money where needed by the city to look at environment and citizen's enjoyment. Keep the least expensive route and put \$ into the bus system.

Name	What City Council should consider from the report?	Other
Soemin Tjong	The phase 2 & 3 of this study indicates up to 24 months of further study to catch up to certain engineering completeness. There is not much time left. We have majority council support on one of the alternatives. I'd like to see leadership and unanimous support ~ please.	
Margaret (Peggy) Albin	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Cost 2) Impact on neighborhoods like Woodridge 3) Noise study results – have there been any studies done for the Rev. B7 route? 4) How can the Council properly assess the impact of the Rev. B-7 route on Woodridge when there are no sound studies? <p>Please publish a 1-page summary that shows the costs/ridership/etc. compared side by side so that a person can see all studies next to each other.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>	Council needs to take objective review of study results – not an emotional, subjective view affected by local neighborhood pressure.
Lars & Carolyn Saxegaard	To continue the study for the next 2 phases.	<p>This new model would help to keep traffic flowing on 112th Avenue.</p> <p>Also, Bellevue will be growing to the east.</p>
Susan Anderson	<p>Consider users of A2 station – unrealistic slalom to go SB & EB I-90 in the evening with Bellevue Way backups; long hikes to get from parked car to platform – impacts my overall time to commute.</p> <p>Consider hidden costs of permitting issues w/slough construction – higher than you estimate and longer schedule --→ more \$\$\$.</p>	Stop study. Move forward with B2M and cooperate with Sound Transit to be able to afford Bellevue's light rail.
Paul Measel	Minimize on-grade crossings.	
Kirk McEwan	<p>There does not appear to be any significant reason to change the mind of the Sound Transit Board.</p> <p>Additionally, this route puts the track high above everything around I-90 broadcasting noise and blocking views in all directions.</p>	
Barb Lyle		<p>What will happen to the existing South Bellevue Park & Ride by I-90?</p> <p>How many cars park 2 the South Bellevue Park & Ride?</p> <p>Why can't A2 be built on existing S. Bellevue P & R?</p>

Name	What City Council should consider from the report?	Other
Geoffrey Bidwell	<p>Six questions:</p> <p>Q. Will the proposed A2 station with transit park & ride as shown in the concept design for the B7R of the report require integration with the existing park & ride on Bellevue Way or is it a standalone functioning facility?</p> <p>Q. Will the concept A2 station with transit and park & ride essentially make the existing park & ride on Bellevue Way redundant?</p> <p>Q. Can the park & ride on Bellevue Way be returned to a vegetative condition to add to the Mercer Slough Nature Park and enhanced?</p> <p>Q. What is the existing surface area of the existing park & ride on Bellevue Way and what increase in impervious surface area will occur with Sound Transit's B2M concept?</p> <p>Q. Will returning the existing park & ride on Bellevue Way to a natural vegetative state provide for mitigation?</p> <p>Q. Are the mitigation calculations in the report consistent with those used by WSDOT on the Interstate 90 Bellevue Access Environmental Assessment L-6678 of May 1987 and as revised and implemented in August 1990?</p>	

Name	What City Council should consider from the report?	Other
Wendy Jones	<p>I am an Enatai resident and a supporter of the B7R alignment for East Link. I am well aware that the impacts for the southern end of Enatai are significant with either alignment--B2M or B7R. However, I feel that B7R can successfully bring East Link to our community with a marked reduction in the impacts to all of the established neighborhoods along the 2 mile stretch of Bellevue Way and 112th Ave SE from I-90 to Main Street. After last night's presentation I still have some questions which I hope you can answer and/or include in the questions from the presentation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The SDEIS states that at least 1 lane of Bellevue Way would likely be closed during the East Link construction period for the B2M alignment. What type of closures would be anticipated, and for how long, with the construction of the A-2 Park & Ride? ● With buses on the top level of the A-2 structure, what mitigation would be available for both exhaust fumes and noise? I'm thinking of this in relation to those who would live across from and above the structure. ● I am aware that the majority of property owners who would be displaced by the A-2 Park & Ride are more than willing to be bought out versus live across the street from the elevated rail line which the B2M alignment would bring to southern Bellevue Way. What about the property owners on the west side of 113th Ave. SE? Could there/would there be the possibility of any compensation for them? ● I asked last night about the actual need for a Main Street station with the B7R alignment--especially given its proximity to the main station, lack of parking and its high cost. If I understood the answer correctly, the reason it was included in the study's suggestions was mainly because it had been in the earlier design by ST and was included for comparative reasons. Does this mean it "has" to happen, or could it be successfully eliminated? ● At what point will the mitigation costs for B2M be available? I continue to be concerned that costs of mitigation for noise will be far greater than anticipated (as experienced in the Rainier Valley). In addition I am aware that there will be a great number of foundation piles needed for part of the B2M alignment. Since much of the construction will parallel the slough and require appropriate drainage, etc., I have concerns that costs will develop that are far greater than those in the current cost estimate for B2M. Will those costs be available from Sound Transit before final alignment decisions are made? 	

Name	What City Council should consider from the report?	Other
Jan Miller	<p>The A2 Station will impact South Enatai. We already deal with I-90, Bellevue Way and the East Channel Bridge noise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pollution from a 1,600 stall, <u>open</u> garage and diesel bus traffic nestled into a residential neighborhood was not discussed. • Noise pollution generated by 1,600 stalls, buses and drop offs by residents running most hours of the day is added to our already loud neighborhood. • Visual blight of this large structure planned in a residential area. • Traffic flow off I-90 onto Bellevue Way trying to access 34th from 113th is a problem for local residents. We have to do the “fly-over,” drive by the garage and turn left onto 113th (southbound). • Allow <u>2 lanes</u> for bus traffic in <u>each direction</u>. Bending buses do not do right/left angle right turns. They cut corners. Could take out bumps of opposing waiting traffic. • The long walkway to the Light Rail Station from the transit center is too long. It’s not appropriate for the handicapped. • The walkway and Light Rail Station plus Transit Station need to be protected from our ever blowing winds and sometimes horizontal rains. • Local walking traffic (residents) need easy access to the buses at the top. • How is security addressed in the garage and stairwells? Need clear (glass) stairway. • The A2 Station with the rail line will be quite elevated. Sound carries. Please, no bells upon entering or leaving the station. • The Light Rail people haven’t got all the noise issues taken care of during the turns and bends in the track, either. Don’t grant noise variances. • During construction, don’t allow construction workers to park in the neighborhoods. Provide off-site parking. <p>Because construction will go on for years, limit the hours they can work. No nighttime construction or pile driving. I know variances can be granted. DON’T DO IT! The neighborhood would very grumpy.</p>	<p>Access to the extreme southern end of Enatai is an issue. Getting thru access 113th by the Transit Garage as mentioned above (4th bullet) is a BIG concern. Do not remove the light at 112th and the current Park & Ride. It guarantees access to the lower portion of Enatai during peak traffic times. If the light wasn’t there, we can’t turn left to get into our neighborhood. The next light, is at 108th, with a short pocket turn lane. I live on 111th at a dead end. I don’t want to completely circle my neighborhood to get home if the 112th light goes away.</p>