



LIGHT RAIL PERMITTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Date: March 13, 2015
To: Light Rail Permitting Advisory Committee
From: Matthews Jackson (425-452-2729, mjackson@bellevuewa.gov)
Carol Helland (425-452-2724, chelland@bellevuewa.gov)
Liaisons to the Advisory Committee
Development Services Department
Subject: March 18th, 2015 Advisory Committee Meeting

Enclosed you will find an agenda packet for your twenty-eighth Advisory Committee meeting next Wednesday, March 18th. We will begin at 3:00 p.m. in Room 1E-113 at Bellevue City Hall. The meeting will be chaired by Doug Mathews.

This packet includes:

1. Agenda
2. March 4th Meeting Minutes
3. City PowerPoint Presentation from March 4th
4. Excerpt from Land Use Code Identifying CAC Review Phases
5. Email from Mike Brennan to Councilmember Robertson
6. Draft CAC South Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit Advisory Document

We will have hard copies of all electronic packet materials for you on March 18th. Materials will also be posted on the City's project web site at <http://www.bellevuewa.gov/light-rail-permitting-cac.htm>.

Please let us know if you have any questions prior to our meeting. We look forward to seeing you next week.



LIGHT RAIL PERMITTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Wednesday, March 18th, 2015

3:00 p.m. – 5:00 pm • Room 1E-113

Bellevue City Hall • 450 110th Ave NE

AGENDA

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| 3:00 p.m. | 1. Call to Order, Approval of Agenda, Approval of March 4th, Meeting Minutes
<i>Committee Co-Chair Mathews</i> |
| 3:10 p.m. | 2. Public Comment
<i>Limit to 3 minutes per person</i> |
| 3:25 p.m. | 3. CAC Scope and Mitigation
<i>Mike Brennan, Development Services Director</i> |
| 3:45 p.m. | 4. South Bellevue Segment Draft Design and Mitigation Permit Advisory Document Continued Discussion– Action Item
<i>Matthews Jackson</i> |
| 4:50 p.m. | 5. Public Comment
<i>Limit to 3 minutes per person</i> |
| 5:00 p.m. | 6. Adjourn |

Project web site located at: <http://www.bellevuewa.gov/light-rail-permitting-cac.htm> . For additional information, please contact the Light Rail Permitting Liaisons: Matthews Jackson (425-452-2729, mjackson@bellevuewa.gov) or Carol Helland (425-452-2724, chelland@bellevuewa.gov). Meeting room is 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 (TR).

CITY OF BELLEVUE
LIGHT RAIL PERMITTING
ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

March 4, 2015
3:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-113

MEMBERS PRESENT: Doug Mathews, Susan Rakow Anderson, Joel Glass, Wendy Jones, Ming-Fang Chang,

MEMBERS ABSENT: Marcelle Van Houten, Don Miles, Siona van Dijk

OTHERS PRESENT: Matthews Jackson, Department of Development Services; Kate March, Department of Transportation; Paul Cornish, John Walser, Sound Transit

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA, APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. by Co-Chair Mathews who presided.

The agenda was approved by consensus.

A motion to approve the December 17, 2014, minutes was made by Mr. Glass. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderson and it carried unanimously.

A motion to approve the February 4, 2015, minutes was made by Mr. Glass. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderson and it carried unanimously.

With regard to the February 18, 2015, minutes, Ms. Jones called attention to the last paragraph on page 6 and noted that the word "caliber" should read "caliper." She also noted that the penultimate sentence in the same paragraph should read "...clarified that neither the sewer project that will occur first or the light rail project will disturb the trees in the median."

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Mr. Glass. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jones and it carried unanimously.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bill Popp, an Enatai resident, said he attended the meeting on March 3 regarding the light rail project and what is happening relative to mitigation. He asked when the Committee would act to approve the mitigation for the South Bellevue section.

Planning Manager Matthews Jackson said the March 3 meeting was an open house

regarding the South Bellevue station area planning effort which is looking at land use and mitigation outside of the purview of the light rail permitting Committee. The Committee's recommendations will be limited to the transit way and the stations and will be forwarded to the director of Development Services who is charged with making the decision on the permits. Traffic impacts and mitigation is outside the scope of the Committee's work.

Mr. Popp said to understand the mitigation Sound Transit is proposing, one must go through the 90 percent design plans to determine all of the impacts. The project is a difficult one and will require very expensive mitigation. It may not even be possible in the ultimate sense to do it even as the engineers have it laid out. The elevation drawings show the height of the wall along the alignment and it is shown in places to be as high as 20 feet tall; along 112th Avenue SE the wall is 12 to 15 feet high and is located right at the edge of the sidewalk. That is an issue about which the Committee should advise the staff to supply elevation drawings so it can be seen just what it will look like when driving past the wall. Additionally, the HOV lane mitigation will have some mitigating benefits. Without the HOV lane, 108th Avenue SE in the Enatai neighborhood the 2030 modeling suggests the queue will up north of Enatai Elementary; with the HOV lane in place, the queue will back up to just south of the school, which is still significant and is hardly appropriate mitigation for the neighborhood. Fully mitigating the impacts of the South Bellevue park and ride will not be possible unless a lane in addition to the HOV lane is added to Bellevue Way, something that is not possible because there are only three receiving lanes on I-90. The solution would be not to put the park and ride lot where proposed and move it instead to the A2 station location at I-90 as envisioned by the B7R alignment.

Mr. Aaron Laing, 2128 109th Avenue SE, said he was present representing himself and not as chair of the Planning Commission or as a member of the Enatai Neighborhood Association board. He thanked the Committee members for their volunteer service to the city. He noted that he previously had sent an email to the Committee in which he described what he believed to be the scope of the Committee's purview in making a recommendation to the planning director on a design and mitigation permit. There is a public record in which Councilmember Robertson, one of the drafters of one of the code sections the Committee is applying, confirms his understanding of the intended and adopted scope of the Committee. There has been some debate, especially on the mitigation side of the design and mitigation permit. He said having read all the Committee's meeting minutes and the permits themselves, he concluded what is ostensibly lacking in the recommendation is the mitigation aspect. There has been a lot of discussion of what amounts to mitigation of mitigation, such as the color pallet of the noise wall and the pattern for the concrete, none of which is actual mitigation. The Committee has made many recommendations to Sound Transit and staff about things it would like to see in the final recommendation, to which the response has been the recommendation is outside the purview of the Committee. There is a provision in the code that says the planning director can respond in writing to anything the director believes is not appropriate mitigation or is outside the purview of the Committee. The Committee should include in its recommendation everything it has been told are outside

its purview; if the director believes the recommendation exceeds the authority of the Committee, so be it, and the director can respond in writing. The Committee was established by the City Council to create a last layer of protection and citizen input into the permits, especially the design and mitigation permit, before they get approved. The staff have eliminated from the draft document more than 80 percent of the ideas the Committee has come up with. With regard to the draft document, specifically pages 38 and 39, it contains many conclusory statements. The Committee is empanelled to look at the actual permit applications to see if something further is needed. Subsection C says "The proposal complies with the applicable requirements of this light rail overlay district. Compliance with all elements of the light rail overlay district will be demonstrated in the issued design and mitigation permit." That means it will not be made clear until after the work of the Committee is done whether or not what actually goes out demonstrates compliance with all elements of the light rail overlay district. That is putting the cart before the horse. The Committee should not simply trust staff when they say everything will be fine in the end.

Mr. Joe Rossman, 921 109th Avenue SE, spoke as a representative of Build a Better Bellevue. He said noted that prior to the meeting he had shared with the Committee two documents, including the elusive 90 percent engineering drawings and specification requirements for the B segment construction plan. Those plans were made available to the public in early September 2014 and it is surprising that Sound Transit has not seen fit to allow the city to provide the Committee with copies of the document. The documents include thousands of pages of drawings that will guide the work of the construction contractor that will be building the East Link rail system through Mercer Slough from I-90 to SE 8th Street. The project so incredibly complex it will take more than six years to build a mile and a half of rail line, a park and ride facility and a light rail station. It represents the single longest construction duration ever done by Sound Transit to date for a given length of distance. Sound Transit has not released any of the cost information even though City Councilmembers have repeatedly asked for it. He said the second document provided to the Committee is one the average Bellevue citizen can easily and quickly understand. It provides for the first time ever a visual depiction of exactly what is going to be done to the Mercer Slough Nature Park as the light rail is built. Fourteen-plus acres of land will be totally scraped right down to bare ground. The specifications make clear that because of the incredible amount of peat and other plant matter that has built up over eons along the west side of the park, the work will be done on what amounts essentially to a sponge. When SE 8th Street was built at 112th Avenue SE a caterpillar scraper sank and remains buried under the intersection. It will be necessary for the contractor to remove hundreds and hundreds of thousands of cubic yards of soil, peat, rock and gravel in a channel 50 to 100 feet wide in order to install layers of rock and stone that will be needed to create a solid foundation on which to build the rail line. The work is completely in violation of the shoreline code at both the state and local levels. Nevertheless, the staff have determined that a shoreline permit should be granted on the strength of the Council having said everything was approved. Those details are why there is litigation going forward. The Council called for placing the rail line beginning to the north of the Winters House all the way to the crossover at 112th Avenue SE in a deep retained cut in order to keep noise from being directed into the neighborhoods or the

park. Without any disclosure Sound Transit has raised the level of the rail bed to grade level or very slightly below all along 112th Avenue SE and the north end of Bellevue Way triggering the need for very tall noise walls. In the course of doing so, Sound Transit has created still more un-mitigatable effects. No one will be able to see the Slough anywhere west of the tall walls, except for some small access ports. The noise walls are so high they will reflect all of the roadway noise westward up into the neighborhoods, violating the city's standards. The noise will also be reflected into the Slough, violating the city's standards. The noise walls are so high they will create a channel of massive air pollution. The prevailing winds blow over the tops of the trees to the west of Bellevue Way and 112th Avenue SE and will curl in the space, building up and gathering the polluted air. No one will be able to comfortably enjoy walking, biking or driving in the air polluted channel. A member of city staff has admitted that issue has not been thought of.

Ms. Betsy Blackstock, a resident of Surrey Downs, agreed with the comments made by Mr. Laing. She referred to page 84 of the best practices document and noted that mitigation techniques such as sound walls need to be built before the impact occurs. The Committee should make reference to that fact in its recommendations.

3. UPDATES

Mr. Jackson said public notice for the Central Bellevue segment has been posted. The segment includes the East Main, Downtown and Hospital stations. Work to fill out the calendar for the coming months is under way. Paper copies of the permit documents will be made available to the Committee members; the document is also available online.

Mr. Jackson reported that the consultants for Sound Transit and the city, as well as the attorneys for both entities, have been working together on the noise issues. Sound Transit is working on a response relative to how they think the city's code should be applied. Sound Transit has indicated it will be supplying additional information relative to noise in the Mercer Slough Nature Park. The city has asked for some additional analysis for the Enatai properties where the projected sound levels will be above the ambient levels.

The city is working with Sound Transit on the timing of constructing the noise walls. The city is interested in having the walls in place at the earliest point technically feasible to mitigate construction noise.

Mr. Jackson said the mitigation map that went to the Council included all mitigation elements, not just those being worked on by the Committee. The scope of work being addressed by the Committee is that which is outlined by the code. There have been conversations regarding the feedback received from Mr. Liang and the response received from Councilmember Robertson. The issues have been talked through by the steering committee, the director-level team, that is helping to guide the work. Sound Transit has a steering committee as well. All are in agreement that the Committee has been working within the established scope.

The Committee has addressed the issue of the look and feel of the sound walls and the use of vegetation to help soften the impacts of the taller walls. Technical experts are working on the technical details so the walls will do what they are intended to do relative to mitigating noise impacts. All of the technical data is available to the Committee.

4. SOUTH BELLEVUE SEGMENT DRAFT DESIGN AND MITIGATION PERMIT ADVISORY DOCUMENT

Mr. Jackson said as directed he made sure that recommendations from the pre-advisory document that were addressed in the permit submittal are noted. For the south Bellevue segment there have been several design changes that occurred largely on the advice of the Committee, including the use of art on the panels and incorporating more color into the station. The Committee at the February 18 meeting did a very good job of summarizing the issues that still need to be in the advisory document.

Mr. Glass praised the staff for doing a good job of highlighting what the Committee has talked about. There are, however, a lot of references in the document to complete compliance with the light rail best practices, something that is not quite true. There are also references to mitigation of traffic, and the statement is made that the proposal is compatible and responds to existing and intended character, quality of development, physical characteristics of the subject property and immediate vicinity. That is not true. The result will in fact be a blight to everything that currently exists and to say otherwise is not correct. The document makes some very broad statements that the Committee should not be making.

Mr. Jackson asked which items from the best practices report are not specifically being met. Mr. Glass said he did not believe that with the alignment chosen it will be physically possible to meet the light rail best practices. It will mow down 1200 trees or more; the line runs up against a wetland; and it will block the view of the Mercer Slough Nature Park. The recommendations made by the Committee represent the best job of working with the plans that have been submitted, but they do not comply with the light rail best practices. Best practices calls for avoiding the impacts, but the line will in fact run right through the middle of it.

Ms. Anderson agreed that the impacts will not be totally avoided, but much has been done to address them. She suggested it would be helpful to have the best practices report in hand while reviewing the recommendations.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Glass, Mr. Jackson suggested revising the recommendation to reflect the fact that the alignment was not chosen by the Committee and that the recommendations represent the best possible mitigations. Mr. Glass proposed enumerating the best practices that clearly are not mitigated for. He noted that the Committee has not discussed construction impacts at all.

Mr. Glass said he did not know whether or not it is true that the proposal addresses all applicable design guidelines and development standards in the light rail overlay district

and fulfills their purpose and intent; the Committee did not study all of the different land use ordinances. The 10- to 14-foot-high sound walls on Bellevue Way and 112th Avenue SE may not meet the land use ordinances. Mr. Jackson said that issue has in fact been talked about a lot, including a review of all the design guideline sections. Mr. Glass said the Committee has talked about trying to mitigate for the walls, but walls of that height are really not compatible with residential neighborhoods or the park; they certainly do not respond to the existing residential character. Mr. Jackson noted that early on in the process the Committee focused on context and studied what the neighborhood is like and what the vision is for what the neighborhood will be like in the future. Mr. Glass allowed that the Committee likely could not do anything other than what it has done given the hand it has been dealt. Even so, the advisory document should not claim as true something that is not in fact true.

Answering a question asked by Ms. Jones, Mr. Jackson clarified that the lettered items are decision criteria drawn from the Land Use Code; they are not statements being made by the Committee. The bulleted items represent the work of the Committee.

Mr. Glass said the Committee has done the best it can do with what it has been given, regardless of whether or not what it has been given is good. The proposed mitigation in the second half of the document is reasonable. He added that he did not want the document to say the light rail use running through a single family residential neighborhood is a compatible use.

Ms. Anderson pointed out that in fact the line will run alongside the Mercer Slough and then up an urban corridor, not through the middle of a neighborhood.

Mr. Jackson noted that some have called for even taller walls as a way to mitigate the noise. The inherent challenge is in finding the sweet spot. Many are anxious to see the light rail line completed as soon as possible, while others feel the opposite. He agreed to draft an opening statement to the effect that the Committee has worked with what it was given and has worked to the best of its ability to identify and recommend mitigation, even though the best practices criteria have not necessarily been fully satisfied.

Co-Chair Mathews commented that the project presents itself with huge issues and the only way to truly and fully mitigate for it would be to not allow the project at all. The project is going forward, it will have impacts, and the Committee is charged with doing the best it can to address those impacts and minimize them to the degree possible.

Mr. Glass commented that the document makes the claim that the proposal is consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding. He said he was not able to determine if a change was made by Sound Transit relative to the depth of the trench running by Winters House as claimed by Mr. Rossman. Mr. Jackson reminded the Committee members that the 90 percent plans have not yet been submitted to the city as part of any project review. The plans submitted to date have been for pre-submittal evaluation. The 60 percent plans are usually used for land use permitting purposes. The East Link project, however, is different from any other project ever addressed by the city. Never before has the Council

seated a citizen advisory committee to provide the Development Services Director with advice on a permit decision.

Justin Lacson with Sound Transit said the elevation of the trench by the Winters House is significantly deeper than the adjacent roadway. To the north of the Winters House the alignment parallels the roadway and is almost at the existing grade. He said he did not know how that compares to what was in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Mr. Glass said it was his understanding that the alignment outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding had the train in a trench in front of the Winters House and staying in the trench fairly far down 112th Avenue SE before rising to the elevation of the roadway. The pictures shown to the Committee have the tracks fairly close to the level of the roadway, making it necessary to have taller sound walls that effectively block all views of park, all without landscaping between the sound walls, the sidewalk and the street. A less deep trench represents a material change from the Memorandum of Understanding.

Ms. Jones said at the January 26 Council briefing the trench was identified as mitigation for the neighborhood. She agreed that if the trench is not as deep as originally envisioned, the result is a significant change. Mr. Jackson said the trench has always been mitigation for access to the Winters House.

Mr. Glass said more information is needed before making any statement in the document that the proposal is consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding. Ms. Jones and Ms. Anderson concurred.

Ms. Jones asked if the permit could be denied or postponed pending compliance with the Memorandum of Understanding. Mr. Jackson reminded the Committee that the proposal is very similar to the one produced for the Bel-Red segment. The proposal as conditioned must be able to satisfy the decision criteria. Where there are design changes that have not been reviewed by the Committee, concurrence of the Committee will be sought relative to satisfying the code and the context. With regard to the permit, the city has many options. Typically permits are conditioned to say something specific must be done prior to issuance of a clearing and grading permit, or prior to issuance of a building permit. The model being utilized for the light rail permitting includes far more substantive construction-level information than is typically seen. The Development Services Director in all cases has the ability to approve, modify or deny an application, but is limited in the case of the light rail permit relative to what can be changed from the recommendation of the Committee, which is highly unusual. In order to deviate from the advice given by the Committee, the director must demonstrate why it is necessary to do so.

Co-Chair Mathews asked if there is a reason why the trench cannot continue at a depth significantly greater than the grade of the roadway in order to reduce impacts. Mr. Jackson said if something changed from the Memorandum of Understanding there likely is a technical reason. He said he would be happy to seek an explanation.

Mr. Glass noted that the document also states that the proposal utilizes to the maximum extent possible the best available construction, design and development techniques. He said he did not fully agree with that statement. Mr. Jackson pointed out that utilizing the best available construction, design and development techniques is a criteria from the code. Mr. Glass said that did not change his opinion. The sound walls will reflect sound rather than absorb sound because it will be the less expensive option. The concrete finish is aimed at reducing costs but it is not necessarily the most attractive or the best finish. The project will run through the wetland and there will be mitigation, but not everything that could be done will be done. There will be no green roof and the wetland will not be returned to its predevelopment state. To say the best will be utilized would be inaccurate.

Mr. Jackson stated that the Committee's desire to see living vegetation, a green wall and/or a green roof are in the advisory document. The mitigation proposed for the wetlands and wetland buffers is going to be equal or superior to what currently exists relative to the quality of habitat and the vegetation. The minimum requirements are exceeded by the Sound Transit mitigation plan. The panels on the guideway will be sound absorbing, and the concrete walls proposed are consistent with common use. The advice from the Committee includes a recommendation for a different type of wall from what Sound Transit originally planned to put it. Including additional sound absorption would yield nominal returns at best per the noise consultants.

Ms. Anderson said she assumed maximum extent possible means within cost limits. If cost is no issue, there are all kinds of things that could be done to make the project better. Mr. Jackson agreed that the project will be constructed with public money and in such cases there is always a call to be mindful of cost considerations. The Committee is, however, free to recommend whatever it wants relative to mitigation.

Mr. Glass said part of his frustration lies in the fact that on several occasions when the Committee has recommended something it has been told the suggestion is either not feasible or lies outside the parameters of what the Committee can address. Mr. Jackson responded by saying that Sound Transit has in fact made a lot of changes based on the advice of the Committee; they have not said no to everything and in fact have not said no to most suggestions.

Ms. Jones noted her support for the call of the Committee to incorporate more vegetation into the design, including some larger specimen trees in the meadow area before the station and also at the Y. In the attempt to create a gateway to Bellevue there should be some enhanced landscaping in the median area along 112th Avenue SE and around the curve at the Y. Mr. Jackson said he has been working with parks to identify opportunities for additional landscaping along the full 112th Avenue SE corridor up to the Y. The idea of having a median work as a gateway is intriguing to parks. They have identified some trees to retain and some that are not in the best health and should come out. He said he has also had conversations with parks about the steep slope side of the Y and the need for taller vegetation. Sound Transit will be creating a nursery to establish plants in line with the notion of having more mature vegetation at the time of planting.

Ms. Jones commented that it had taken quite a bit of time to get everyone on the same page with the artistic interpretations of the color schemes and asked if it was necessary to further elaborate what earth tones are. Mr. Jackson allowed that might be helpful given that everyone makes assumptions. He said in his mind earth tones are browns and tans. The artists have taken that direction and are working to update their designs.

Ms. Jones agreed with the browns and tans but said earth tones also include red and orange.

Ms. Anderson supported clarifying that earth tones means tans, browns, beige, brickish red and the like. Ms. Jones added that the proposed art treatments should use those colors as well as the rusts, reds and orange.

Ms. Jones said she liked the suggestion made to include plantings around the light poles on the roof of the garage. Mr. Jackson agreed to add that as a recommendation.

Ms. Jones also said she would like to see a parking stall or two on top of the garage set aside for people to stand and view the Slough. Mr. Jackson said he would draft some language to that effect.

Ms. Anderson said the Committee has often received feedback that the garage cannot be seen so it will not matter if it has a great deal of vegetation. The station can be seen, however. She suggested using station/garage in all such references in the document so that nothing is overlooked. She also said she would like to see it stated clearly in the beginning that the design and mitigation permit review process is solely based on the 60 percent design. Mr. Jackson said that will certainly be in the staff report. It is clear in the code at what levels the Committee is to engage.

There was agreement to include in the document references to traffic and noise impacts even in light of the fact that the Development Services Director may conclude the comments are beyond the scope of the Committee.

Ms. Jones called attention to the use of city right-of-way section and the reference to limiting impacts on traffic to the best level technically feasible and asked if that could be expanded to reference the impacts that might involve taking traffic through the neighborhoods, both during construction and one the line is operational. Mr. Jackson said he could do that.

Ms. Jones referenced the noise wall to be constructed on the west side of the guideway and commented that the garage wall itself could bounce noise back into the neighborhood. She asked if the noise study took that into consideration. Mr. Jackson said his assumption was that the noise study is focused on operational conditions, which would include having the garage in place. He said he would verify that.

Mr. Glass said he was disappointed that the Committee had not even been able to read the interim reports from the city's sound expert. He said the Committee would benefit from

knowing what the experts are saying about where thing might be going. Mr. Jackson said the expert has not to date made any recommendations for new walls, or any recommendation specific to any additional wall height. The conversations have largely been focused on methodology and keeping noise levels with the train in operation equal to or less than what the current ambient noise levels are.

Mr. Chang said it is not an easy task for the Committee to put out an appropriate recommendation given the time each member has to contribute, and the limited authority the Committee has. The Committee is supposed to look after the interests of the residents. Little discussion, however, has been devoted to engineering aspects and as such the Committee will not have any impact on the outcome of the design. He said he hoped as an engineer to be able to review and comment on the design work. The Committee would benefit from having someone from the city or Sound Transit walk through some of the engineering aspects if for no other reason than to be assured that everything the Committee has recommended can in fact be accommodated.

Mr. Jackson said when the request went out for Committee members the idea was to get a broad spectrum of people. There never was an expectation that the Committee would be looking at engineering plans and making recommendations on them. All of the plans are available for the public to see and comment on.

Co-Chair Mathews clarified that there was consensus in regard to the bullet points in the draft document. He said the next Committee meeting should focus on where there are overriding concerns in need of additional conversation.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Aaron Liang said he is proud to be part of the community and to see those who are willing to volunteer their time to serve their fellows. He said he was heartened to hear that the draft is not yet in any shape to be passed on. It is true that the Committee must work with the hand it has been dealt, but it is also true that the Committee is charged with reviewing and making recommendations on all aspects of the design and mitigation permit. The Committee should give the direction it deems appropriate and let the director sort out what is and is not in the purview of the Committee. The Council is currently trying to negotiate a development agreement with Sound Transit behind closed doors and what the Committee recommends in terms of mitigation will absolutely influence that process. The Memorandum of Understanding profile was supposed to be sacrosanct and every effort should be put into making sure it will remain that way. Sound Transit is working to amend the track profile and that is disconcerting. Additionally, the Committee is working from the 60 percent designs and should include in the recommendation direction not to materially deviate from that design in the 90 percent designs. The Committee absolutely has the authority to make recommendations about construction conditions. The Committee should also make recommendations on life of the project conditions, including site-specific noise measurements before construction begins and after the project is complete in order to determine if additional mitigation is warranted.

Mr. Joe Rossman concurred with the comments made by Mr. Liang. He said last year the Recreation and Conservation Office conducted a study to explore and understand the importance of the issue of accessibility to the state's wilderness and park lands. The Office considers the Mercer Slough Nature Park to be one of the preeminent natural areas of its type in the entire state. The plan Sound Transit has set forth in its 90 percent documents fundamentally makes it impossible for citizens, both present and future, to enjoy the sense of emotional and physical accessibility to the unique natural environment. It will be totally walled off except for a short distance in front of the Winters House. Mercer Slough is Bellevue's equivalent to the Washington Arboretum Park is to the city of Seattle. He suggested the draft document was not written by Mr. Jackson but rather by other staff members in anticipation of the discussions that are going on at a higher level leading up to completion of a development agreement between the city and Sound Transit. The push is on to have an agreement reached before the end of the month. The higher powers are asking the Committee to simply agree to the extremely conclusory statements in the document, which will have the effect of law. The same Sound Transit staff person who admitted to not having thought about possible air pollution problems caused by the tall walls also astoundingly made the statement that it is common knowledge among all the technical staff at Sound Transit that the senior experts recommended to the political leaders that a tunnel be built from I-90 to downtown Bellevue to avoid the very problems the Committee is now focused on. It was the Sound Transit politicians who said no.

Mr. Bill Popp said the statements in the draft document are absolutely conclusory. He said as a professional engineer he could not agree to most of the propositions put forth in the bullet points. The Committee has been precluded from focusing on certain areas but is being asked to rubber stamp those things. The power of the Committee has been concealed from the Committee. The draft document makes that clear. The Committee should not agree with what it has not studied.

Ms. Betsy Blackstock recommended using the word "shall" in association with every recommendation made in the draft document. To do so would add the extra umph the Committee is looking for.

Mr. Jackson clarified that he was the sole author of the document.

6. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Mathews adjourned the meeting at 5:19 p.m.

LIGHT RAIL PERMITTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE



COMMITTEE MEETING
March 4-3:00PM | ROOM 1E-113



Agenda

- **3:00**
 - Call to Order, Approval of Agenda, Approval of February 4th Meeting Minutes – Co-Chair Mathews and Van Houten
 - Public Comment
- **3:20**
 - Updates
- **3:45**
 - Draft South Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit Advisory Document – Matthews Jackson and CAC
- **4:50**
 - Public Comment



CAC Scope of Work

LUC 20.25M.035.C. Scope of CAC Work

The scope of work for the CAC is intended to support the CAC purpose described in subsection A of this section. The CAC is advisory to the decision maker for the design and mitigation permits, and its scope includes:

1. **Becoming informed** on the proposed RLRT system or facility project;
2. **Accepting comments from the public** during CAC meetings for incorporation into the consolidated advice provided by the CAC to the Regional Transit Authority and the City of Bellevue;
3. **Participating in context setting** to describe the communities, urban and historic context, and natural environment through which the alignment passes;
4. **Providing early and ongoing advice** to the Regional Transit Authority on how to incorporate context sensitive design and mitigation into schematic designs for proposed project elements including stations, linear track elements, landscape development, walls (including concrete and masonry and tunnel portal), park and rides, traction power substations and other features of the RLRT system or facility; and
5. **Providing advisory guidance to permit decision makers** as described in more detail below regarding any RLRT system or facility design and mitigation issues prior to any final decision on required Design and Mitigation Permits, including written guidance as to whether the proposal complies with the policy and regulatory guidance of subsection E of this section and LUC 20.25M.040 and 20.25M.050.



South Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit Draft Advisory Document

1. Building Height

- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit incorporate a living wall, green roof, or other green vegetation treatment on the garage as mitigation for Sound Transit's request for additional building height.

2. Landscape Development

- The CAC recommends the inclusion of a living wall, green roof, or other green vegetation be installed on the upper levels of the garage to help soften the edges of the structure as well as communicate the idea of a grand entry into Bellevue.
- The CAC recommends that additional landscaping options to help screen exposed noise walls should be included in the landscape plans. This should include a climbing vegetation option where there is limited space for additional landscaping.
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit include additional appropriate landscaping to screen the guideway.
- The CAC recommends that more mature vegetation be incorporated into the design of the light rail corridor. This can be achieved by planting some large specimen trees at the point where the trains enter the South Bellevue Station (meadow), on the east side of the Y of Bellevue Way and 112th Ave SE, and in the median in 112th Ave SE.



South Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit Draft Advisory Document

3. Light and Glare

- The CAC recommends light standards on the deck of the South Bellevue Station Garage are as low as feasible to avoid light pollution into the neighborhoods in the vicinity. **(In order to prevent light spillover or trespass Sound Transit is using LED lights for their poles that are designed with technology to reduce backlight and to focus light in a fixed area on the surface of the garage).**

4. Recycling and Solid Waste

- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit work with its sustainability group to evaluate a system wide compost collection bin option at its stations.

5. Critical Areas

- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit work collaboratively with the City of Bellevue to develop public information sign(s) at the South Bellevue Station that would inform transit users and visitors of wildlife and habitat within Mercer Slough Nature Park.
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit adhere to all best management practices and complies with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations related to wildlife including but not limited to migratory birds.

6. Use of City Right of Way

The CAC acknowledges that specific details regarding the use of the City ROW will be handled through the review and issuance of Right of Way Use Permits per LUC 20.25M.040.J; however, they want to emphasize the importance of limiting impacts on traffic to the best level technically feasible.



South Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit Draft Advisory Document

Additional General Design Guidelines

- The CAC recommends that more earth tones and color variety be incorporated into the proposed art treatments and other station and corridor elements. **(Sound Transit has indicated that the artists for the station are evaluating options for additional color and earth tones in proposed art treatments.)**
- The CAC recommends less hard edges in the design of the South Bellevue Station. One suggestion would be to incorporate more organic shapes into the design to soften hard lines. **(Sound Transit has attempted to incorporate more organic shapes in the design using art treatments at both the station, parking garage, and guideway.)**
- The CAC recommends Sound Transit evaluate the possibility of using an artistic design for the mesh screening at the South Bellevue Station Garage. **(Sound Transit has proposed a green artistic treatment for the mesh screening on the garage. Final color combinations are still in development.)**
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit extend the proposed art treatment on the guideway noise walls and additional colors be incorporated into the design. **(Sound Transit has shown an art treatment on a portion of the guideway noise walls that reflects CAC pre-advisory advice. The CAC has requested additional color variety which is under development. Sound Transit has also indicated that an extension of the art treatment is in preliminary design.)**



South Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit Draft Advisory Document

- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit use a stacked stone or brick type pattern with variegated earth tones for noise walls. Ashlar stone walls one recommendation from the CAC. The CAC also recommends evaluation of art opportunities to help buffer any negative visual impacts of areas of tall noise walls.
- The CAC recommends Sound Transit work with the City of Bellevue to install way finding kiosk(s) at the South Bellevue Station and as appropriate along the alignment to direct people to available resources and recreational opportunities within Mercer Slough Nature Park.
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit use round catenary poles instead of H poles from the South Bellevue Station to the tunnel portal at the intersection of 112th Ave SE and Main Street.

Departures by the Director from specific recommendations included within the CAC's Design and Mitigation Permit Advisory Document shall be limited to those instances where the Director determines that the departure is necessary to ensure that the RLRT facility or system is consistent with: (i) applicable policy and regulatory guidance contained in the Light Rail Overlay; (ii) authority granted to the CAC pursuant to this section; (iii) SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the RLRT system or facility; or (iv) state or federal law. Departures from the CAC Design and Mitigation Permit Advisory Document shall be addressed in the decision by the Director, and rationale for the departures shall be provided.



Next Meeting

No Meeting on March 18th

April 1, 2015

- Introduction to Central Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit

Figure 20.25M.035.D.1 – Illustration of CAC Process in Relationship to Design and Permitting Activities

CAC Review Phases*	General Intent of CAC Review	Relationship to Regional Transit Authority Design Phases*	Relationship to City Overlay Permit Phases*
Context Setting	Provide early input on “context” to which design elements and features of RLRT system or facility should respond, including landscape development and tree retention; develop understanding of project goals and objectives; provide early guidance on areas where the policy and regulatory guidance of subsection E of this section and LUC 20.25M.040 and 20.25M.050 and request additional information that may be necessary to evaluate compliance.	Preliminary Engineering Phase (0 –30% Design)	Pre-Application Conference
Schematic Design	Provide feedback regarding effectiveness at incorporating contextual direction into the early phases of design. Anticipated that CAC would provide advice regarding complementary building materials, integration of public art, preferred station furnishings from available options, universal design measures to enhance usability by all people, quality design and materials and landscape development and tree retention. Provide further input and guidance, based on the input and guidance provided in the context setting phase, on compliance (or lack of compliance) with the policy and regulatory guidance of subsection E of this section and	Design Phase (30% Design)	Pre-Development Review

Figure 20.25M.035.D.1 – Illustration of CAC Process in Relationship to Design and Permitting Activities

CAC Review Phases*	General Intent of CAC Review	Relationship to Regional Transit Authority Design Phases*	Relationship to City Overlay Permit Phases*
	LUC 20.25M.040 and 20.25M.050 and whether information is sufficient to evaluate such compliance.		
Design Development	Provide feedback regarding effectiveness of design and landscape development in incorporating prior guidance at context and schematic design stages. Provide further input and guidance, based on the input and guidance provided in the context setting phase, on compliance (or lack of compliance) with the policy and regulatory guidance of subsection E of this section and LUC 20.25M.040 and 20.25M.050 , and whether information is sufficient to evaluate such compliance. Provide the Advisory Document.	(60% Design)	Permit review (CAC input provided prior to Director recommendation (if CUP required) or Director decision on the Design and Mitigation Permit (Process II), as applicable)
Construction Permits	This phase is only necessary if additional design was required as a condition on the permits issued pursuant to LUC 20.25M.030.C . The intent of this CAC review phase is to provide feedback on final design details for specific RLRT system or facility components when the information necessary for the CAC's review was not available at the time of the design and mitigation review process. Examples include	(90 – 100% Design)	Review of design and mitigation conditions required to be met prior to Building Permit issuance

Figure 20.25M.035.D.1 – Illustration of CAC Process in Relationship to Design and Permitting Activities

CAC Review Phases*	General Intent of CAC Review	Relationship to Regional Transit Authority Design Phases*	Relationship to City Overlay Permit Phases*
	review of final details of public art or landscape development included in the project, which may have been available at a conceptual level only at the time of design and mitigation review.		

* Anticipated. Design phasing is under control of applicant. In the event of a conflict between the stated design phase and the City's overlay permit phase, CAC involvement occurs at the time of the identified City permit phase.

From: Brennan, Mike
Sent: Sunday, January 11, 2015 10:46 PM
To: Council
Cc: Helland, Carol; Jackson, Matthews; March, Kate
Subject: East Link CAC -- Scope and Status of Work -- Please do not Reply All

Councilmember Robertson,

Thank you for your question about the scope of the Light Rail Permitting CAC. I am providing information council might find useful when responding to questions from the public about the scope and status of the CAC's work as they continue to review the Design and Mitigation permits for East Link. As you know, the CAC is charged with serving as the city-wide perspective on the design and mitigation of Sound Transit's East Link light rail system as described in LUC Chapter 20.25M.

Specifically, LUC Chapter 20.25M describes the CAC's scope as *"Providing early and on-going advice to the regional transit authority on how to incorporate context sensitive design and mitigation into schematic designs for proposed project elements including stations, linear track elements, landscape development, walls (including concrete and masonry and tunnel portal), park and rides, traction power substations and other features of the RLRT System or Facility."* (A full copy of the CAC's scope and purpose as stated in the LUCA is attached for your reference).

As described above, the CAC was tasked with first setting the context for the alignment, and then reviewing Sound Transit's designs for compatibility with this context. Over the past year, the CAC has provided Sound Transit with extensive guidance to help achieve this task, and has had a significant impact on the design evolution of the stations. Public input is critical to achieving this purpose. Given this importance, I thought you may like to hear an update about the public feedback the CAC has received to date.

The CAC has held 24 regular meetings at which CAC members have heard a total of 64 public comments during oral communications and received 22 comments via email or comment form. All meeting materials and minutes are posted on the CAC website [here](#).

In addition to these regularly scheduled meetings, the CAC co-hosted three public open houses with Sound Transit at which a total of 202 public comments were submitted. CAC members circulated at the open houses to engage in conversation with community members in attendance and hear their opinions first hand. These open houses were held at the 60% design milestone and greatly informed the CAC's pre-development advisory documents, which are meant to help guide Sound Transit as it reaches the 90% design milestone. CAC members have also attended a variety of other public meetings and community briefings with staff to gain greater insight into the design perspectives of a variety of community members.

While an important part of the D&M Permitting process, the CAC is just one arm of an extensive permit review and project coordination effort underway in the city. City staff and our technical consultants are responsible for ensuring that the mitigation proposed by Sound Transit complies

with city codes. For example, the city's technical noise expert Julie Wiebusch is assisting in the technical peer review of the proposed noise walls.

The Land Use Code does not charge the CAC with overseeing construction or construction mitigation. Staff has and will continue to work with Sound Transit to plan for anticipated construction impacts as more information related to construction and construction phasing becomes available. This includes working with Sound Transit to plan traffic management prior to the start of construction. Staff will provide information about construction and other mitigation required for the project during council briefings scheduled over the next two weeks.

As you know, the city has yet to issue any Design & Mitigation permits to Sound Transit. You can see the current status of permits and all of the advisory documents issued to date on the CAC's website under the [advisory document page](#).

Please don't hesitate to contact me with any questions about the Light Rail Permitting CAC, or the permit review process.

Mike



LIGHT RAIL PERMITTING CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

ADVISORY DOCUMENT – RECOMMENDATION TO DIRECTOR SOUTH BELLEVUE SEGMENT DESIGN AND MITIGATION PERMIT

~~FEBRUARY 27~~ MARCH 13, 2015

Introduction

The Light Rail Permitting Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) was appointed by the Bellevue City Council consistent with the terms of the Light Rail Overlay regulations contained in the city's Land Use Code (LUC). Land Use Code section 20.25M.035.A describes the CAC purpose to:

1. **Dedicate the time necessary to represent community, neighborhood and citywide interests in the permit review process***; and
2. Ensure that issues of importance are surfaced early in the permit review process while there is still time to address design issues while minimizing cost implications; and
3. **Consider the communities and land uses through which the RLRT System or Facility passes, and set “the context” for the regional transit authority to respond to as facility design progresses***; and
4. **Help guide RLRT System and Facility design to ensure that neighborhood objectives are considered and design is context sensitive by engaging in on-going dialogue with the regional transit authority and the City, and by monitoring follow-through***; and
5. Provide a venue for receipt of public comment on the proposed RLRT Facilities and their consistency with the policy and regulatory guidance of paragraph 20.25M.035.E below and Sections 20.25M.040 and 20.25M.050 of this Part; and
6. **Build the public's sense of ownership in the project***; and
7. **Ensure CAC participation is streamlined and effectively integrated into the permit review process to avoid delays in project delivery*.**

* Identifies the focus of this Advisory Document

Design and Mitigation Permit Review – 60% Design Development Phase

This phase of review is intended to provide feedback regarding effectiveness of design and landscape development in incorporating prior guidance at context and schematic design stages. This phase is intended to provide further input and guidance, based on the input and guidance

provided in the context setting phase, on compliance (or lack of compliance) with the policy and regulatory guidance of LUC 20.25M and LUC 20.25M.040 and 20.25M.050, and whether information is sufficient to evaluate such compliance. The CAC advice is based on the alignment and station designed agreed to by the City of Bellevue City Council and Sound Transit Board through a Memorandum of Understanding. The CAC is charged with providing the Director of the Development Services Department with a final advisory document.

CAC Work Product

The work of the CAC at each review stage will culminate in a CAC advisory document that describes the phase of review and CAC feedback. The work product required following the Pre-Development Phase of CAC review is intended to provide Sound Transit with early guidance and advice that is integrated into future Design and Mitigation Permit submittals. This final Design and Mitigation Permit advisory document is intended to provide the Director of the Development Services Department with a recommendation to demonstrate Sound Transit compliance with Design and Mitigation Permit Decision Criteria pursuant to LUC 20.25M.030.C.3.

On May 13, 2014, Sound Transit was provided with the South Bellevue Segment Pre-Development Advisory Document. That document outlined Sound Transit compliance with context setting characteristics and early Design and Mitigation Permit requirements. The pre-development advisory document also included several recommendations on additional items to be addressed during formal permit review.

The following represents the CAC advisory recommendation to the Development Services Department Director regarding compliance related to LUC 20.25M.030.C.3, LUC 20.25M.040, and 20.25M.050.

20.25M.030.C.3 Design and Mitigation Permit Decision Criteria

A proposal for a RLRT system or facility may be approved or approved with conditions; provided, that such proposal satisfies the following criteria:

- a. The applicant has demonstrated compliance with the CAC Review requirements of LUC 20.25M.035; and
 - Sound Transit has demonstrated compliance with CAC review requirements by attending and presenting materials regarding the East Link Light Rail System and Facilities at CAC meetings held the 1st and 3rd Wednesday of each month. In addition to the regularly scheduled meetings Sound Transit and City staff provided tours of the existing Central Link Light Rail System and Facilities and proposed East Link route in the City of Bellevue including the South Bellevue Segment.

b. The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan including without limitation the Light Rail Best Practices referenced in Comprehensive Plan Policy TR-75.2 and the policies set forth in LUC 20.25M.010.B.7; and

- The East Link Project has demonstrated consistency with the numerous Comprehensive Plan Policies that are applicable to light rail (LU-9, LU-22, LU-24, ED-3, TR-75.1, TR-75.2, TR-75.5, TR-75.7, TR-75.8, TR-75.9, TR-75.12, TR-75.15, TR-75.17, TR-75.18, TR-75.20, TR-75.22, TR-75.23, TR-75.27, TR-75.28, TR-75.32, TR-75.33, TR-75.34, TR-75.35, TR-118 and UT-39). This proposal is also consistent with Light Rail Best Practices which focus on community and neighborhoods, community involvement, connecting people to light rail, land use, street design and operations, system elements (elevated, at-grade, and tunnel), property values, station security, and construction impacts and mitigation. A detailed description of project compliance will be included in the issued Design and Mitigation Permit.

c. The proposal complies with the applicable requirements of this Light Rail Overlay District; and

- As it will be conditioned, this application for Design and Mitigation Permit will be in compliance with all elements of the Light Rail Overlay District including RLRT system and facilities development standards. Approval of an Alternative Landscape Option and Noise Monitoring and Contingency Plan will be included as conditions of approval. will be demonstrated in the issued Design and Mitigation Permit.

d. The proposal addresses all applicable design guidelines and development standards of this Light Rail Overlay District in a manner which fulfills their purpose and intent; and

- As discussed below, the proposal addresses all applicable elements of 20.25M.040 and 20.25M.050.

e. The proposal is compatible with and responds to the existing or intended character, appearance, quality of development and physical characteristics of the subject property and immediate vicinity; and

- The South Bellevue Segment of East Link must comply with all applicable zoning and context requirements. Recommendations from the CAC to better integrate and soften the look and impact of the station and garage located at the South Bellevue Station are responsive to the existing and intended character of this segment. Light Rail Overlay (LUC 20.25M) development standards, including the establishment of the RLRT Transition Area also respond to the character within this segment.

f. The proposal will be served by adequate public facilities including streets, fire protection, and utilities; and

- A majority of existing public facilities are available to serve East Link in South Bellevue. The city has initiated numerous capital facilities projects to serve light rail and future city utility and transportation needs. When the light rail system is operational anticipated impacts to public facilities including streets, fire protection, and utilities will have been mitigated.
- g. The proposal complies with the applicable requirements of the Bellevue City Code, including without limitation those referenced in LUC 20.25M.010.B.8; and
- Development, construction and operation of the RLRT system and facilities will comply with applicable Bellevue City Codes, including the noise control code and environmental procedures code. Technical analysis of Sound Transit submitted Noise Studies will be completed prior to issuance of the Design and Mitigation Permit. Any additional noise mitigation resulting from technical review will be included as a condition of approval of the Design and Mitigation Permit.
- h. The proposal is consistent with any development agreement or Conditional Use Permit approved pursuant to subsection B of this section; and
- The proposal is consistent with the Memorandum of Understanding signed by the City of Bellevue and the Sound Transit Board which was completed at the Preliminary Engineering stage of plan development. Plan development through the final design stage will result in expected refinements to design that is typical to any major development. Significant design changes in plan design that are within the scope of work for the CAC will be brought back to the CAC for evaluation during construction permit review.
- i. The proposal provides mitigation sufficient to eliminate or minimize long-term impacts to properties located near the RLRT facility or system, and sufficient to comply with all mitigation requirements of the Bellevue City Code and other applicable state or federal laws.
- To the greatest extent possible with the chosen alignment and station design, the proposed RLRT facility and system ~~Sound Transit will be required to~~ will avoid, minimize, and mitigate anticipated long-term impacts to properties located near the light rail system and facilities. Mitigation includes, but is not limited to, enhanced landscaping, critical area planting enhancements, permanent noise walls, sound absorbing panels on the guideway, and the installation of public art.
- j. When the proposed RLRT facility will be located, in whole or in part, in a critical area regulated by Part 20.25H LUC, a separate Critical Areas Land Use Permit shall not be required, but such facility shall satisfy the following additional criteria:
- i. The proposal utilizes to the maximum extent possible the best available construction, design and development techniques which result in the least impact on the critical area and critical area buffer; and

- ii. The proposal incorporates the performance standards of Part 20.25H LUC to the maximum extent applicable; and
 - iii. The proposal includes a mitigation or restoration plan consistent with the requirements of LUC 20.25H.210; except that a proposal to modify or remove vegetation pursuant to an approved Vegetation Management Plan under LUC 20.25H.055.C.3.i shall not require a mitigation or restoration plan.
- Mitigation and restoration requirements per LUC 20.25H due to impacts to critical areas and their buffers will be incorporated into the Design and Mitigation Permit approval. Impacts to critical areas in the South Bellevue Segment include temporary and permanent impacts to wetlands and their buffers, temporary and permanent impacts to streams and their buffers, and impacts to habitat for species of local importance. Mitigation for impacts to critical areas and their buffers per the criteria located in LUC 20.25H will occur in the South Bellevue Segment within Mercer Slough Nature Park as well as a site located in the Bel Red Segment. Mitigation is required to result in a condition that is equal to or superior to the pre-existing environment. Based on staff's review of the technical reports and mitigation proposed by Sound Transit, the proposed mitigation will provide a lift in critical areas function at maturity over the existing condition.

CAC Recommendation to the Director of Development Services

At the request of the CAC, CAC Pre-Development Phase advice that has been addressed or partially addressed in the Design and Mitigation Permit submittal are included in bold for the Director's reference.

20.25M.040 RLRT system and facilities development standards

1. Building Height
 - The CAC recommends that Sound Transit incorporate a living wall, green roof, or other green vegetation treatment on the garage/station as mitigation for Sound Transit's request for additional building height.
2. Landscape Development
 - The CAC recommends the inclusion of a living wall, green roof, or other green vegetation be installed on the upper levels of the garage/station to help soften the edges of the structure as well as communicate the idea of a grand entry into Bellevue.

- The CAC recommends that additional landscaping options to help screen exposed noise walls should be included in the landscape plans. This should include a climbing vegetation option where there is limited space for additional landscaping.
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit include additional appropriate landscaping to screen the guideway.
- The CAC recommends that more mature vegetation be incorporated into the design of the light rail corridor. This can be achieved by planting some large specimen trees at the point where the trains enter the South Bellevue Station (meadow), on the east side of the Y of Bellevue Way and 112th Ave SE, and in the median in 112th Ave SE.

3. Light and Glare

- The CAC recommends light standards on the deck of the South Bellevue Station Garage are as low as feasible to avoid light pollution into the neighborhoods in the vicinity. **(In order to prevent light spillover or trespass Sound Transit is using LED lights for their poles that are designed with technology to reduce backlight and to focus light in a fixed area on the surface of the garage).**

4. Recycling and Solid Waste

- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit work with its sustainability group to evaluate a system wide compost collection bin option at its stations.

5. Critical Areas

- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit work collaboratively with the City of Bellevue to develop public information sign(s) at the South Bellevue Station that would inform transit users and visitors of wildlife and habitat within Mercer Slough Nature Park.
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit adhere to all best management practices and complies with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations related to wildlife including but not limited to migratory birds.

6. Use of City Right of Way

- The CAC acknowledges that specific details regarding the use of the City ROW will be handled through the review and issuance of Right of Way Use Permits per LUC 20.25M.040.J; however, they want to emphasize the importance of limiting impacts on traffic to the best level technically feasible.

20.25M.050 Design guidelines

1. Design Intent - In addition to complying with all applicable provisions of the Southwest Bellevue Subarea Plan, the design intent for the Regional Light Rail Train system and facility segment that passes through this subarea is to contribute to the major City gateway feature that already helps define Bellevue Way and the 112th Corridor. The Regional Light Rail Train system or facility design should reflect the tree-lined boulevard that is envisioned for the subarea, and where there are space constraints within the transportation cross-section, design features such as living walls and concrete surface treatments should be employed to achieve corridor continuity. The presence of the South Bellevue park and ride and station when viewed from the neighborhood above and Bellevue Way to the west, as well as from park trails to the east, should be softened through tree retention where possible and enhanced landscaping and “greening features” such as living walls and trellises.
2. Context and Design Considerations - The CAC was tasked with evaluating the existing context setting characteristics included in the Land Use Code in order to verify that the design of the station and alignment is consistent with the vision for the Southwest Bellevue Subarea. The Land Use Code states that the character of this area is defined by:
 - The expansive Mercer Slough Nature Park;
 - Historic references to truck farming of strawberries and blueberries;
 - Retained and enhanced tree and landscaped areas that complement and screen transportation uses from residential and commercial development; and
 - Unique, low density residential character that conveys the feeling of a small town within a larger City.

The CAC advised that the following additional context and design considerations should be considered when evaluating the East Link project in the Southwest Bellevue Subarea for context sensitivity during future CAC and permit review phases. The following items pertain to the South Bellevue Segment:

- The alignment transition from the I-90 right-of-way to the South Bellevue Station should be reflected as a “Grand Entry” into Bellevue. This gateway area defines Bellevue as the “City in a Park.” The gateway serves a number of functions, and should appropriately greet the different users that pass through it, including transit riders, vehicles, residents, bicyclists from the I-90 trail, fish (specifically salmon), and wildlife.
- The South Bellevue Park & Ride garage should incorporate green/living walls and trellis structures on the roof level in addition to interesting concrete surface treatments to break down mass and scale, and to help blend the garage into the

Mercer Slough Nature Park when viewed from the neighborhoods to the west and the park to the east.

3. Additional General Design Guidelines

- The CAC recommends that more earth tones and color variety be incorporated into the proposed art treatments and other station and corridor elements. Earth tones means tans, browns, beige, rusts, reds and orange. **(Sound Transit has indicated that the artists for the station are evaluating options for additional color and earth tones in proposed art treatments.)**
- The CAC recommends less hard edges in the design of the South Bellevue Station. One suggestion would be to incorporate more organic shapes into the design to soften hard lines. **(Sound Transit has attempted to incorporate more organic shapes in the design using art treatments at both the station, parking garage, and guideway.)**
- The CAC recommends Sound Transit evaluate the possibility of using an artistic design for the mesh screening at the South Bellevue Station Garage. **(Sound Transit has proposed a green artistic treatment for the mesh screening on the garage. Final color combinations are still in development.)**
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit extend the proposed art treatment on the guideway noise walls and additional colors be incorporated into the design. **(Sound Transit has shown an art treatment on a portion of the guideway noise walls that reflects CAC pre-advisory advice. The CAC has requested additional color variety which is under development. Sound Transit has also indicated that an extension of the art treatment is in preliminary design.)**
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit use a stacked stone or brick type pattern with variegated earth tones for noise walls. Ashlar stone walls one recommendation from the CAC. The CAC also recommends evaluation of art opportunities to help buffer any negative visual impacts of areas of tall noise walls.
- The CAC recommends Sound Transit work with the City of Bellevue to install way finding kiosk(s) at the South Bellevue Station and as appropriate along the alignment to direct people to available resources and recreational opportunities within Mercer Slough Nature Park.
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit use round catenary poles instead of H poles from the South Bellevue Station to the tunnel portal at the intersection of 112th Ave SE and Main Street.

Design and Mitigation Permit Approval

The recommendations contained in this Advisory Document represent the conclusion of the CAC review of the South Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit. The recommendations included in this document shall be incorporated into the Director's administrative decision. Departures by the Director from specific recommendations included within the CAC's Design and Mitigation Permit Advisory Document shall be limited to those instances where the Director determines that the departure is necessary to ensure that the RLRT facility or system is consistent with: (i) applicable policy and regulatory guidance contained in the Light Rail Overlay; (ii) authority granted to the CAC pursuant to this section; (iii) SEPA conditions or other regulatory requirements applicable to the RLRT system or facility; or (iv) state or federal law. Departures from the CAC Design and Mitigation Permit Advisory Document shall be addressed in the decision by the Director, and rationale for the departures shall be provided.

DRAFT