



## LIGHT RAIL PERMITTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

**Date:** May 15, 2015

**To:** Light Rail Permitting Advisory Committee

**From:** Matthews Jackson (425-452-2729, [mjackson@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:mjackson@bellevuewa.gov))  
Carol Helland (425-452-2724, [chelland@bellevuewa.gov](mailto:chelland@bellevuewa.gov))  
*Liaisons to the Advisory Committee*  
*Development Services Department*

**Subject:** May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2015 Advisory Committee Meeting

Enclosed you will find an agenda packet for your 32<sup>nd</sup> Advisory Committee meeting next Wednesday, May 20. We will begin at 3:30 p.m. in Room 1E-113 at Bellevue City Hall. The meeting will be chaired by Doug Mathews and Marcelle Van Houten.

This packet includes:

1. Agenda
2. May 6 Meeting Minutes
3. City PowerPoint Presentation from May 6
4. East Main Segment CAC Pre-Development Advisory Document
5. Downtown Bellevue Segment CAC Pre-Development Advisory Document

We will have hard copies of all electronic packet materials for you on May 20<sup>th</sup>. 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, May 20, 2015

3:30 p.m. – 5:30 pm • Room 1E-113

Bellevue City Hall • 450 110th Ave NE

## AGENDA

- |           |   |
|-----------|---|
| 3:30 p.m. | 1. <b>Call to Order, Approval of Agenda, Approval of May 6<sup>th</sup>, Meeting Minutes</b><br><i>Committee Co-Chairs Mathews and Van Houten</i> |
| 3:40 p.m. | 2. <b>Public Comment</b><br><i>Limit to 3 minutes per person</i>  |
| 4:00 p.m. | 3. <b>Introduction to the Central Bellevue Design and Mitigation Permit Sound Transit</b>   |
| 5:10 p.m. | 4. <b>Next Meeting and Calendar</b><br><i>Matthews Jackson</i>  |
| 5:20 p.m. | 5. <b>Public Comment</b><br><i>Limit to 3 minutes per person</i>  |
| 5:30 p.m. | 6. <b>Adjourn</b>   |

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](mailto:mjackson@bellevuewa.gov) ) or Carol Helland (425-452-2724, [chelland@bellevuewa.gov](mailto: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

May 6, 2015  
3:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
Room 1E-113

MEMBERS PRESENT: Doug Mathews, Marcelle Van Houten, Susan Rakow Anderson, Joel Glass, Wendy Jones, Don Miles

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ming-Fang Chang

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

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

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

Co-Chair Van Houten called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

The agenda was approved by consensus.

A motion to approve the minutes of the April 15, 2015, was made by Mr. Glass. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anderson and it carried unanimously.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Joe Rossman, 921 109th Avenue SE, commented that the Sound Transit board at its meeting two weeks ago completed the Memorandum of Understanding that had been adopted by the city several days prior. There were some 250 people in the audience, a substantial majority of whom appeared to be members of the development community present to hear Sound Transit's commitment to accomplishing transit-oriented development. Throughout the course of the afternoon, the term "TOD" was used 125 times. No other single use or benefit of light rail was mentioned as much, which would seem to argue that transportation is less important than some of the other agendas. A comment was made by Capital Committee Chair Fred Butler at the end of the meeting to the effect that the Sound Transit board is fully committed to accomplishing transit-oriented development everywhere light rail is taken, including in south Bellevue. Two years ago the Bellevue City Council voted unanimously to exclude the South Bellevue park and ride station and the southwest quadrant of the area around the 112th Avenue SE and Main Street station from any consideration of implementation of transit-oriented development initiatives and programs.

Ms. Betsy Blackstock, a resident of Surrey Downs, reminded the Committee members that the residents of Bellevue are counting on them. The City Council chose each individual member and gave the Committee the power to guide the ship regardless of what city staff says. She encouraged the Committee members to ask for and even demand transparency. Noise cannot be fully mitigated if it is not even fully understood. The Committee can put whatever it wants in the final document and should act to do just that.

### 3. EAST LINK PROJECT UPDATE

Planning Manager Matthews Jackson noted that Sound Transit staff had at the request of Ms. Anderson provided maps showing the alignment and what the systems and facilities will look like along different stages. He encouraged the Committee members to review the information.

Mr. Jackson reminded the Committee that public comment was previously offered on a couple of occasions regarding the city's request to mitigate for the impacts to Mercer Slough resulting from the conversion of park land to light rail by swapping in a different property that is surrounded by Mercer Slough property. On April 9 the RCO board in Olympia voted unanimously to accept the request.

The Council took action on April 20 regarding the revised Memorandum of Understanding and unanimously approved it. The Sound Transit Board subsequently approved it as well on April 23.

Mr. Jackson informed the Committee that the shoreline appeal was withdrawn by the appellants on April 21, so the shoreline permitting process is complete, and noted that the Bel-Red segment design and mitigation permit was issued on April 23.

With regard to the property trade, Mr. Miles asked if it will involve wetland improvements. Mr. Jackson said there is no mitigation planned for the site. The six-acre parcel is located on the northeast side of the park and is surrounded by city-owned park property.

Paul Cornish with Sound Transit addressed the issue of what will be seen of the Slough by those walking along Bellevue Way and 112th Avenue SE. He noted that there will be noise walls in some locations, a barrier with a picket fence on top of it in other places, and in some areas a mesh between the pickets. He showed the Committee members a sample of the mesh. Responding to a statement made at the previous meeting about being able to see through the mesh, Mr. Cornish said the architects searched for and found a different product with thinner wire that will improve visibility through it.

Ms. Jones asked if there is any kind of a clear product that could be placed in front of the Winters House so there would still be a view of it for those passing by. Mr. Cornish reminded her that the track is in the trench as it runs in front of the Winters House and the fence protecting it is not that tall. He said those who have used plexiglass-type products

have encountered issues with keeping them clean and having them fade and yellow over time.

The Committee members took a few minutes to review the various maps supplied by Sound Transit showing what the sound walls and facilities will look like along the alignment. John Walser, senior architect with Sound Transit, stressed that the guideway will be fenced on both sides to keep people off the tracks. He also clarified that heights of the walls on the maps were shown relative to the street level.

Co-Chair Mathews thanked Ms. Anderson for asking for the maps.

Mr. Glass called attention to Section F just to the south of the Winters House and noted that the map showed the transmission wires right at grade. He asked how long the section is and he was told by Mr. Walser it is about 400 hundred feet long. Mr. Glass asked if there are alternative solutions for the height of the wires in that stretch that could obviate the need for such a high fence or walls for that long stretch. He said the new mesh option is a huge improvement but it still is very dense. Mr. Walser commented that the section to the south of the Winters House driveway and parking lot will have the mesh. To the north of the driveway there is a stretch roughly 100 feet long with opening before the lid in front of the Winters House that will have the mesh, and then to the north of Winters House there will be another 400-foot stretch that will have the fencing with the mesh. Window screens have a very fine mesh pattern that allows for seeing through them; the mesh to be used to protect the alignment will have a much more open weave and it will be possible to see through it. He also noted that the height of the overhead wires is dictated by the pantograph on top of the light rail vehicle. It has a little spring and can accommodate a couple of feet of variation in the wires, but that is all. The alignment in front of the Winters House will be trenched in order to get the wires under the lid. That will bring the wires within the range of an individual walking along the sidewalk, which will be cantilevered over the trench to allow for a wider sidewalk, resulting in the need to protect people from the wires.

Answering a question asked by Co-Chair Van Houten, Mr. Walser said the pickets in the fence are six inches on center and the pickets are almost three inches wide, leaving a three-inch clear gap between pickets.

Mr. Glass asked if two-foot-eight-inch barriers that will be installed in places will essentially be Jersey barriers. Mr. Walser said they will not have the Jersey barrier face but they will be designed to withstand the impact of a car jumping the curb. The intent is for the barriers to be cast in place.

Responding to a question asked by Ms. Jones, Mr. Walser clarified that to the south of the Surrey Downs Park near the signal bungalow the retaining wall behind the structure will need to have a fence on top of it to keep people from going over the wall. Otherwise there will generally not be a need to have a fence on top of the retaining walls.

Co-Chair Van Houten asked if a color other than black had been considered for the mesh.

Mr. Walser said black is a color that easily disappears into the background and that is why it has been used by Sound Transit on other projects. Co-Chair Van Houten said she would like to at least see another color considered, such as dark green, particularly where the train stops.

Mr. Glass asked what type of rail fencing will be used to keep people from falling down the hill at the park. Mr. Cornish said it is the standard Bellevue pedestrian/bicycle railing that is currently in place along the back of the sidewalk on Bellevue Way.

Land Use Director Carol Helland added that the rail fencing design criteria differs depending on the context. Fencing used for freeway overcrossings have one design, and the ones along 112th Avenue SE have a different design.

Turning to the April 15 version of the advisory document, Mr. Jackson said he had made no changes to it since the last meeting, leaving to the Committee members the any decisions to revise it.

The Committee worked from the version of the document that began on page 50 of the packet and included the comments and suggestions made by Ms. Anderson regarding the original document as revised by Mr. Glass. There was agreement to make no changes to pages 50. No changes were made to page 51, except that in the penultimate paragraph the change suggested by Mr. Glass to use the phrase "shall demonstrate" was not made given that the language of paragraph (a) was taken directly from the code.

Mr. Glass pointed out that as drafted it is not clear that the language is in fact from the code. Ms. Anderson agreed that throughout the document it should be made very clear where the code is quoted and that the Committee is simply responding to it.

Mr. Jackson reminded the Committee members that at the last meeting Ms. Helland made it clear that the Committee is not tasked with amending the decision criteria that is written into code. He said the Committee could choose to not include quotes from the code, or to clarify which paragraphs are in fact taken directly from the code.

Mr. Glass agreed that quotes from the code should be identified as such. He said his conclusion was that the application does not meet some of the Comprehensive Plan policies. He said that was why he wanted the advisory document to specifically say the applicant shall demonstrate compliance. Mr. Jackson pointed out that there is specific code language that requires Sound Transit to do certain things in order to show they have met all decision criteria. He said they have done all of those things and that is why he drafted language indicating that the applicant has demonstrated compliance.

Ms. Helland suggested using italics to indicate where the code is directly quoted. The Committee members agreed to use that format to lessen some of the confusion.

It was noted that paragraph (b) on page 52 is quoted code language.

Ms. Anderson commented that the revisions suggested by Mr. Glass paraphrase items discussed by the Committee and comments made by the public. Ms. Jones said she appreciated the revisions as being very explanatory of the context.

Co-Chair Mathews expressed discomfort to the way in which the discussion and recommendation in paragraphs (a)(i) and (a)(ii) bolts together bits and pieces of conversations and discussions. He said he did not see it as being necessary to include. The Committee minutes will back up the decisions made. Approval of the Memorandum of Understanding by the city and Sound Transit actually changes some of what is said in paragraph (a)(i). Additionally, the construction mitigation plan is not part of the Committee's purview. There are hundreds of pages of documentation associated with the permit that backs up the basic advisory document and it makes no sense to discuss it in the advisory document something the city will require regardless, namely that Sound Transit is going to have to meet all of the city's code requirements.

Answering a question asked by Ms. Anderson, Mr. Miles said the construction mitigation plan was referred to by Sound Transit when they commented about what they would be doing in certain areas.

Mr. Glass allowed that it had been a month or so since he drafted his proposed revisions to the advisory document. He said his intent was to say the project is large and significant and as such the construction mitigation plan should have some public input. He said he was not suggesting it should be addressed by the Committee.

Ms. Anderson agreed that allowing the public to comment on the construction mitigation plan would be a good idea.

Mr. Jackson said there is always opportunity for public input regarding any major city or outside agency project. There will continue to be significant outreach conducted going forward.

Co-Chair Van Houten said the suggested revisions offered by Mr. Glass could be viewed as simply reiterating the Committee's understanding of the process. The question is whether or not the comments make the document more useful. She said her preference would be to focus on the recommendations and avoid rehashing all the reasons behind the Committee's conclusions.

Ms. Jones expressed the view that the revisions offered by Mr. Glass give more context and strength to the recommendations. She added that throughout the process there have been varying opinions as to what the Committee's purview is, and by including the revisions voice will be given to what the Committee discussed, even if a discussion did not result in an actual recommendation.

Co-Chair Mathews said the question is whether or not the additional language adds weight to the message of what the Committee wants to see from Sound Transit. All of the discussions held by the Committee are reflected in the meeting minutes.

Co-Chair Van Houten commented that the advisory document represents a synthesis of all the Committee's discussions and public input. The record created by the minutes offers plenty of evidence for how the Committee reached its decisions.

Mr. Miles agreed the advisory document should take more of an outline form listing the specific code requirements and what the Committee decided should be done to meet each requirement.

There was consensus to take that approach.

There was agreement to delete the discussion paragraph.

With regard to the recommendation paragraph, Mr. Jackson pointed out that modifying wall heights to lower them would be contrary to the goal of providing sound protection to meet city code. The two approaches contradict each other. The intent of the noise study is to demonstrate that Sound Transit will provide the minimum height necessary to mitigate for additional noise created by the light rail train.

Ms. Jones said she came away from the last Committee meeting with an understanding that sound absorptive walls are less aesthetically pleasing, so there is a tradeoff between having a taller wall that is more visually pleasing and a lower wall that has an industrial look and feel. Mr. Jackson said there are walls where the line enters the Mt. Baker tunnel that have sound absorption materials. He suggested an application of that sort would not be welcomed in South Bellevue.

Mr. Cornish said he put to the Sound Transit noise people the question of whether the effectiveness of noise barriers is based on their height. The answer given was that height is directly related to effectiveness. Noise essentially follows a line of sight, so regardless of the materials used, walls height is the primary determining factor when it comes to noise mitigation.

Mr. Glass commented that the picket fences and mesh as described by Sound Transit do not fit with a park-like context. Co-Chair Van Houten said there is no getting around the fact that the fences are needed. Mr. Glass said there are a lot of different fence formats out there and the Committee should not be afraid to say the proposed approach does not look very good and to recommend they try again.

Co-Chair Van Houten said that is covered by the call for sound walls more compatible with the surrounding built environment. She suggested the recommendation could go on to say that the fences should be designed to minimize blocked views and maintain to the extent possible maintain the visual context of a city in a park.

Ms. Jones said she would like to see direction added to explore other color options.

There was agreement to delete the references to walls being sound absorptive and lower



in height.

With regard to page 53, there was agreement to remove references to wall height from the paragraph (b)(ii) recommendation.

Co-Chair Mathews pointed out that the concepts of living walls and green roofs is already in the Committee's recommendation and did not need to be reiterated. Mr. Glass argued that the reference goes along with the Comprehensive Plan policy to protect residential areas from impacts.

Co-Chair Mathews also commented that the language in the recommendation paragraph about complying with city code is also not necessary since that is a given.

Ms. Jones suggested the (b)(ii) recommendation is essentially the same as the (a)(ii) recommendation. Co-Chair Van Houten said that is because policies LU-9 and land use-22 are very similar. She proposed combining the responses to both of those policies.

Co-Chair Mathews agreed and added that saying the same thing over and over does not make the statement any stronger.

Mr. Jackson proposed pulling the discussion and recommendation paragraphs from the body of the document, extracting out the actual advisory elements and folding them into the final advisory document. There was consensus to take that approach.

Mr. Jackson said the Committee could make public the list of recommendations as spelled out by Mr. Glass by posting it as a separate document. There was agreement to do that.

With regard to paragraph (c)(ii) on page 53, Ms. Jones questioned including the reference to accessing Mercer Slough from the west during construction. Mr. Glass said it was his understanding that during construction access to Mercer Slough will be completely walled off and it would be nice to maintain what little access there is currently.

Co-Chair Mathews suggested that access through a construction zone would not be safe at any rate.

There was agreement not to recommend access to Mercer Slough from the west.

With regard to requiring the multiuse path to be at least 12 feet wide, Mr. Glass said his intent was to assure having a usable path. Mr. Jackson said there are some pinch points that get down to a width of about eight feet. It is not possible to extend too far to the east because of the critical area buffer. The pinch point near the Winters House is dictated by the lid and the general lack of space. The way things have been designed the intent is to maintain the standard to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. Walser explained that at the pinch points the landscape zone width is sacrificed in

order to maintain a minimum of eight feet of width for the path. Mr. Jackson added that where the landscape buffer is reduced city staff and Sound Transit have worked on alternative landscape options, including median landscaping, to assure a total gateway feature at the Y intersection.

Mr. Glass allowed that there is a critical area near the pinch point close to the Y intersection, but pointed out that the plan is to allow a wide train track to run through it. He said it appeared to him the reason for not maintaining full width for the path at the pinch point is an economic decision rather than an attempt to avoid the critical area. Mr. Jackson said the city code is clear in saying impacting critical areas must be avoided to the greatest extent possible. The train will go through the critical area but mitigation for the disturbance will be required. Offsetting the loss of landscaping at the pinch point will bring about a better result than encroaching further into the critical area buffer.

Ms. Jones asked if the sidewalk could be cantilevered out over the critical area at the pinch point. Mr. Jackson explained that the area presents several challenges. Feedback has been received about the number of trees that will be lost along with the tree-lined character. The restoration planting targeted for the area will not involve a tall canopy, but there has been a call for having trees at least up to the street level. Cantilevering out over the critical area would take away from the ability to plant trees there.

Co-Chair Mathews voiced support for eliminating the full 12-foot path requirement from the recommendation. By at least keeping the path to a minimum of eight feet, pedestrian and bicycle access will be maintained. Co-Chair Van Houten agreed and said she would rather lose a little of the landscaping than encroach further into the critical area.

There was agreement to remove all of the recommendation paragraph (c)(ii).

Turning to paragraph (d)(ii) on page 54, Co-Chair Van Houten said it appeared to her the meat of the recommendation was that the construction mitigation plan should be subject to some public scrutiny.

Mr. Miles commented that all plans for projects are available to the public. Mr. Glass said he would like to see there be an opportunity for public comment.

There was agreement to include language reiterating the importance of public outreach and comment opportunities on the construction mitigation plan.

With regard to paragraph (e)(ii) on page 55, Ms. Anderson said as drafted by Mr. Glass it appeared to be a commentary on what the Committee is charged with doing. She suggested that as such it was not needed. There was agreement not to include the paragraph as a recommendation but to include it somewhere in the introduction to the document. There was agreement to do the same for paragraph (f)(i).

Commenting on paragraph (g)(ii), Mr. Glass said the wetlands plantings are often quite small. Particularly at the Y where it is adjacent to the road, in addition to the saplings

and plants the wetland should receive some larger trees. In time some thinning may be required. Additionally, along with having unique specimen trees there should here and there be a large signature tree, and the Committee should identify the locations. He proposed the large pasture area on the east side of the road near the freeway. Mr. Jackson said that recommendation is included in the report. He agreed to verify that and to make it more specific for the locations if need be.

Co-Chair Van Houten suggested that recommendations in paragraph (g)(ii) do not specifically relate to policy TR-75.7 which is more focused on land use and transportation.

Answering a question asked by Ms. Jones, Mr. Jackson said the city has templates for critical area mitigation planting that specifies size and types of trees based on environments. Many of the plantings Sound Transit has proposed are larger than the city's minimums.

Mr. Glass said he was not trying to suggest that all of the trees in the wetland area should have a caliper of two inches. The important thing is to be able to see them at the time of planting. Mr. Jackson said he would avoid being too specific but would add a call for some larger trees intermixed in the mitigation planting, and would verify locations for specimen trees.

Turning to paragraph (h) on page 55, Co-Chair Van Houten commented that much of what it includes reiterates the critical areas report. She said the process for reviewing environmental regulations obviates the need to include the section. The exception should be the last part of paragraph (h)(ii)(2). She proposed retaining the sentence "Ensure that all impacts have been sufficiently identified, avoided where possible and exceptionally mitigated." The last sentence of the paragraph as proposed is a moot point given that the shoreline permitting process has been completed. There was agreement to do that.

Ms. Jones pointed out that the term "exceptional mitigation" has been bandied about quite a lot and she asked if there is some way it could be succinctly defined. Co-Chair Van Houten said in her view the term would mean going above and beyond the minimum requirements of the code.

Mr. Jackson clarified that the term "exceptional mitigation" came about prior to having a light rail section in the Land Use Code. A lot of exceptional mitigation was put into the actual code requirements.

Co-Chair Van Houten suggested the recommendation in paragraph (i)(ii) reiterates what has already been talked about relative to trees. As such the recommendation is not needed.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Glass, Mr. Jackson said Sound Transit has identified all of the trees. They had provided the city with the broad data but not with information about size and type. A public records request was submitted which yielded that helpful

information, but the city has not yet gone through the entire alignment with an eye on identifying additional trees that could be saved; that work will be done. Language could be added to the report reinforcing the notion of saving trees to the greatest extent possible. There was agreement to add some reinforcing language.

Co-Chair Van Houten suggested that the recommendation in paragraphs (j)(i) and (k)(ii) only reiterate what has been included elsewhere. There was agreement not to include either one.

With regard to paragraph (m)(ii), Ms. Jones raised the issue of sound walls to attenuate the noise of trains from impacting adjacent parks. Mr. Glass recalled that the Committee had discussed considering the parks as sensitive receptors.

Mr. Jackson commented that adding a wall is a specific thing and as drafted the last part of paragraph (m)(ii) would require interpretation as to intent.

Mr. Glass said he assumed that all properties considered to be sensitive receptors will need to have walls, including parks if they are deemed to fall into that category. Mr. Jackson reminded the Committee that Mercer Slough was not identified by Sound Transit as a sensitive receptor as part of complying with the FTA requirements. However, the city puts the Slough into that category and will require mitigation accordingly. In some locations there is a distance between the rail corridor and trails used by people, but in other places they are quite close. If the Committee elects to recommend including a sound wall, it will need to demonstrate what is to be mitigated and to what extent. He added that the Committee has also recommended not including walls that will impact visual access to the park.

Mr. Glass commented that if birds are chased from the park because of the noise from the train, it will not be the same park people enjoy currently. Not all birds are chased by noise, but some certainly are.

Mr. Jackson said the city asked for additional information about the sound walls on the east side of the guideway. He added, however, that he was not aware of Sound Transit doing any additional analysis of what a wall on the east side would achieve. The general feedback has been that without a wall on the east side of the guideway, the impacts to the recreational uses in the park would not be significant. Displacement of birds will likely be greatest during construction, particularly as trees are removed. Some will come back and some will establish elsewhere. Animals that live in urban environments are generally very resilient and the impacts will largely be temporary. Having a wall probably would not achieve much in the greater scheme of things.

Mr. Glass argued that Mercer Slough is a far different park from Downtown Park and should be treated differently. He said he would defer to the notion of exceptional mitigation and call for having the park designated as a sensitive receptor.

Co-Chair Mathews commented that he visited several light rail operations while serving

as a member of the Light Rail Best Practices Committee. He said it was observed that train noise primarily flows from curves in the alignment and at stations where trains stop and start. Most of the run through the Slough will not be very noisy at all. The existing road traffic will be the same once the light rail project is completed and the train simply will not make much of a difference.

Mr. Glass said horror stories have been told about noise generated by Central Link. East Link is required to install sound walls in order to meet the federal standards, so it stands to reason that the system will be generating some noise.

Mr. Miles said using his own equipment he measured the noise associated with the light rail and SR-520 four blocks away, and the noise from the freeway was three times louder. Every effort should be put into mitigating noise, but the efforts should be qualified and not just demanded.

Co-Chair Mathews said he would not want to see walls erected where they are not needed. He suggested that the light rail best practices are referred to in the transmittal and nothing more needs to be said.

Mr. Glass proposed calling for parks to be considered sensitive receptors and that sound walls should be required where needed.

Ms. Anderson recommended including "The CAC recommends that Sound Transit conduct additional noise analysis for impacts to users of Mercer Slough as a sensitive receptor." There was agreement to delete paragraph (m)(ii) and to include the proposed language in the recommendation.

Co-Chair Van Houten suggested that as drafted the discussion in paragraph (n) is more of a statement that construction noise should be mitigated. Mr. Glass agreed but noted that the Committee had previously reached consensus that Sound Transit should offer residential sound packages to frontline properties. There was consensus to retain paragraph (n)(ii).

Co-Chair Mathews commented that the discussion and recommendation in paragraph (o) is nothing more than what is included in basic city regulations. As such it did not need to be retained. The Committee members agreed.

There was agreement that paragraph (p)(ii) was redundant and could be eliminated.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Glass, Mr. Jackson said the transmittal includes a recommendation from the Committee to install the sound walls as early as possible. The same topic is covered by the Memorandum of Understanding.

It was agreed that the recommendation in paragraph (b)(ii) on page 62 was included elsewhere and as such could be deleted.

There was agreement not to delete the last sentence of the bullet under paragraph (i) on page 64.

There was agreement not to include a recommendation to use sound absorptive panels for freestanding noise walls as outlined in the eighth bullet under paragraph 3 on page 68.

Co-Chair Van Houten observed that along I-405 many of the really high walls have ivy growing on them and she asked if that could be the case on some of the sound walls in Bellevue. Mr. Jackson said that is in the Committee's recommendation already.

The Committee addressed next the list of recommendations starting on page 71. It was agreed that the first two had already been addressed. With regard to the third, Mr. Jackson noted that the permit just issued includes a monitoring and mitigation plan. Sound Transit will be directed to undertake a series of actions to verify the analysis they have done is accurate and that their mitigations are adequate.

Mr. Glass suggested that is different from addressing nighttime operations with the city's code in mind. He said he was not know if the analysis seen by the Committee takes into account the extended hours associated as getting the line charged and the OMSF operations. Mr. Jackson said the Committee was given information about the number of trains going out and the times that would happen. Additional environmental analysis will be done on the OMSF and that analysis likely will include anything to do with noise that has not already been studied. He agreed it would not hurt to include the recommendation. There was consensus to do so.

With regard to the fourth recommendation, Co-Chair Van Houten asked if additional traffic to and from the park and ride is within the purview of the Committee to comment on. Mr. Miles suggested that while the Committee may not be able to recommend specific changes, it is free to comment on the situation.

There was agreement to include the seventh recommendation statement.

With regard to air quality, Co-Chair Van Houten noted the Committee had previously agreed not to include the topic given that it falls outside the scope of the Committee's charge.

There was consensus to include the eighth recommendation.

With regard to the changes proposed by Mr. Chang found on page 72, there was agreement that the issue had already been discussed and would not be included in the recommendation.

Mr. Miles said his comments captured on page 73 were only observations and not recommendations.

Mr. Jackson said he would take the feedback, put together a document for the Committee

members to review, and seek a thumbs up/thumbs down response before finalizing it for the transmittal. He said the central Bellevue section would be the topic of the next meeting.

Ms. Helland thanked the Committee members for their diligent work in working through the details and providing recommendations.

## 5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. John King, a resident of Surrey Downs, said the discussion of the park as a sensitive receptor was very illuminating. He said where there are no homes between the park and the track there is only an open space. The homes on the west side of the park are liable to feel the noise impact of the trains going by because there will be nothing between them and tracks. The Committee members were commended for paying close attention to that issue. Surrey Downs Park has been downgraded to more of a neighborhood park. The city, the neighbors and the Committee area all approaching the park from different angles, but the fact that it will become more of a contemplative space should be part of the consideration. It should be considered a sensitive receptor.

## 6. ADJOURN

Co-Chair Van Houten adjourned the meeting at 6:06 p.m.

# LIGHT RAIL PERMITTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE



COMMITTEE MEETING  
May 6-3:30PM | ROOM 1E-113





# Agenda

- **3:30**
  - Call to Order, Approval of Agenda, Approval of April 15<sup>th</sup> Meeting Minutes – Co-Chairs Mathews and Van Houten
  - Public Comment
- **4:00**
  - East Link Project Update – Matthews Jackson
- **4:15**
  - Draft South Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit Advisory Document Continued Discussion– CAC Co-Chairs Mathews and Van Houten
- **5:20**
  - Public Comment



# East Link Project Update

- State of Washington, Recreation and Conservation Funding Board, (RCO Board) Unanimous Approval – April 9, 2015
- City Council Unanimous Approval of Revised Memorandum of Understanding with Sound Transit – April 20, 2015
- Shoreline Appeal Withdrawn April 21, 2015
- Sound Transit Board Unanimous Approval of Revised Memorandum of Understanding – April 23, 2015
- Issuance of Bel Red Segment Design and Mitigation Permit – April 23, 2015



# South Bellevue Segment Design and Mitigation Permit Draft Advisory Document

- **No Changes Made to the Draft Advisory Document Presented at the April 15<sup>th</sup> CAC Meeting**
- **Additional CAC Comments Provided in Agenda Packet**



# LIGHT RAIL PERMITTING CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

---

## ADVISORY DOCUMENT EAST MAIN SEGMENT PRE-DEVELOPMENT REVIEW MAY 16, 2014

### 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

### Pre-Development Review

This phase of review is intended to provide feedback regarding effectiveness at incorporating contextual direction into the early phases of design. The CAC is expected to 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, materials, landscape development, and tree retention. The CAC is 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 regulations and whether information is sufficient to evaluate such compliance.

### 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.

At the February 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 CAC meeting Sound Transit presented its pre-development review stage package for the East Main Segment. The CAC continued to discuss the East Main Segment at the March 5<sup>th</sup>, 2014 and March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 meetings.

**The following represents the CAC advisory comments regarding LUC 20.25M.040, 20.25M.050, and context setting sensitivity.**

#### 20.25M.040 RLRT system and facilities development standards

1. Building Height – No concerns expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
2. Setbacks – No concerns expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
3. Landscape Development
  - The CAC recommends Sound Transit to explore the use of grasscrete for the turnaround area for emergency vehicles.
4. Fencing – No concerns were expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
5. Light and Glare - The No concerns expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
6. Mechanical Equipment - No concerns were expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
7. Recycling and Solid Waste - No concerns were expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
8. Critical Areas - No concerns expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.

9. Use of City Right of Way - No concerns expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.

#### 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. 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 East Main Segment:

- Along 112<sup>th</sup> SE design treatments and mitigation should be complementary to differing levels of development intensity that exist on the east (commercially developed) and the west (residentially developed) sides of the road.
- The portal and tunnel between the East Main and Downtown Stations present an opportunity to “Visually Transport” transit riders from the historic mid-century modern, stable neighborhoods of Southwest Bellevue to the bustling urban context

of the Downtown. Art on the portal and in the tunnel could help depict the transition from the suburban context to the urban context.

- Landscaping should be employed to soften the impact of the portal structure adjacent to the East Main Station. If art opportunities are employed, additional emphasis on the concrete mass of the East Main portal structure should be avoided.

### 3. Additional General Design Guidelines

- The CAC recommends both visual and audio signals installed at the stations provided they are not too obtrusive.
- The CAC recommends stone or brick for the wall along 112<sup>th</sup> so that it reflects the tree lined boulevard envisioned in the context characteristics. This could be achieved with a more natural formliner pattern rather than a smooth surface.
- The CAC recommends Sound Transit evaluate opportunities to use the tunnel portal as an opportunity for an artistic expression.
- The CAC wants Sound Transit to evaluate additional opportunities for pedestrian access to the East Main Station from the Surrey Downs neighborhood.
- The CAC wants to see detailed technical analysis of anticipated noise impacts from train construction and operations along the alignment.

#### Next Steps

The advice contained in this Advisory Document should be forwarded to Sound Transit for use in refining its design of elements and features of the East Link light rail system features in support of its Design and Mitigation Permit submittal.



# LIGHT RAIL PERMITTING CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## ADVISORY DOCUMENT DOWNTOWN SEGMENT PRE-DEVELOPMENT REVIEW JULY 15, 2014

### 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

### Pre-Development Review

This phase of review is intended to provide feedback regarding effectiveness at incorporating contextual direction into the early phases of design. The CAC is expected to 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, materials, landscape development, and tree retention. The CAC is 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 regulations and whether information is sufficient to evaluate such compliance.

### 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.

At the March 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014 CAC meeting Sound Transit presented its pre-development review stage package for the Downtown Segment which includes both the Downtown Transit Center and Hospital Stations. The CAC continued to discuss the Downtown Segment at the April 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2014, April 16<sup>th</sup>, 2014, and May 7<sup>th</sup>, 2014 meetings.

**The following represents the CAC advisory comments regarding LUC 20.25M.040, 20.25M.050, and context setting sensitivity.**

### 20.25M.040 RLRT system and facilities development standards

1. Building Height – No concerns expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
2. Setbacks – No concerns expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
3. Landscape Development
  - The CAC recommends that landscape development at the Hospital Station, particularly in the vicinity of NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, be designed in a way which does not create a site obstruction for motorists.
4. Fencing – No concerns were expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
5. Light and Glare - No concerns expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
  - The CAC recommends that no stations should have up lights that could shine into neighboring buildings or residential areas. All lighting should remain within the confines of the stations to the greatest extent possible.
6. Mechanical Equipment - No concerns were expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.

7. Recycling and Solid Waste - No concerns were expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
8. Critical Areas - No concerns expressed by the CAC. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.
9. Use of City Right of Way – See comment above regarding landscape development. More project specific information will be included during the Design and Mitigation Permit review stage.

#### 20.25M.050 Design guidelines

1. Design Intent – Downtown Subarea - In addition to complying with all applicable provisions of the Downtown Subarea Plan, the design intent for the RLRT system and facility segment that passes through this subarea is to enhance Downtown Bellevue’s identity as an urban center that serves as the residential, economic, and cultural heart of the Eastside. The above-ground expression of the Downtown Station is envisioned as a highly utilized urban “place” with an architectural vocabulary that not only reflects and communicates the high quality urban character of Downtown as a whole, but also complements the immediately adjacent civic center uses including Bellevue City Hall, Meydenbauer Convention Center, the Transit Center, Pedestrian Corridor, and the Downtown Art Walk. The alignment crossing over I-405 will be prominent to visitors entering, leaving, and passing through the Downtown, and its design should be viewed as an opportunity to create a landmark that connects Downtown Bellevue with areas of the City to the east. The station and freeway crossing should reflect Bellevue’s branding, and should be comfortable and attractive places to be and experience, with high quality furnishings and public art that capitalize on place-making opportunities.

Design Intent – Wilburton/NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street Subarea - In addition to complying with all applicable provisions of the Wilburton/N.E. 8th Street Subarea Plan, the design intent for the RLRT system and facility segment that passes through this subarea is to focus on the hospital station’s role as a gateway location to points east of Downtown on to Bel-Red and beyond. The alignment crossing over I-405 should create a cohesive connection between the Downtown and hospital stations, but the hospital station itself should have its own identity. With significant ridership anticipated to be generated from the Medical Institution District to the west, the hospital station should take design cues from the hospital, the ambulatory health care center, and the medical office buildings that were designed to be responsive to the Medical Institution Design Guidelines that are shaping the character of this area.

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 stations and alignment is consistent with the vision for the Downtown and Wilburton/NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street Subareas. The Land Use Code states that the character of this area is defined by:

### Downtown Subarea

- Private entertainment and cultural attractions;
- High quality urban amenities such as pedestrian oriented development and weather protection that encourages people to linger and not just pass through;
- High rise buildings that attract a creative and innovative work force;
- Multifamily developments that attract urban dwellers that are less tied to their vehicles to accomplish day-to-day tasks;
- Great public infrastructure including roadways, transit and pedestrian improvements, parks and public buildings; and
- Stable property values that make it a desirable place for businesses to locate and invest.

### Wilburton/NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street

- Outdoor spaces that promote visually pleasing, safe, and healing/calming environments for workers, patients accessing health care services, and visitors;
- Buildings and site areas which include landscaping with living material as well as special pavements, trellises, screen wall planters, water, rock features, art, and furnishings;
- Institutional landmarks that convey an image of public use and provide a prominent landmark in the community; and
- Quality design, materials, and finishes to provide a distinct identity that conveys a sense of permanence and durability.

The CAC advised that the following additional context and design considerations should be considered when evaluating the East Link project in the Downtown Bellevue and Wilburton/NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street Subareas for context sensitivity during future CAC and permit review phases. The following items pertain to the Downtown Segment:

### Downtown Subarea

The CAC advises that the following additional context and design considerations should be considered when evaluating the East Link project in the Downtown Subarea for context sensitivity during future CAC and permit review phases.

- a. The Downtown Station should convey a sense of arrival at a bustling economic hub that provides access to retail, visitor services, offices, and urban residential neighborhoods.
- b. The station should convey a future focus on smart growth, and the importance of transit to the success of sustainable development.
- c. The aesthetics of the station roof should be taken into account and finished to enhance views down on the Downtown station for adjacent high rise and convention center development.
- d. Clear connectivity, accessibility, and way finding should be provided between the Downtown Station and the Bus Transit Center.

#### Wilburton/NE 8th Street Subarea

The CAC advises that the following additional context and design considerations should be considered when evaluating the East Link project in the Wilburton/NE 8th Street Subarea for context sensitivity during future CAC and permit review phases.

- a. Height of the flyovers (freeway, 116<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, and NE 8<sup>th</sup>) between the Downtown Station and the Hospital Station presents unique opportunities and challenges.
  - i. Design attention should be given to the under-portions of the flyover structures that will be visible from vehicles and pedestrians that pass underneath them.
  - ii. Required railings on the flyover structures could present an art opportunity if they could be employed without further emphasizing the mass of the structure.
- b. The aesthetics of the Hospital station roof should be taken into account and finished to enhance views down on the station for adjacent development on Midlakes Hill to the east and future development anticipated in the Wilburton Village.
- c. Clear connectivity, accessibility, and way finding should be provided between the Hospital Station and the Medical Institution District where Overlake Hospital and the Group Health Ambulatory Care Center are located.
- d. Weather protection should be provided on the route between the Hospital Station and the Medical Institution District.
- e. References to the freight hub and rail platform that served Bellevue's historic truck farming industry should be incorporated into the Hospital Station.
- f. The Hospital station context should convey a sense of institutional permanence and quality that is broader in focus than accessibility to health care.

### 3. Additional General Design Guidelines

- The CAC recommends that the issue of lighting be uncoupled from the issue of meeting the needs of those with disabilities and that both audio and visual cues be included in station design.
- The CAC recommends that the design of the Downtown Transit Center Station should complement the existing City Hall and new plaza design while providing distinct elements that demarcate the different uses.
- The CAC recommends enhanced weather protection at the corners between the existing bus transit center and the new Downtown Transit Center Station.
- The CAC recommends that restroom facilities be incorporated into the Downtown Transit Center Station design.
- The CAC recommends that variable seating heights be provided at all light rail stations in Bellevue.
- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit include places for people to rest along the walkway connecting the Hospital Station to 116<sup>th</sup> Ave NE.
- The CAC recommends a signature treatment of the railing for the entire span from the Downtown Transit Center Station to the Hospital Station. The CAC recommends painting the underside of the elevated guideway green and for Sound Transit to look for opportunities to further enhance the aesthetics of the NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street crossing south of the Hospital Station.

In addition to the items noted above, the CAC also makes the following recommendation that should be forwarded to the Station Area Planning team:

- The CAC recommends that Sound Transit work with the City to establish a multi-purpose path for pedestrians and bicyclists over I-405.

#### Next Steps

The advice contained in this Advisory Document should be forwarded to Sound Transit for use in refining its design of elements and features of the East Link light rail system features in support of its Design and Mitigation Permit submittal.