



City of Bellevue **Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan**

Steering Committee Meeting #17

MEETING SUMMARY

DATE: June 18, 2009

TIME: 5:00 PM

LOCATION: Bellevue City Hall

ATTENDEES:

Steering Committee

Tom Tanaka
Hal Ferris
Bob MacMillan
David Schooler
Doug Leigh
Iris Tocher
Stefanie Beighle
Stu Vander Hoek
Marcelle Lynde
Merle Keeney
Rich Wagner

City Staff and Consultants

Robin Cole, City of Bellevue
Mike Bergstrom, City of Bellevue
Patrick Foran, City of Bellevue
Matt Terry, City of Bellevue
Paul Inghram, City of Bellevue
Nancy LaCombe, City of Bellevue
Kris Liljeblad, Perteet
David Blau, EDAW
Jan Mulder, EDAW
Newton Breiter, EDAW
Marilee Stander, EDAW

SUMMARY:

1. Welcome and review of the agenda/meeting overview

Doug Leigh opened the meeting and welcomed people to join in the upcoming Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) comment process, and mentioned that any public comment taken in tonight's meeting will not be entered into the document. June 23rd at 6:00 in this room (City Hall Room 1E-108/113) will be the time for oral comments to be documented for EIS purposes. Tonight we'll get educated on what we will be doing over the next month and a half.

Mike Bergstrom commented that in addition to the meeting on the 23rd being the time for verbal comment, written comments on the Draft EIS would be taken through July 20. Mike noted that DEIS comment sheets were available at the sign in table for people who would like to use them. He also stated that an electronic version of the comment form is on the project web page.

Doug went on to discuss the agenda for tonight's meeting. We're going to go through the DEIS, discuss the process for making recommendations, and take public comment. He asked if anyone wanted to suggest any additions or amendments to the March 14 meeting notes before moving on. A motion was made to approve the notes – all voted in favor. Doug also asked if there were

any additions or amendments to the March 19 meeting notes. A motion was made to approve the notes – all voted in favor.

Mike Bergstrom summarized the process to date, before introducing EDAW to present an overview of the DEIS.. The Meydenbauer Park and Land Use Plan project officially started in March 2007 (April 2007 was the first Steering Committee meeting). From then through January 2008, the focus was the land use portion of the project. From May 2008 until October 2008, park alternatives were developed and then frozen while an environmental impact statement was prepared. The next meetings will proceed with the public comment period of the EIS. There will be meetings at the end of July that will move towards a preferred alternative. Then there will be a Final EIS that reflects a preferred alternative to be analyzed in the document, and that responds to comments received on the Draft EIS. In the spring of 2010, the city council will approve a preferred alternative. In late 2010, amendments to the City of Bellevue Comprehensive Plan will be processed. After the brief summary of the process, Mike introduced the consultants from EDAW, noting that most people had not met Jan Mulder, the “choreographer” of the EIS.

2. Presentation of Alternatives Reviewed in Environmental Impact Statement

David Blau started by reinforcing some key dates in the process:

- June 4, 2009 – DEIS issued
- June 23, 2009 – DEIS public hearing
- July 20, 2009 – DEIS comments due
- November 2009 – anticipated FEIS issuance

David went on to discuss the fundamental objectives of the EIS. This is not a project level EIS. This is a broad umbrella analysis of overall components of a project before you enter final design. He pointed out opportunities involved with the project including:

- Enhance public access
- Distinguish Bellevue
- Identify activities and design elements
- Improve physical and visual connections

Additional objectives were outlined in EDAW's PowerPoint presentation.

David noted that in March 2007, the City adopted 12 planning principles (posted on wall), and that the Steering Committee had identified two of the principles which stood out:

- Create a remarkable and memorable shoreline experience
- Focus on environmental stewardship

David then elaborated on the Draft EIS, showing the study area for the project. The green areas represent park properties and the yellow areas are part of the upland land use area. He noted that he would be referring to one portion of the project area called the 'Kite Parcel' and pointed it out on the map. He explained that he would show the alternatives analyzed in the EIS – first in plan view, and then in photo simulations to illustrate what they would look like on the ground. As part of the EIS process, a No Action Alternative is required as a baseline to judge the alternatives from. There are two action alternatives and each has a variant that leaves 100th Ave SE open.

The No Action Alternative does not represent existing conditions. It still involves removing the residences that have been purchased by the city. He noted that a no action might look like the plan view illustration shown. The three public piers and beach remain. All residences and associated private docks are removed. There is opportunity for some redevelopment on the Chevron and Brant Photography properties under current zoning regulations. Arrows on the plan show vehicular access to the parcels. In the no action alternative, the park expands from 3 acres to 8.5 acres. Long-term moorage would total 87, with 14 transient boat slips. There would be a

slight reduction in overwater coverage, and ~70 parking spaces would be retained. As shown in the simulations, 9 residences and 2 duplexes are removed.

Showing the simulation, he said that the view was at the corner of 100th and Main St. looking southwest towards the 'Kite Parcel'. David noted that you can't see the water at all and that the tree line shown is on the other side of the bay. Under existing conditions (and the No Action Alternative), that's what you will see. He then moved on to Alternatives 1 and 2.

In Alternative 1, the land use study portion represents changes in densities. The city looked at different densities and settled on 60 dwelling units/acre with the same building height allowance. By allowing an increase in density, the city would hope to provide incentive to developers to provide appropriate development. The entrance to the park in Alternative 1 would be very dramatic with an ADA access path picking up the over 80 feet of elevation change throughout the site. The change in elevation offers the opportunity to do many things with the grade, including the placement of parking underneath portions of the park. Low profile community use buildings are incorporated. The park would increase from 8.5 (under No Action) to 9.5 acres under Alternative 1. The stream would be daylighted for the entire stretch which would offer both an ecological and educational amenity. Wetlands would be created at the mouth of the stream. The beach would be relocated as the current location wouldn't be complementary to the additional stream and wetlands. In this scheme, Pier 3 is removed as well as the small pedestrian pier near the existing beach. This would be replaced by an arced pedestrian pier. Moorage would be reduced with the elimination of Pier 3 to 40 long-term and 14 transient. People propelled vessels (PPVs) could be tied to the outside of the arced pier. Overwater coverage is reduced to 23,000 square feet. Most of the shoreline is restored to create a more natural condition – a little under 1,000 linear feet. A couple of locations for small community centers are shown. These could be adaptive reuse projects or new buildings. Off of 99th Ave, there would be underground parking that would not interfere with views. A total of 106 parking spaces (surface and underground) would be provided. The whaling building remains (in all schemes).

Showing the visual simulation view from across the bay, David pointed out that you can see the new restroom, the pathway to the shoreline and the parking.

Moving on to the photo-simulation of the view toward the Kite Parcel, he pointed out the dramatic changes. He showed the existing conditions and then what the parcel would look like if the changes from Alternative 1 were made. With the street closed, the parcel would open up to dramatic views with no blockage. Under the variant with the street open, you can see the difference and judge how the change feels.

In Alternative 2, the upland land use piece receives the same treatment (60 dwelling units/acre). The kite parcel would have a dramatic boardwalk extending down to, and over the water. David offered that in his experience, people love floating boardwalks. Alternative 2 represents the same increase in park size. The parking and entry at the existing Meydenbauer Park are retained while half of the stream is daylighted. While Alternative 1 focused more on education and restoration, Alternative 2 looks like more of an urban edge with a bit more formality. Piers 2 and 3 would be removed and Pier 1 would be expanded with a new wing to the north. The new public pier would start at the intersection of 100th and Main St. It would continue down to the waterfront via several elevators to provide access to the water's edge. Reminding the audience again of the major change in elevation, the grade would allow for parking and a small café under the pier. Moorage would be reduced to 25-35 long-term with 14 transient slips. The total overwater coverage would be 28/29,000 square feet. He pointed out that the consultants and city understood that small vendor kiosks and a café were controversial. Parking would be created under the plaza on the Kite Parcel and underground off of 99th Ave NE.

Hal Ferris asked a question – since we didn't include the same option of parking in both alternatives, we can't change it after the EIS...?

David Blau responded – That isn't true. As long as the city determines that the environmental impacts don't change at a programmatic level, then we can make changes.

Jan Mulder concurred and added that if the City knew it wanted to change the parking, then it could be modified in the Final EIS.

David Blau then showed the Alternative 2 photo simulation of the view from across the bay. He pointed out the new restroom, pier and treatment of the kite parcel. He changed to the view of the Kite Parcel, showing what Alternative 2 would look like with the road open and road closed.

Doug Leigh asked where the picture was taken from.

Marilee Stander said that it was taken from the sidewalk on the south east corner of 100th Ave and Main St.

David Blau continued. You can see a very graceful entrance to the park in Alternative 2. There is no interruption in views. Everything steps down. The café is tucked in.

There was a quick discussion about the Vue Condominiums and whether they would interfere with the view – it was determined that the simulations were accurate.

David Blau then turned it over to Jan Mulder to discuss the EIS. She headed up a whole team of technical specialists that have been working on the document for the several months while the steering committee has not been meeting.

3. Presentation of Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Findings

Jan Mulder offered that she would step the committee through the basic environmental impacts. She reinforced that the EIS was a programmatic level document – not a project level one; specific future projects would tier off this analysis. The No Action Alternative is required as a baseline against which to evaluate the action alternatives and does not represent existing conditions. She reiterated David's point that that Alternative 1 has a slightly more environmental/restoration emphasis and Alternative 2 a slightly more civic one. Under the No Action Alternative most impacts are construction-related. Single family residences and duplexes are removed; much of the shoreline is restored to more natural conditions. In the short-term, these activities will cause potential erosion, sedimentation, and surface water pollution. Long-term impacts on the No Action Alternative include tsunami and other natural disaster risks that would be slightly greater than the action alternatives due to older structures and greater number of overwater structures. Alternative 1 impacts are similar to the No Action with construction-related activities. Alternative 2 impacts are similar to the No Action and Alternative 1.

Surface Water (impacts to soil and water)

- No Action – turbidity due to runoff, reduction in impervious surface, minor changes
- Alternative 1 – potential improvement in water quality over the long-term due to water treatment facilities; increased impervious surface due to structures
- Alternative 2 – Slightly more impervious surface than Alternative 1 due to more structures

Plants and Animals

- No Action - very minor impacts through removal of residences. Removal of docks would have a minor long-term benefit.
- Alternative 1 – greater long-term benefits (daylighting of stream, restored shoreline, and less overwater coverage). The restored shoreline would improve fishery habitat. Overwater coverage is about ½ of the No Action Alternative's.

- Alternative 2 – Slightly more overwater coverage than Alternative 1. Slightly less benefit with slightly more impact compared with Alternative 1 (little difference from No Action)

Shoreline – collection of impacts discussed so far, changes in marina structure and access, reduced moorage

- No Action – could potentially displace some marina users. Long-term redevelopment would increase other uses in the area
- Alternative 1 – more use intensity and more construction
- Alternative 2 – same as Alternative 1
- Both Action Alternatives – long-term benefits really address access to park.

Parks and Recreation

- No Action – temporary inconvenience with users. Long-term – benefit of community access
- Alternative 1 – improvement upon No Action – Environmental Education Center, fewer long-term moorage slips but greater diversity of water access (transient is set at a minimum of 14 through all alternatives, 15 PPVs)
- Alternative 2 – has the greatest civic response to park redevelopment, greater long-term public benefits (potential café, floating boardwalk). Fewest moorage slips and 10 PPVs

Cultural and Historic Resources

- No historic structures are proposed for removal in any of the alternatives. The action alternatives are both more robust in renovating and using the whaling building as an interpretive center (similar in Alternative 1 and 2)

Visual Quality

- No Action – improvement with the removal of residences
- Alternative 1 – further improvement with the redevelopment of the Kite Parcel. Various paths/structures provide other viewing opportunities, added benefit of greening the shoreline.
- Alternative 2 – provides slightly more viewing opportunities, gathering spaces add further public benefits

4. Transportation Analysis

Kris Liljeblad with Perteet provided an analysis of the transportation impacts of the alternatives. To provide context, the transportation analysis used a forecast year of 2020. There is substantial growth anticipated in background traffic by 2020 due to continued downtown development. The growth in background traffic is responsible for most of the change we observed, and the traffic impacts due to the park are minor in comparison. The park alternatives cause minor impacts.

No Action Alternative

The intersection of 100th Ave NE and NE 1st would decline to Level of Service (LOS) F in 2020 due to the growth in background traffic. This change would result in difficulty getting in/out of the neighborhood due to a lack of gaps in the north-south traffic on 100th Avenue NE.

There would be some short term construction-related impacts associated with site changes.

The site is adjacent to 101st Avenue/Main Street/Lake Washington Boulevard, which are part of an existing recreational loop route around Lake Washington that is especially used by bicyclists.

Meydenbauer Bay Park would provide a destination along this route. Under the goals stated for the park, the park would be an increasingly important destination.

In conclusion, there would be no significant impacts associated with site changes under the No Action Alternative.

Alternative 1 & 2

Between the alternatives and the No Action, transportation changes are very minor. The biggest difference is the closing of 100th between Main St and Meydenbauer Way. This would cause the delay at the intersection of Main St and 101st to increase, lowering the LOS from C to E. There is very little difference in this effect between Alternative 1 and 2.

There would be a reduction in the level of congestion at 101st and NE 1st (from LOS F in No Action to LOS E) due to less traffic if 100th were closed. Neighborhood traffic would be able to exit more easily.

If the park becomes a more attractive destination by making a substantial improvement for users, there would be more conflict between vehicles/pedestrians/cycles. The park will create a magnet for non-motorized users. In 2020 there will be many more vehicles and more non-vehicular users, and more foot access via downtown. A higher number of pedestrians is expected due to downtown growth and due to a big increases in transit ridership. With 100th left open, there will be a greater potential for conflict between vehicles and pedestrians and bicycles.

Kris stated that there is not very much difference between the alternatives – a 13 second difference in total delay along Main Street between 100th and Bellevue Way. He said he hoped that a decision wouldn't be based solely on that.

Alternative 1

Kris continued by pointing out that his diagrams focus on the vehicular aspect of the project, specifically the LOS at intersections surrounding the park – the ones that change color from green to yellow to orange to red (green represents LOS C or better, yellow represents D, orange represents E, and red represents F, based on average vehicle delay). The intersection most affected by Alternative 1 is Main Street, at 101st Avenue where the LOS changes from C in No Action to E. The average delay at this intersection would increase by about 16 seconds compared to No Action. The intersection at NE 1st and 100th Avenue would improve from LOS F in the No Action to LOS E. In Alternative 1A, with 100th Avenue open, the intersection at Main St and 101st would remain at LOS C (as in the No Action), but the intersection at NE 1st St and 100th Avenue would return to LOS F as in the No Action Alternative.

Alternative 2

The impacts in Alternative 2 are very similar to Alternative 1

Bob McMillan interjected – Does the analysis allow for any change in intersection controls?

Kris – We made the assumption that signals wouldn't change (we'd need to have another meeting to discuss all the mitigation options we evaluated).

Bob – Left turns are a problem.

Kris – The City will look at addressing that – there are several options to improve existing conditions.

Hal – It would be helpful if the City identifies how many parking spaces would need to be removed to allow extended left turn lanes. They might take the existing on-street parking (50 ft would take out 2 cars).

Kris – Looking at extending the 2020 horizon to 2030, the 2 car bay could turn into a 6 car bay, which may start to change the pedestrian-scale dynamic of Old Bellevue.

Rich – Could you explain what you did in the analysis (#1)? 2020 is only 10 years away. Why did you assume that? What should we be doing for 2030, which is not that far away either?

Kris – The numbers are taken from the City's traffic model, including land use changes to that 2020 forecast horizon. From there, additional analysis was done at the intersection level using Syncro and SimTraffic software.

David Schooler – Did you assume that changes were made to NE 2nd and what they might be?

Kris – We took our numbers from the City's model, which assumes the projects in the City's capital improvements program. I believe it includes a NE 2nd improvement.

David – What happens if we close 100th and 2nd is not changed?

Kris – We didn't look at all possibilities (if some of the city's projects are built and others are not) we focused on Main Street and this subarea.

5. Summary of Impacts

Jan Mulder gave a brief recap and summary of impacts and conclusions determined by the DEIS. Primarily, project level impacts would be short-term. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would likely address these impacts. Public review, laws, and comprehensive plan guidelines would address other impacts. There would be an improvement in water quality in the bay due to the opportunity to improve treatment of water draining into the bay and the reduction in moorage. Additionally, shoreline habitat would be improved.

6. Discussion by Steering Committee

Mike Bergstrom asked if the committee members had any questions or need for further clarification, and also stated that staff from several city departments would be available at the June 30 meeting to answer questions and provide input. No further questions were raised.

David Blau reminded the steering committee about the topics to be covered in the next meetings. The next steering committee meeting will be on June 30 with the Public Works, Police, Fire, and Safety Departments. On the 30th, we'd like to start hearing the committee's preferences on the alternatives, which will lead into crafting a hybrid of the alternatives including the best points so that a preferred alternative plan can be shown on July 28th. There are a series of topics, including road closure, moorage, community spaces, types of uses, parking, stream daylighting, and pedestrian pier treatments that need to be addressed. He recommended that the committee discuss the process for discussing these issues in order for the June 30th meeting to move forward with a clear direction.

Doug suggested that the discussion proceed around the room, and that commonalities and disagreements be noted.

Merle stated he thought it was best to “eat the elephant one bite at a time”. Each element should be discussed and addressed individually with the knowledge that they are intertwined. The consultants are to provide a clear framework for this.

Iris wanted the consultants to organize points one by one and allow the committee to summarize the interactions towards the end.

Rich agreed with Merle’s suggestion; he was concerned about the amount of time that it may take to deliberate on the issues; organization is needed for efficiency.

Iris suggested that if a list were prepared ahead of time, issues could be evaluated based on the planning principles so that the committee is prepared.

Bob requested clarification as to the implications of traffic and the influence of downtown park improvements.

David Schooler agreed with Merle’s suggested approach, but the committee needs a chance to revisit issues after discussing them. He wondered if the vote would be a majority or supermajority – thinking that for him, it was a majority rule vote. Separate opinions could be stated and published.

Merle agreed stating that there will be points of disagreement, and that the committee needed to vote on issues and allow for dissent. Consensus might not be possible.

David Blau provided an explanation of the levels of consensus focusing on the list posted on the wall. “Won’t agree, but won’t stand in the way” is acceptable. Numbers 1-4 would be considered a success.

Hal stated that breaking down the discussion into individual elements might lose sight of the overall picture.

There was a brief discussion of how to incorporate the planning principles and DEIS public comment, which will be made available as soon as possible.

David Blau pointed out that 90% of EIS comments generally come in the last two days.

Iris pointed out that the committee receives copies of all comments submitted by the public.

Marcelle – will we get a verbatim transcript of the public hearing? Also, information about the height elements of the elevated pier would be helpful.

Robin – we have a court reporter scheduled and will post it as soon as possible.

Bob requested that they take a look at the travel lanes on the upside of Bellevue Place since there are only 1.5 travel lanes rather than 2.

David Schooler reminded the committee that they needed to ensure access to the front door of 10,000 Meydenbauer even if the street is closed.

Rich asked how access to 10,000 Meydenbauer will be accommodated.

Stu pointed out editorial errors on Page 3-201 of the Draft EIS.

Merle proposed that the committee discuss how the park fits within the rest of the parks system, lake to lake trail, etc.

Doug brought up the fact that there wasn't an evaluation of the impacts to 98th Ave and thought it should be addressed.

Tom asked about the effect of the light rail station on the project.

Kris offered that he had alluded to that with the mention of increased foot traffic. Vehicular traffic is expected to be relatively less than it is now compared to employment base. Mode splits will change over time with the circulator, light rail, etc.

7. Public Comment

Anita Skoog – 9302 SE Shoreland Dr

- Thought the public involvement process was rushed – 5 public forums, the public has until July 20 for DEIS comments, two additional meetings in July. She felt the process discourages public involvement.
- Stated that the Shoreline Master Program update suggests environmental use designations with new uses which would apply in the project area including view deck, signage, educational facilities, a public boat launch. Didn't think we were doing meaningful planning, and that the SMP update and the Meydenbauer project were on divergent paths.
- Noise – Ski boats are noisy – recent loud groups in the bay reminded her of that. Stated that there was not a study on the amplified effect of noise on water.
- No Action – sees this as a viable alternative. Thought that removing the houses could suffice. Just as Downtown Park is splendid in simplicity, this park could be simple too. The square footage of structures in the action alternatives is a lot.
- Reminded the committee that DEIS comments would not be complete until July 20th.

Rod Bindon

- Rod stated that he represented the Meydenbauer Bay Yacht Club who believe the traffic study is invalid. With the tolls on the SR520, we think that people will increase traffic on I-90, and think that 100th should remain open to accommodate the additional traffic. Softening the shoreline will attract Canadian Geese.
- Most of the alternatives provide ADA access – wouldn't it be easier to drive to the water?

Marv Peterson

- Liked Anita's comments
- Not just 10000 Meydenbauer will be affected by the closure of 100th Ave SE, everyone south of 100th would be affected – doesn't believe traffic numbers. Due to the fact that there are no services to the south, everyone would have to go to NE 2nd – affecting other traffic.
- Why do away with a viable road? The cost of relocating utilities is high.
- Many neighbors are going to be neighbors to the park, and want to be part of the design.

Pamela Ebsworth

- Wanted to thank David Schooler, team, EDAW. The EIS is an incredible document. She noticed that there were many comments that were qualified with "slightly, minor, little change, minor..."
- She thought that the audience didn't see the changes as slight, minor, modest, etc.
- You can't just airlift Kirkland into a community.
- Traffic study is incorrect.
- "Form follows function" should be a mantra.

- Park should follow Webster's dictionary – "a park is a piece of ground protected in a natural state".

Jerome Baruffi

- 1st thing – on the traffic study, with an average of 85 cars/hour for 24 hours a day – Most of the traffic happens between 5-6 pm. Traffic seems to be increasing.
- We are looking at a small portion of the bay that is an amphitheatre. Down the bay, there is silt building up. It would be nice to address that issue. When it affects boats, then will it be addressed?
- Changing the residential nature of the bay – going from residential development to the amount of proposed development will change the nature of the bay. A park with restaurants, convention centers... changes the nature of the bay. A park makes sense if it's a park.
- Zig-zag paths aren't the best for wheelchair access; let them drive to the bottom using the existing street.

8. Adjournment

Iris adjourned the meeting.

Robin – If you need any additional information before the next meeting, please let staff know.

Iris – Public comments are appreciated – please reiterate them to be added to the EIS.

PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS (who signed in):

- Dan Lewis
- Sue Drais
- John Evans
- Robert Sheehan
- Anita Skoog Neil
- Laura Basacchi
- Rod Bindon
- Marv Peterson
- Daryl Williams
- Pamela Ebsworth
- Jim Powell
- Aaron Dichter
- Don & Betty Mastropaulo
- Jerome Baruffi
- Ed Sweo
- Kathleen Hodge
- Ray Waldmann
- JH Peters
- Carol Starr
- Court Harris
- Linda Osborn