

Community Open House – Summary

Feb. 15, 2017

The City of Bellevue hosted a second community open house on Jan. 19, 2017. The purpose of this open house was to solicit input on pared-down design options for the Bellevue Way HOV Project. The focus of the meeting was to present refined design options and design features, reflect community feedback to date, and further identify community priorities and concerns. An online open house with the same content and questions was also available between Jan. 11 and Jan. 31, 2017, so that members of the public could participate without attending the in-person event. (Initial project briefings and the first open house – which was also available online and in-person – were held in spring 2016.)

Notifications

The project team advertised the second round of open houses to a broader area using more tools than the first round, which resulted in increased in-person turnout. A postcard was distributed to 4,462 residences and businesses and an email invite was sent to 139 individuals on the project email list. Community notifications also included a news release, posts on the city events calendar and Neighborhood News, and advertisements on Facebook, Twitter and NextDoor.

Attendance

Open House: Jan. 19, 2017, 5 – 7 p.m., Bellevue City Hall

- 45 sign-ins, 50-55 total attendees
- 13 surveys (29% of attendees), respondents did not always answer all questions

Online Open House: Jan. 11 – 31, 2017

- 192 site visits, 134 unique users
- 27 surveys (20% of users), respondents did not always answer all questions

Summary of Survey Results

Survey respondents included both residents in neighborhoods adjacent to the corridor and members of the traveling public. Please note that respondents did not always answer all questions. Overall, survey respondents provided the following feedback:

- **Length:** When asked to select a preferred project length, 33% of respondents (10 of 30) preferred Option 2 (HOV through “Y” intersection). However, in response to a second question about length, 70% of respondents (21 of 30) voiced support for Option 4 (HOV through “Y” intersection on 112th Avenue only). Option 4 provides the best annual travel time savings.
- **Width:** 61% of respondents (22 of 36) preferred the wider shoulder width option. Most mentioned space for disabled vehicles as their main reason for choosing the wider option. Some also preferred the space for larger trees.
- **Construction phasing:** A majority (56%, or 18 of 32 respondents) did not support phasing construction. If phased, 60% (9 of 15 respondents) preferred phasing option 4B (1,700-foot HOV extension from South Bellevue P&R to Winters House).

- **Aesthetics:** Most (75%, or 21 of 28 respondents) supported how aesthetic design is progressing. Commenters generally supported natural features and features that relate to the area's history.
- **Noise walls:** Approximately 63% (20 of 32) – but not all adjacent property owners – would like the city to continue considering noise walls.
- **Project opposition:** Four of the 40 respondents (10%) voiced strong opposition to the project. Their concerns included (1) whether the project would provide long-term traffic relief, (2) construction impacts on neighborhood residents, and (3) project cost and funding sources.

Results by Survey Question

Responses to each survey question are summarized in more detail below, and include both the in-person and online open house comment forms. Open house boards are attached at the end of this summary, and hyperlinks are provided to relevant information for each question, as appropriate.

- **Question 1: After reviewing these [[roadway width](#)] options, which do you prefer?**
 - Narrow: 12 (33%)
 - Wide: 22 (61%)
 - Other: 2 (6%) [no project, neither]
 - Note: Of the 14 residents who indicated they were adjacent to the corridor, preferences for narrow or wide options were mixed (eight preferred wide, four preferred narrow, and two preferred neither).
 - Comments: In general, commenters mention the space for disabled vehicles as their main reason for choosing the wide option. Some also prefer the space for larger trees. Commenters mention less impacts to neighborhood residents as their main reason for choosing the narrow option.
- **Question 2: Which of the following [[project length](#)] options would you prefer?**
 - Option 1 (HOV to "Y" intersection): 7 (23%)
 - Option 2 (HOV through "Y" intersection): 10 (33%)
 - Option 3 (general purpose lane to "Y" intersection): 4 (13%)
 - Option 4 (HOV through "Y" intersection on 112th Avenue only): 9 (30%)
 - Comments: A few commenters mentioned that most drivers are single occupants. Some noted that option 2 moves the most people.
- **Question 3: Option 4 (HOV through "Y" intersection on 112th Avenue only) is the best performing in terms of [annual travel time savings](#). Would you support option 4?**
 - Yes: 21 (70%)
 - No: 9 (30%)
- **Question 4: Would you support [phased construction](#)?**
 - Yes: 14 (44%)
 - No: 18 (56%)
 - Which phased option?
 - 4A (320-foot HOV extension north of South Bellevue P&R): 3 (20%)

- 4B (1,700-foot HOV extension from South Bellevue P&R to Winters House):
9 (60%)
 - No preference: 3 (20%)
 - Comments: Most commenters either expressed general opposition to the project or preferred that the project be constructed all at once to complete construction as soon as possible.
- *Question 5: Do you support how the [aesthetic design options](#) are progressing?*
 - Yes: 21 (75%)
 - No: 7 (25%)
- *Question 6: What inspirations resonate with you based on the images [\[presented\]](#)?*
 - Opinions were mixed, but in general commenters supported natural features and features that relate to the area's history. One commenter noted that, given the length height of the retaining wall, both vegetation and incorporated design features would improve the gateway to the city.
- *Question 7: Do you think the city should continue to consider [noise walls](#)?*
 - Yes: 22 (65%)
 - No: 12 (35%)
 - Note: Of the 13 residents who indicated they were adjacent to the corridor, preference for noise walls was mixed.
 - Comments: Some thought it is important to mitigate noise, some do not want to block the view, and others stated that noise walls are too expensive. One commenter noted that neighborhood residents will have dealt with the impacts of construction for seven years and a noise wall and quiet pavement would offset these impacts.

Additional Questions and Comments

- *Question 8: Do you have any other comments related to the materials presented?*
 - Several commenters expressed concern about the project need and long-term relief the project would bring to the city and neighborhoods.
 - Some were concerned that the need for an HOV lane (and the project) would lessen once light rail is operational in the corridor.
 - Others noted increased traffic due to the growing population and called for planning that accounts for traffic volumes in 2030 and beyond.
 - One commenter expressed concern about project funding and environmental impacts.