



## 130<sup>th</sup> TOD Request for Proposals Addendum #1

---

**DATE:** April 25, 2025  
**TO:** All Potential Responders  
**FROM:** City of Bellevue  
**PROJECT NAME:** 130<sup>th</sup> TOD Request for Proposals

This addendum is responsive to *most* questions received in reference to the 130<sup>th</sup> Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Request for Proposals (RFP) published on Friday, March 10, 2025. Outstanding questions awaiting responses will be addressed in a subsequent Addendum to be released on Friday, May 1.

The City of Bellevue received eighty-five (85) questions regarding the 130<sup>th</sup> TOD RFP and the subject property. Staff reviewed questions and have provided responses to the best of their ability based on the most recently available information.

### I. Development Goals and Evaluation Priorities

1. **Question:** On page 9 of the RFP, it is stated that DEI (Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion) should be prioritized throughout the project. Are there specific goals or requirements related to DEI or the workforce during construction for either the Sound Transit garage or the full project? Are there distinct goals for the Sound Transit garage compared to the mixed-use housing portion of the project? Or is the expectation that best efforts will be made without specific goals (e.g., apprenticeship, WMBE subcontractor participation, prevailing wage requirements, Section 3, Priority Hire, etc.)?
  - i. **City Response:** As referenced in the RFP, DEI is an encouraged goal that reflects the City's broader commitment to diversity and inclusion within the mixed-use development. While Sound Transit does not have specific DEI requirements tied to the 302-stall park-and-ride facility, proposers are encouraged to include examples and strategies that demonstrate how their project supports this goal. The approaches outlined in the question are all strong examples, and it is at the proposer's discretion to determine how best to incorporate DEI principles. While not a core requirement, DEI remains a valued and encouraged component of the proposal.

2. **Question:** Small Business – micro retail. Could these goals be accomplished through live/work units? Is retail a must and if so, is there flexibility on the amount of retail?
- i. **City Response:** Ground-floor commercial uses are required along 130th Avenue as part of the 130th Avenue Node in the current BelRed Land Use Code. These required uses may be interrupted by residential lobbies or work-live units, as allowed by code. To support small businesses, the City encourages micro-retail opportunities that promote economic vitality and provide affordable rental space for entrepreneurs. While work-live units are permitted, they do not meet the definition of micro-retail when provided as standalone spaces and therefore may not fully satisfy the intent of this encouraged goal. Additional information on the BelRed Land Use Code can be found [here](#).
3. **Question:** The RFP mentions a design requirement for proposers to detail their sustainability efforts and "align with the City's environmental stewardship goals." Are these goals outlined in more detail elsewhere?
- i. **City Response:** As referenced in the RFP, sustainability and environmental stewardship are encouraged goals, not requirements, for proposers. Proposers are encouraged to incorporate sustainability principles into their development plans where feasible. The City has adopted the **Sustainable Bellevue Environmental Stewardship Plan**, which outlines specific goals, strategies, and targets to support Bellevue's long-term health, livability, and sustainability. More information about the plan can be found here: [Sustainable Bellevue Environmental Stewardship Plan | City of Bellevue](#).
4. **Question:** Is there a page limit on the proposal response?
- i. **City Response:** No, there is not a page limit on the proposal response.
5. **Question:** What is the City's process for designating the Development Partner?
- i. **City Response:** As referenced in the RFP, the City will follow a structured process to select a development partner, as outlined below:
1. Proposal Evaluation  
The City will review all submitted proposals and determine which is most advantageous based on alignment with City objectives and the proposer's experience, approach, and capabilities.
  2. Interviews (if conducted)  
At the City's discretion, proposers may be invited to participate in

interviews to clarify their proposals and further assess fit with the City's goals.

3. Developer Selection and ENA Negotiation

The City intends to select a proposer and enter into an Exclusive Negotiations Agreement (ENA) by **July 2025** subject to City Council review and approval. The ENA will be in substantially the same form as provided in Exhibit A of the RFP.

4. Right to Terminate or Reengage

If negotiations with the highest-ranked proposer are unsuccessful, the City reserves the right to terminate discussions and engage the next-highest ranked proposer.

5. Finalize Project Terms

During the ENA period, the selected proposer will work with the City to refine the project concept, define development deliverables, and negotiate all deal terms.

6. City Council Review and Site Control Transfer

Final deal terms, including the Purchase and Sale Agreement (PSA), will require City Council review and approval, anticipated in **Q4 2025**.

## II. Property Due Diligence, Environmental

1. **Question:** Is a land survey available?

- i. **City Response:** The 130th Park-and-Ride design plans included in the RFP reflect the most current information available regarding existing site conditions. A formal land survey is not available.

2. **Question:** On page 7 of the RFP, under "Purchase Price," it is noted that the City conducted initial cost estimates for the construction of the Sound Transit garage in 2023. Would the City be willing to share this estimate with us?

- i. **City Response:** KPFF, with assistance from ProDim, developed a conceptual cost estimate for constructing 302 parking stalls within a mixed-use development. At the conceptual design level, the estimated additive construction cost for the stalls is \$33.2 million. This estimate includes hard construction costs as well as design and construction contingencies, contractor general conditions, home office overhead, contractor profit, cost escalation through the end of 2025, Washington State sales tax, design fees, and permit fees. The estimate does not include potential financing or interest costs, nor builder's risk insurance.

3. **Question:** What was the cost estimate of the Sound Transit Facility in 2023?

- i. **City Response:** KPFF, with assistance from ProDim, developed a conceptual

cost estimate for constructing 302 parking stalls within a mixed-use development. At the conceptual design level, the estimated additive construction cost for the stalls is **\$33.2 million**. This estimate includes hard construction costs as well as design and construction contingencies, contractor general conditions, home office overhead, contractor profit, cost escalation through the end of 2025, Washington State sales tax, design fees, and permit fees. The estimate does **not** include potential financing or interest costs, nor builder's risk insurance.

- 4. Question:** What is the process for negotiating and agreeing on a price for Sound Transit to purchase the parking structure? How will Sound Transit evaluate a "fair price" for the parking structure – "fair value" or cost-plus mark-up?

- i. City Response:** As outlined in the RFP, the City will work directly with the selected development partner to deliver the ST Facility in accordance with a 2015 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and a 2019 Conveyance Agreement for the 130th Station parcels between the City and Sound Transit. Under these agreements, the City took ownership of the 130th parcels and committed to delivering the ST Facility. Ownership of the ST Facility will be conveyed to the City by the development partner through a condominium structure, with timing to be negotiated. The City will then transfer ownership of the completed facility to Sound Transit at no cost.

To support this structure, the City intends to negotiate a Condominium Declaration and related governing documents (e.g., association bylaws), along with a separate operations and maintenance agreement. These documents will define the terms of use and responsibilities within the project's common areas and must be acceptable to Sound Transit. Additionally, the City and development partner will negotiate a purchase price for the ST Facility based on jointly developed cost estimates, to be finalized and documented near the completion of the ST Facility's design.

- 5. Question:** On page 8, section C, "Interim Parking," the RFP mentions the need to construct an interim surface park-and-ride lot to accommodate the project. Is it assumed that the proposed team will be responsible for designing and constructing this lot for the City of Bellevue, or is Bellevue seeking an indication of whether the team can perform these tasks? It is currently assumed that the work for this parking lot will occur during the preconstruction phase.

- i. City Response:** The City will be responsible for designing, permitting, and constructing the interim parking lot during the preconstruction phase of the mixed-use project. This approach ensures the interim facility is open and operational before construction of the mixed-use project begins and the existing 300-stall surface park-and-ride lot on the 130th parcels is vacated.

- 6. Question:** Is the selected developer responsible for any aspects of the required interim parking? If so, are there any portions of the existing temporary lot that need to be preserved for Sound Transit's use elsewhere and if so, will Sound Transit remove them?
- i. City Response:** The selected development partner will not be responsible for the interim parking lot. The City will lead the design, permitting, and construction of the interim facility and will coordinate with the development partner on project timing. This coordination will ensure the interim lot is open and operational prior to groundbreaking on the mixed-use project and the closure of the existing 300-stall surface park-and-ride on the 130th parcels.
- 7. Question:** ST Facility: Throughout the RFP it mentions the ST Facility should include service and maintenance access – are there specifications provided? Also, it states facility should include bike storage – is there a specific requirement?
- i. City Response:** Please refer to the design and construction manual provided for service and maintenance access and bike storage requirements.
- 8. Question:** Is the Design and Construction Agreement between City of Bellevue and Sound Transit referenced in the documents available? If not, what are the implications upon this proposed development?
- i. City Response:** Yes, the Design and Construction Agreement is available and has been uploaded to the [RFP webpage](#) as attachment K. *130<sup>th</sup> Design and Construction Agreement*.
- 9. Question:** Will shared parking with Sound Transit be allowed for the entire project?
- i. City Response:** The Sound Transit park-and-ride stalls are designated exclusively for transit riders and are not considered shared parking. As such, the development partner will be required to construct separate parking to meet the applicable land use code requirements for the mixed-use development.
- 10. Question:** Please confirm if there could be overlap parking for the 302 stalls that are being built for Sound Transit. It would obviously be structured into the proposal.
- i. City Response:** The Sound Transit park-and-ride stalls are designated exclusively for transit riders and are not considered shared parking. As such, the development partner will be required to construct separate parking to meet the applicable land use code requirements for the mixed-use development.

**11. Question:** Other than the indicated target of 2030 for the ST Facility opening, does the City have an expectation or preference for completion of the balance of the development?

**i. City Response:** The City is open to a phased development approach, with the requirement that the first phase include delivery of the ST Facility. The remaining portions of the 130th Parcel may be completed in a subsequent phase, following a timeline proposed by the development partner.

**12. Question:** Would the City and Sound Transit desire to open the ST Facility before 2030 if that could be accomplished?

**i. City Response:** Yes, the City is open to feasible options for opening the ST Facility prior to 2030.

**13. Question:** What specific requirements will the developer need to fulfill to meet Department of Ecology or City of Bellevue requirements and covenants prior to site acquisition, during construction, and throughout the operational phase of the project? What is expected to be completed prior development partner purchasing the land and what should be included in the budget as initial remediation required by the development partner?

**i. City Response:** The City is coordinating with the Department of Ecology to progress towards a formal No Further Action opinion. A specific remediation timeline is not available currently, and as such it is not clear which activities will be completed prior to purchase. The City will continue to work with the selected developer to ensure that all requirements are fulfilled and covenants removed.

**14. Question:** Ecology: We are assuming you desire us to bid as if an NFA will be granted. Please confirm otherwise.

**i. City Response:** The City is coordinating with the Department of Ecology to progress towards a formal No Further Action opinion. Please bid as if an NFA will be granted.

**15. Question:** When will the City receive a formal opinion of clean-up actions required to remove the remaining restrictive covenant?

**i. City Response:** The City is coordinating with the Department of Ecology to progress towards a formal No Further Action opinion. A specific remediation timeline is not available currently, and as such it is not clear which activities will be completed prior to purchase. The City will continue to work with the selected developer to ensure that all requirements are fulfilled and

covenants removed.

**16. Question:** What is the status of the No Further Action letter related to the environmental remediation work that has been completed? Is there an estimated timeframe for issuance of the NFA letter?

i. **City Response:** The City is coordinating with the Department of Ecology to progress towards a formal No Further Action opinion. A specific remediation timeline is not available currently, and as such it is not clear which activities will be completed prior to purchase. The City will continue to work with the selected developer to ensure that all requirements are fulfilled and covenants removed.

### III. Prevailing Wage Requirements, Ownership Structure

**1. Question:** Will prevailing wages are only required for the ST garage work?

i. **City Response:** The City anticipates that prevailing wages will apply to the ST Facility construction. Depending on the nature of the proposed development and the ability to clearly delineate between public and private elements of the development, prevailing wages may or may not apply to non-ST Facility construction. For those elements that are shared between the ST Facility and other portions of the development, the City anticipates that prevailing wages will apply to all work on such shared elements, including shared infrastructure and structural elements.

**2. Question:** Will the parking structure and the multifamily building require prevailing wage for construction if they are separate buildings and the multifamily building is owned / developed by a private developer / owner?

i. **City Response:** The City anticipates that prevailing wages will apply to the ST Facility construction. Depending on the nature of the proposed development and the ability to clearly delineate between public and private elements of the development, prevailing wages may or may not apply to non-ST Facility construction. For those elements that are shared between the ST Facility and other portions of the development, the City anticipates that prevailing wages will apply to all work on such shared elements, including shared infrastructure and structural elements.

**3. Question:** What portions of the project are subject to Prevailing Wage?

i. **City Response:** The City anticipates that prevailing wages will apply to the ST Facility construction. Depending on the nature of the proposed development and the ability to clearly delineate between public and

private elements of the development, prevailing wages may or may not apply to non-ST Facility construction. For those elements that are shared between the ST Facility and other portions of the development, the City anticipates that prevailing wages will apply to all work on such shared elements, including shared infrastructure and structural elements.

4. **Question:** If the ST Facility is located below another portion of the project, such as a mixed-use tower, would the tower become subject to Prevailing Wage? If the ST Facility is not located below another portion of the project, but shares a wall, or structural elements, or infrastructure, would that extend the public works applicability to other portions of the development?

i. **City Response:** The City anticipates that prevailing wages will apply to the ST Facility construction. Depending on the nature of the proposed development and the ability to clearly delineate between public and private elements of the development, prevailing wages may or may not apply to non-ST Facility construction. For those elements that are shared between the ST Facility and other portions of the development, the City anticipates that prevailing wages will apply to all work on such shared elements, including shared infrastructure and structural elements.

5. **Question:** Does the Prevailing Wage requirement apply to 100% of the applicable portion of the project? If the project's sponsor is also a general contractor who typically self-performs work, can those portions of work be excepted from Prevailing Wage requirements?

i. **City Response:** Prevailing wages will apply to all work performed on all applicable elements of the development, including self-performed work.

6. **Question:** In a mixed use project, there are often allocated construction costs (across other uses) and likely shared expenses. We are assuming the developer proposes a structure that works for feasibility of the project. Please confirm otherwise. A commercial condo or sale related to a mixed use project can get complicated.

i. **City Response:** The City is open to structures proposed by the developer, however, with respect to that portion of the garage which will be conveyed to Sound Transit, the preference is to utilize a condominium structure.

7. **Question:** Please confirm if separate parcel ownership (with cross easements) is acceptable in lieu of a commercial condo. A commercial condo has a variety of challenges that come with it.

i. **City Response:** Sound Transit's use and ownership of its portion of the garage must be achieved through a condominium structure such that

Sound Transit ultimately owns its unit.

#### IV. Sound Transit Garage

1. **Question:** Please define the operating hours and what level of security or monitoring will be committed to and enforced by Sound Transit over the long term. It is important given the mixed use concept and separate ownership.

- i. **Sound Transit Response:** Parking facilities owned and operated by Sound Transit are available to transit passengers 24 hours per day. Passengers may park for up to 24 hours while on trips taken by transit. Sound Transit manages its parking facilities in accordance with board-approved policy.

Sound Transit is not able to commit to a specific security or monitoring program for this location at this time. In-person security monitoring patrol is led by our East Side mobile patrol and is typically conducted in garages 2-4 times per 12-hour shift. Additional security is provided by Transit Security Officers (onboard security officers), that will conduct checks randomly throughout the day. Remote security monitoring is conducted through a closed-circuit TV system 24 hours per day. Developers will be required to implement safety and security related requirements outlined in Sound Transit's [Project Delivery Standards](#) and Requirements Manual for ST Facilities including but not limited to CPTED principles.

2. **Question:** The RFP states the Development Partner will convey ownership of the ST Facility to the City via a condominium structure. Can the City clarify if the ST Facility will be open 24/7 for transit riders?

- i. **Sound Transit Response:** Parking facilities owned and operated by Sound Transit are available to transit passengers 24 hours per day. Passengers may park for up to 24 hours while on trips taken by transit. Sound Transit manages its parking facilities in accordance with board-approved policy.

3. **Question:** Out of the 302 stalls being built for Sound Transit, what amount would be accessible stalls?

- i. **Sound Transit Response:** The number of accessible parking stalls is outlined in the 130<sup>th</sup> Design and Conveyance Agreement - Exhibit A Transit Access Improvements Requirements – Americans with Disabilities Act

For either Permanent or Interim TAs, the total number of ADA parking stalls included in the 300 parking stalls shall number the greater of the federal or

Sound Transit requirement or 8 ADA stalls.

To be confirmed by developer, current Federal ADA law for 302 spaces would generate 6 standard ADA Stalls and 2 van stalls.

Additionally, guidance for the provision of accessible parking is described in [Sound Transit Requirements Manual](#) Section 830.3.4.1 Accessible parking.

4. **Question:** Please describe more specifically Sound Transit's involvement in the design and documentation process during the milestone reviews. Will Sound Transit be applying their quality control process?

i. **Sound Transit Response:** The design and documentation process for Sound Transit Facilities will be subject to the [Sound Transit Design Development Submittal and Review Process](#) (EP-03). Sound Transit will collaborate with the selected developer to identify specific sections of the EP-03 document that will be required for this Facility. The City and Developer will be responsible for completing Quality Records, including Quality Checks as part of the submittal process.

5. **Question:** Per Sound Transit Requirements Manual, clause 830.3.10.1 notes "garages must be 'open' structures, as defined by and in accordance with the requirements of the IBC, except where site constraint or building program requires garages to be otherwise and clause 830.3.10.2 notes "garages must be designed to minimize the use of earth-retaining structures." Please confirm that these two clauses preclude the garage from being located below grade.

i. **Sound Transit Response:** Sound Transit Requirements Manual Sections 830.3.10.1 and 830.3.10.2 do not preclude the garage from being located below grade. Please note the exception for site constraint or building program.

Sound Transit prefers an open and above grade garage that aligns with goals for passenger experience ([Station Experience Design Guidelines](#)), meets safety and security requirements ([Sound Transit Requirement Manual](#)), and ensures optimal long-term operations. If a below grade garage is proposed, Sound Transit will advise on performance criteria and requirements, especially in the areas of ventilation and waterproofing.

## V. Permitting/Zoning, Building, Fire, Utilities, Transportation

1. **Question:** In the future LUCA for BelRed, what is the anticipated Maximum Impervious Surface/Lot Coverage percentage?

i. **City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The

strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.

**2. Question:** When will a BelRed Land Use Code Amemdmnt draft be available?

- i. City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.

**3. Question:** When does the City anticipate the public release of the draft LUCA?

- i. City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.

**4. Question:** In the future LUCA for BelRed, please confirm that the requirement of providing Multifamily play areas for new developments of 10 units or more will still be required.

- i. City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.

**5. Question:** Does the City anticipate future LUCA to revise Market Rate Multi-Family Dwelling parking requirements? To what minimum number of parking spaces required?

- i. City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.

**6. Question:** Please confirm that the proposed provisions of LUC 20.10.398 land use districts would apply Mixed-Use Highrise (Mu-H) to this site. If so, is there a draft for a future overlay for the BelRed TOD?

- i. **City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.
- 7. **Question:** Does the City anticipate that in any future LUCA for BR-RC-1 zone, the 15' step back on Spring Street will not be required?
  - i. **City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.
- 8. **Question:** Does the City anticipate that in any future LUCA for BR-RC-1 zone, the 15' step back on streets identified as a Required Sidewalk-Oriented Development will not be required?
  - i. **City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.
- 9. **Question:** Is a Sound Transit Parking structure exempt from the required ground floor uses?
  - i. **City Response:** LUC 20.25D.130.A does not provide a specific exemption from its requirements for a parking structure associated with public transit. LUC 20.25D.030.C.3 however provides an opportunity for a deviation to the requirements of LUC 20.25D.130 provided that the alternative is more consistent with the purpose and intent of the code. That is, there is potential for a Sound Transit Parking Structure to be permitted at ground-floor where a ground-floor active use is required, however this is entirely dependent on the details of the proposal, and how the structure would be presented to the street.
- 10. **Question:** 130th Ave NE is listed as a 'Shopping Street', will the minimum required sidewalk dimension change?
  - i. **City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until

code adoption.

**11. Question:** Which (if any) property lines are considered side or rear?

i. **City Response:** See LUC 20.50.046 for definitions of Setback - Front, Setback - Rear, and Setback - Side for clarification of how boundaries are characterized. For clarification, front boundary abuts the street right-of-way, access easement, or private road from which the lot is addressed or gains primary access. The rear boundary is opposite to the front boundary. The remaining boundaries are side boundaries. There are some caveats to this, please review LUC 20.50.046 for further detail.

**12. Question:** Presume we can ignore PSE easements 20210806000992 and 8312160694 (locations not recorded). Please confirm.

i. **City Response:** Easements cannot be ignored. All easements must be identified on the survey. Applicants may need to engage with PSE to determine easement boundaries.

**13. Question:** Can we ignore buffers/setbacks of steep slope on adjacent property to the northeast?

i. **City Response:** Critical areas (LUC 20.25H) cannot be ignored. A topographical survey will be required to confirm the presence of steep slopes and their buffers insofar as they impact the site.

**14. Question:** As of this date, the 2025 LUCA Draft has not been released. Can the City provide the expected Maximum FAR allowed under 2025 LUCA for anticipated zone (BR-RC-H-2 Highrise Residential Mixed Use)?

i. **City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.

**15. Question:** As of this date, the 2025 LUCA Draft has not been released. Can the City provide the expected Maximum Floor Plate Areas and associated trigger heights allowed under 2025 LUCA for anticipated zone (BR-RC-H-2 Highrise Residential Mixed Use)?

i. **City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.

**16. Question:** As of this date, the 2025 LUCA Draft has not been released. Can the City provide the expected Minimum Parking Ratios per Use allowed under 2025 LUCA for anticipated zone (BR-RC-H-2 Highrise Residential Mixed Use)?

**i. City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.

**17. Question:** As of this date, the 2025 LUCA Draft has not been released. Can the City provide the expected FAR Amenity Incentive System allowed under 2025 LUCA for anticipated zone (BR-RC-H-2 Highrise Residential Mixed Use)?

**i. City Response:** The LUCA for BelRed is currently in development. The strikedraft is anticipated to be available Summer 2025 with adoption anticipated December 2025. The Public Hearing cannot be confirmed but is anticipated in Fall 2025. Questions about the future BelRed code and updates cannot be confirmed until code adoption.

**18. Question:** Please describe in more detail the City's expectation for the public engagement process in the design of the open space.

**i. City Response:** Public engagement through the land use entitlement process will be undertaken in accordance with LUC 20.35 insofar as relevant to the type of entitlements required. Public comments may be received by Development Services which will be addressed as part of staff reporting.

**19. Question:** Can the portions of lots that will be dedicated for right-of-way be used to calculate the applicable FAR for the site?

**i. City Response:** LUC 20.50.020 defines FAR as being the development gross floor area excluding parking and mechanical areas divided by net on-site land area. It states, "Net on-site land area includes the area of an easement but does not include the public right-of-way". If land that currently forms part of the site is to be dedicated for right-of-way purposes, it would be considered in the calculation of FAR unless receiving compensation from the CITY for the right-of-way dedication.

**20. Question:** Can the Sound Transit light rail station site area be used to calculate the applicable FAR for the site?

**i. City Response:** As per above, if land is to be dedicated for Sound Transit purposes currently forms part of the site, it would be considered in the overall

FAR calculation for the site. This is based on the current lot configuration and does not consider any future lot line adjustments.

**21. Question:** We understand that garage uses are to be screened. If permissible commercial uses, i.e. retail, occupy the frontage between the garage and the public right of way, is that retail space required to be of a particular height relative to the height of the parking structure?

**i. City Response:** Land Use cannot comment on this question without the benefit of more detailed plans.

**22. Question:** What is the location of Goff Stream? King County GIS and Bellevue Map Viewer show different locations along 132nd Ave NE. What are its buffers/setbacks? Buffer/setback 10' for underground/closed stream locations per code, but studies show 50' setback at both open and closed stream locations.

**i. City Response:** The location of Goff Stream must be verified by a topographical survey. Goff Stream is a Type F creek. The buffer for a Type F stream is 50ft for a developed site unless afforded some variation under the provisions of LUC 20.25H.075.C. An additional 50ft structure setback would apply to Type F Streams per LUC 20.25H.075.D. A Critical Area Land Use Permit may be required if disturbance of the buffer or structure setback area is proposed. This advice may change on receipt of a detailed topographical survey.

**23. Question:** The RFP states the project will feature a future Open Space at the SE corner of the 130th Parcels in response to capping Goff creek. Current BelRed Land Use code requires a 50' buffer at Critical Area Overlays, including closed segments of streams. Current development conditions include a driveway off 132nd Avenue NE into the 130th Parcels. Can the City clarify future site improvements as part of future development that are allowable within the Critical Area Overlay buffer and intended Open Space, specifically structure setbacks and driveway access?

**i. City Response:** LUC 20.25H.075.C states that closed stream segments have no critical area buffer. They continue to have structure setbacks which per LUC 20.25H.075.D is 10ft. All disturbance of land within a critical area, the associated buffer, or the associated structure setback will require a Critical Area Land Use Permit and will require some degree of mitigation. There is no explicit list of matters which can or cannot be permitted, however all disturbances will be required to satisfy the performance standards under LUC 20.25H.080.

**24. Question:** Please clarify if the Goff Creek open space setback can be counted

towards the Tier 1b Park Dedication amenity bonus.

- i. **City Response:** The Park Dedication amenity bonus item relates to land dedicated to parks that is consistent with the BelRed Parks and Open Space Plan generalized location and size requirements depicted in the BelRed Subarea Plan. The BelRed Subarea Plan identifies a future neighborhood Park and Civic Plaza adjacent Goff Creek in proximity to the site. There may be opportunity for dedication of this land for Park purposes to qualify under the Amenity Incentive System per LUC 20.25D.090.

## VI. Addendum #2 Questions

Outstanding questions awaiting responses will be addressed in a subsequent Addendum to be released on Friday, May 1.

1. **Question:** Would the city and Sound Transit be open to considering 2 separate building structures – (a) the parking structure separate from (b) the multifamily building creating a simple ownership structure upon completion – Sound Transit owns the parking structure, and RFP winner owns the multifamily building?
2. **Question:** What will be the dimension of the ROW dedication for 131st Ave NE? Please provide precise E/W location.
3. **Question:** Is there a required dimension of the buffer shown on exhibit F on 132nd Ave NE?
4. **Question:** Will there be a new ROW on the north side of the site for a future street? If so, what will be the dimension of the dedication required?
5. **Question:** Planning for Interim Local Street dimensions for NE 17th St on property. What are the required setbacks/easements from the North property line to achieve?
6. **Question:** We understand there are plans by Bellevue to extend a road to the north. This impacts feasibility considerably and there are some grading concerns with the property to the north. Please reconfirm the street standards that are required in connection with the mixed use agreement.
7. **Question:** Please confirm if major utilities will be required on this potential street extension
8. **Question:** Are there any dedication of land requirements for ROW or buffer as shown in Tisareno's Plan?
9. **Question:** Can the selected developer build over right-of-way within the project limit? If

so, what clear height must be maintained?

- 10. Question:** Materials included with the RFP indicate right-of-way dedications for a future 131st Ave and future NE 17th. Are these alignments required to be located where indicated, or can these alignments be modified if the result is a more unified and vibrant project?
- 11. Question:** Will the City permit driveway access on 130th Street or Spring Street or will access need to be provided on 131st Ave or 132nd Ave?
- 12. Question:** What flexibility is there with the location of 131st Ave NE? How wide will it be required to be? 60' recommended per Transportation Design Manual, 66' shown in prior study.
- 13. Question:** Are we allowed to build below the future 131st Ave NE (pedestrian only street)? If so, how much vertical space is required?
- 14. Question:** The street location south of the site (across the Lightrail tracks) is shown centered on the property line separating two parcels (#2825059058 and #2825059285), consistent with the Kelly TOD RFP which calls for a 30' dedication on the east side of the property. Extending this location northward to the site as the RFP proposes does not align with property lines. Please clarify the intended location for the future 131st Avenue NE given surrounding property lines to the site and avoiding undue burden on future development.
- 15. Question:** The street is identified as a Future Local Street, per the BelRed Streetscape Plan, and is required to provide a 61'-0" ROW. Can the City clarify if the applicant will be required to provide a full 61'-0" ROW on the property?
- 16. Question:** What should be the assumed future street elevations for the purpose of this proposal?
- 17. Question:** Will the City be providing the engineered design of the future street for the proposed project to be designed to?
- 18. Question:** Is the selected development team required to build the future street to terminate at the property line and to City of Bellevue Transportation Design Guidelines as part of the development?
- 19. Question:** Is there an interim condition the City will accept for this Future Local Street?
- 20. Question:** Is this street intended to have a utility easement? Does the City intend to locate utilities in the future right-of-way?

- 21. Question:** For the purpose of this proposal, please clarify the City's intended or assumed location for future NE 17th Street as there is conflicting information in various documents. The street location is shown aligned to the North property line of Parcel #2825059040 in the Property Appraisal. This alignment seems consistent with the BelRed Vision for the street to border a proposed park on the parcel north of the property. The street location is shown at a mid-block location in Exhibit E (Heartland Study) and diagrammatically in the BelRed Transportation Improvement Projects document. The street is shown to dead end at Future 131st Avenue NE.
- 22. Question:** The street is identified as a Future Local Street, per the BelRed Streetscape Plan, and is required to provide a 61'-0" ROW. Please clarify if the applicant will be required to provide a full 61'-0" ROW on the property.
- 23. Question:** What should be the assumed future street elevations for the purpose of this proposal?
- 24. Question:** Will the City be providing the engineered design of the future street for the proposed project to be designed to?
- 25. Question:** Is the selected development team required to build the future street to terminate at the property line and to City of Bellevue Transportation Design Guidelines as part of the development?
- 26. Question:** Is there an interim condition the City will accept for this Future Local Street?
- 27. Question:** Is this street intended to have a utility easement? Does the City intend to locate utilities in the future right-of-way?
- 28. Question:** Is the selected developer responsible for any stream restoration for Goff Creek?

**END**