



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

**Steering Committee Meeting #19**

**November 19, 2009 Meeting Packet  
Agenda Item No. 2.a**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

---

**DATE:** July 28, 2009

**TIME:** 5:00 PM

**LOCATION:** Bellevue City Hall

**ATTENDEES:**

**Steering Committee**

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

**City Staff and Consultants**

Robin Cole, City of Bellevue  
Mike Bergstrom, City of Bellevue  
Patrick Foran, City of Bellevue  
Warren Merritt, City of Bellevue Fire Dept.  
Matt Terry, City of Bellevue  
Dan Stroh, City of Bellevue  
Paul Inghram, City of Bellevue  
David Blau, EDAW  
Marilee Stander, EDAW  
Newton Breiter, EDAW  
Emy Carpenter, Moffatt & Nichol

**SUMMARY:**

**1. Welcome and review of the agenda/meeting overview**

**Doug Leigh** opened the meeting and welcomed those in attendance. He mentioned the possibility that it may be the last steering committee meeting, depending on the outcome. He said that they would go over the agenda and review meeting notes from two previous meetings. After that they would follow up on our June 30 meeting and hold discussion of the draft hybrid.

**2. Review and approval of the June 18 and June 30, 2009 Meeting Summaries**

**Doug Leigh** asked if anyone had any changes to the June 18 meeting notes. There were no changes, and the June 18 meeting summary was approved as written.

**Doug Leigh** then asked if anyone had any changes to the June 30 meeting notes.

**Rich Wagner** wanted to clarify a comment that was included on page 24 of the steering committee packet. His intention when saying that he agreed with closing 100<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE was that he thought the park entrance would be better if 100<sup>th</sup> were closed, but not without a proper and more thorough traffic study that demonstrates viable traffic after the park is in place.

**Betina Finley** desired to have her comment on page 10 refined by clarifying that one of the reasons she approved partial daylighting was to maintain emergency access to the west end of the park.

**Bob MacMillan** pointed out that on page 24, while he didn't articulate it the same way, he agreed with Rich Wagner that 100<sup>th</sup> could be closed with a proper traffic study and with solutions to the problems that exist both today and also after park expansion and any redevelopment that is in the pipeline.

**David Schooler** pointed out a grammatical correction that should be made to Page 13.

Following the changes, the committee agreed to approve the notes.

**Doug Leigh** then opened the discussion to follow up on the June 30 steering committee meeting.

**Mike Bergstrom** stated that as part of tonight's process, the consultants would introduce the draft hybrid alternative to see if it met what the steering committee had intended. The hybrid is intended to capture direction from the Committee that was given on June 30 and to see if the direction has changed. He pointed out that the public comment period on the Draft EIS ended after the Committee's June 30 meeting and that all comments were forwarded to the Committee. He stated that the Final EIS will be prepared over the coming months.

### **3. Summary of Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Comments:**

**David Blau** made sure that everyone could hear him and then turned to the slides. He started by giving a very brief summary of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process and offering an overview of the comments received on Draft EIS. He said that the City had a 45 day comment period that ended on July 20. In terms of a summary, the city has received 50 letters/emails of comment. They had a transcript from the public hearing which includes 15 speakers. 13 of the 15 speakers also provided written comments. Some submitted comments twice. Out of the 50 letters/emails, 46 were individual. One agency responded – the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe. He stated that the committee, consultants, and staff had read the comments several times and the EIS team would start to address comments as they move to the Final EIS. Comments fell into several categories:

Some of the comments were related to **Process**. As a clarification, David pointed out that the steering committee was in place to act as advisory to the city council. The city council has the final decision. Approximately half a dozen comments related to that.

David continued and said that the **Transportation** part of the DEIS received a lot of commentary. There were questions about underestimation of traffic impacts, of parking, methodology, emergency access, and the relocation of utilities.

Other comments were directed towards **Land Use**. He said that a number of comments brought up the relationship between the shoreline master plan update and this process and recommended that they be better integrated. Some comments were positive and some critical of the work that had been done.

Some commented that the increase in density in land use portions was a good approach. Others wondered whether the park was going to increase crime rates or decrease pedestrian safety.

Under **Biophysical Environment**, there were comments on noxious weed control, degrading water quality, noise associated with the park, other pollution problems, loss of bird habitat, significant trees, and impervious surfaces in the park.

As far as the **Marina** was concerned, there were a lot of questions relating to more detail. David offered that in his experience, working at the programmatic level, most comments related to more detail will be addressed as we move further in the process. The comments won't be left unattended and will help the city focus as they move forward.

Comments relating to **Visual** analysis pertain mostly to not blocking any views. He commented that the committee had discussed many times about how the grade change on site allows them not to block any views and that parking structures can be tucked into the hillside.

David clarified that all of these comments would be addressed in the final EIS document.

#### **4. Recap of Draft Hybrid Alternative Guidance from Committee:**

**David Blau** expressed the desire to recap the guidance that the city and consultants received from the committee on June 30. He said they looked at areas that they thought were areas of agreement: removal of existing residential structures, beach relocation/enlargement, adaptive reuse of the whaling building and icehouse, the upland land use plan, softening the shoreline edge, and removing coverage over the piers. He felt there wasn't debate over these issues and took them forward in the hybrid plan.

David listed the 7 issues that presented debate:

**Stream Daylighting** – Recalling the discussion, he mentioned there were 11 committee members present at the June 30 meeting with the addition of Tom's detailed memo. On the stream daylighting, the committee had a slight preference for partial daylighting for the reasons just mentioned – the existing infrastructure, parking, road, and emergency access. They had a slight majority favoring the partial daylighting. When he previously asked the committee if those favoring the full daylighting could follow along with partial, the answer was yes.

**Building Uses and Structures** – There was agreement that Bellevue didn't need another environmental education center (by staff and committee). Patrick suggested calling the space an activity center. David mentioned that the question he posed to the committee was whether they want to be on the low or high side of spacing (4000 sf vs. 8000 sf). The committee agreed to go to the larger side and the minority said they could go along with it.

**Piers and Watercraft** – A strong majority said they wanted to expand pier one. Several committee members asked about saving pier 2. There was no support for saving pier 3. Overall, the minority said they would be okay joining the majority and we looked at expanding pier 1.

**Other Uses** – There was a majority of committee members in opposition to commercial activity in the park. A minority thought a couple of commercial uses (cafe, for example) would be okay. A majority of

the committee did not want a café, and the others agreed to not have one. A majority supported portable seasonal kiosk uses and ppvs.

**Parking** – With a range from around 100 to 150-plus spaces, there was an overwhelming majority that thought the park should provide parking on the higher side.

**Public Access** – Again, the committee had a strong majority that wanted to build terraces and a structure on the kite parcel with tucked-in uses underneath. A minority wanted no structure at all on the kite parcel. The minority was willing to go along with the majority. David pointed out that as seen on screen, the consultants were working with a similar idea. In reference to the pier, there was a strong voice from the committee to go just to the water’s edge with the raised pier and then drop down to water level. There was a majority in favor of the floating boardwalk and the minority agreed to go along with it. The curved pedestrian pier had unanimous support.

**100th Avenue SE** – 11 of 12 supported closure of 100<sup>th</sup> which they stated was consistent with the planning principles. One was undecided.

**David Blau** asked the committee if that was their recollection.

**Iris Tocher** replied yes.

**Bob MacMillan** wanted to reiterate that this was assuming the city can find solutions to traffic issues.

**David Blau** responded that the consultants drew the best pieces of the alternatives into one hybrid that they hoped represents the ideas of the committee.

##### **5. Presentation of Draft Hybrid Alternative:**

**David Blau**, referring to the Draft Hybrid Alternative plan on screen described the major elements of the plan. He said they were maintaining access in the ravine and that the master plan would discuss removing exotics and restoring natives. They would daylight a portion of the stream, and in addition, there would be an excellent outdoor classroom area that would work with any outdoor educational events in the park. There would be a pathway that comes down through and crosses over. He pointed out that they could see that the design team worked on further developing the forms. One side of the park became more urban and the other more natural.

David moved on to describe the overlook terrace and the park elements as one moves to the waterfront. An activity center would be included with a very low profile. There would be access to parking underneath from 99<sup>th</sup>, in addition to approximately 8 parking stalls along 99<sup>th</sup>. The beach was moved and enlarged, and the existing beach park pier removed. They had added a restroom and changing room building near the beach. There were outdoor classroom areas and they had added what they called a discovery play area near the beach so children would be supervised. Because of the grade change, the elements would be terraced and look very nice. The terraces would be embraced by a staircase down to an arced pier that allowed for ppvs on the east side, outside the swim area.

In the marina area, the whaling building would be preserved and reused with a historic nautical theme. They had expanded pier one to the south and felt that it worked very well. The floating boardwalk

complemented it, creating a nice loop effect. They showed day-use moorage along the outside of the floating walkway.

The entry to the park came off of 100<sup>th</sup> with a water connection that connected to Downtown Park. The water connection grows as you move to the bay. Terraces would step you down to the bay. A pedestrian pier would start at the plaza and step down to the shore edge. An elevator would bring you down to the water/floating walk.

At the end of Meydenbauer Way, the consultants had shown a fairly generous plaza/turnaround that would facilitate emergency access as well. There would be about 8 temporary stalls near the whaling building – not too generous. The idea for the pier 1 expansion allowed for a stronger continuous band of restoration along the shoreline.

David told the committee they would talk more about 10,000 Meydenbauer later in the presentation.

From the main entry plaza, a walkway would take you along grade or you can choose to take the pedestrian pier and come down the elevator. There are approximately 50 spaces under the main plaza.

**Doug Leigh** asked where access to the parking spaces was.

**David Blau** clarified that it was off of the plaza/turnaround

**Stefanie Beighle** asked about ppv access and launch provisions

**Marilee Stander** thought it could be open for discussion, but that ppv storage could occur under the kite parcel in addition to the parking.

**Robin Cole** said that the access road off of Meydenbauer Way serves a sewer lift station and must remain. Boats have been removed from the south side of the public pier, and moved to the boardwalk.. She pointed out that ppv access was between the whaling building and the curved pedestrian pier, where there are eyes on the beach.

**Betina Finley** asked about the distance between where a ppv would be picked up and where it would be launched.

**Robin Cole** explained that although ppvs could be stored under the kite parcel, they would likely be on racks closer to the launch during the season.

**Betina Finley** asked about pedestrian access. Could you describe what you envision happens at the grand entry plaza?

**David Blau** pointed out that the simulations illustrate what our intentions were and the parking could be provided below.

**Betina Finley** asked if there were any uses below.

**David Blau** pointed out that there would be gathering space (no commercial) and parking.

**Merle Keeney** asked about the location of the access to the parking under the kite parcel.

**David Blau** responded it would be from the plaza at the bottom of the hill.

**Doug Leigh** asked about piers. He asked if the floating walkway was floating and the arced pier fixed.

**David Blau** said yes, at this time.

**Doug Leigh** asked if there was a difference in the way the whaling building transitioned to the shoreline and access to that building.

**Marilee Stander** said they had shown it having more pedestrian space than currently exists.

**Doug Leigh** said that what he was getting at was that there should be transparency for fish – approximately 60%, in order to provide a migratory path.

**Hal Ferris** said that as part of the planning commission dealing with the shoreline master plan, he believes there are certain elements shown in this plan that will not be consistent with the shoreline master plan revisions. As an example, any piers within 30 feet of the shoreline would have to be narrow. They would need to have open grating/transparency. He said the committee needed to be sure that they didn't get attached to this plan and later on in the process be prevented from building it. He remembered that when walking down by the marina, a person can't see past the boats to the water. He was just thinking that they may gravitate towards a plan and then maybe be disappointed.

**David Blau** said they had implemented these successfully with various materials and treatments.

**Hal Ferris** pointed out that the rules that these over-water structures will be built under are different from the rules that have existing in the past.

**Patrick Foran** brought up the fact that they had discussed that this is a 20+ year process where rules and regulations may or could change and that the concept can be carried through in the master plan and addressed later.

**Marilee Stander** pointed out that an option that was explored was pulling the floating boardwalk away from the shore, which would provide more space, but lose moorage.

**David Blau** detailed the marina program from the Draft Hybrid Alternative, then moved on to describe how fun it would be to enter from the other side of the park, the ravine, seeing the daylighted stream, wading through the park through terraces, by the whaling building, along the shore and then through the grand viewing plaza. He said it could be fantastic.

**Betina Finley** inquired if it would be wheel-chair accessible.

**Robin Cole** clarified that with project level design, we would address wheelchair issues.

**David Schooler** asked if the hours of transient use could be limited.

**Robin Cole** brought up the fact that one provision is that the transient moorers need to have the same access to amenities in the park as permanent moorers.

**David Schooler** pointed out that the steering committee could recommend limiting hours.

**David Blau** asked if there were any other observations or comments. He said that, with the approval of the co-chairs, they could finish their presentation, and then take public comment before allowing the committee to follow up.

**Bob MacMillan** brought up the fact that the Vue Condominiums have access at the bottom of the park area, and asked if other access has been explored. He didn't recall any representatives of the Vue Condos here to present ideas or conflicts. One option would be to create a one-way couplet that loops Meydenbauer Way through.

**David Blau** asked if they should address that now or take it under advisement and bring it up later.

The committee agreed to address it later.

**Rich Wagner** wanted to ask procedure questions. He inquired if this was the time to address or comment. He felt that the committee hadn't had much time to see the draft hybrid alternative. He expressed that there was a lot of pressure to take care of the process right now, rather than have time to think about it.

**David Blau** said that the consultants were there to serve the process and the committee. He said the decisions were entirely up to the committee as to whether they want to reach consensus or whether to reach agreement.

**Rich Wagner** felt that there are lots of changes to consider and it seemed the process was racing to a closure.

**Marilee Stander** offered that they could take comments later in the meeting.

**Doug Leigh** stated that this piece was more about understanding the plan – the program, etc. and that they could have discussion later on, following public comment, to reach an actual recommendation. The end goal was to have a draft recommendation either after tonight or on Thursday.

**David Blau** said there were a couple of comments they'd like to address before that. One was to look at access to 10,000 Meydenbauer and the other was to look at views, specifically from 10,000 Meydenbauer.

**Marilee Stander** told that committee that she would first discuss it based on the plan and then show views.

The first thing they addressed was how people would access 10,000 Meydenbauer – both pedestrian and vehicular, and emergency access, and both presently and in the future. As far as existing conditions go for 10,000 Meydenbauer, there is a long walkway off of 100<sup>th</sup> with a few steps, which is not ADA accessible, but convenient and well-used. The other access is off of Meydenbauer Way through the parking garage. In the alternative scenario, access would be created via the plaza at the end of

Meydenbauer Way. People could be dropped off in the plaza and walk around to the front door via the grand walkway. Also, people could continue access through the 10,000 Meydenbauer garage, or through the underground parking that could provide level access from the garage to the front walkway. As far as emergency access is concerned, they had talked about having two hydraulically controlled bollards at the end of the grand walkway that would drop down and emergency vehicles could access by driving up the walkway.

Marilee next showed some sketches. She pointed out that the committee would have to view them as more of a concept sketch. The sketches would show more of what the designers intended (pointing out the image on screen). She pointed out that you can see that the structure is light and floating. The elevator structure would be glass. This shows a nice view of the structure, the floating boardwalk, and the overlook. Near the shoreline, the height is approximately 35' above the water. As you move up towards the kite parcel, this would be approximately 15' above grade. When they moved to detailed design, they could look at stepping the structure or adjusting its height.

The last simulation they did was looking from about the second or third floor of 10,000 Meydenbauer. She said that when you look at the existing view, you can't really see much of the water. The marina covers and the duplex block most of the shoreline and water. She pointed out that when transitioning to the potential view, you can see that there is a great deal more water in view. The elevated structure was slightly higher than the duplexes, noting that she had previously spoken generally about it being approximately the same height as the duplexes. She offered that there are other options of stepping it down, etc. that could be implemented in design.

**David Schooler** asked her to point out where the turnaround was (it wasn't in view of the drawing).

**Stu Vander Hoek** asked if there was a height allowance when the city bought the marina and if the duplex was built to that height.

**Mike Bergstrom** replied that it was zoned R30, but near the water. He wasn't totally sure, but guessed that the height allowance was either 30 or 35'.

**Stu Vander Hoek** asked if the elevated pier and elevator would be allowed under the shoreline master plan.

**Hal Ferris** mentioned that as Patrick had pointed out, there is a lot of work to be done on the shoreline master plan and that would be determined later.

**Marilee Stander** stated that in the model, we have it designed at 35'.

**Hal Ferris** inquired about the location of the piers in the rendering.

**Marilee Stander** pointed them out in the rendering and **David Blau** reminded the committee that they would only do a partial simulation.

**Iris Tocher** said she was very excited about the plan. She thought the consultants had listened to the committee's comments and really responded well to them which she appreciated. She stated that she knew that there were several issues and felt they were addressed.



**David Blau** said the committee had worked a long time on this and it was definitely up to the committee to determine if they're comfortable with the outcome.

**Doug Leigh** asked if anyone had any questions about the fundamentals of the hybrid.

**Stefanie Beighle** asked if it were possible to reserve spaces in the parking garage off of Main St for residents of 10,000 Meydenbauer.

**Robin Cole** said that it would be a project level design decision, but certainly an option.

**Doug Leigh** asked if there were further questions and then opened the floor to public comment via the sign-up sheet.

**Bill Reams** (audience member) asked if there was enough flexibility in the hybrid to allow for keeping 100<sup>th</sup> open if the city council decided not to close it.

The **Committee** said there was.

**Doug Leigh** clarified the public comment process. Please come forward, state your name and address. He asked that they not repeat comments and simply state that they agree. He said they also had the opportunity to provide comments about the hybrid.

## **6. Public Comment**

**Pamela Ebsworth** began by saying that her comments would be longer than 3 minutes. She said she was there to represent 10,000 Meydenbauer and appreciated being involved in the process. She stated that her constituents had a number of disagreements with the committee. 1) The closure of 100<sup>th</sup>: she said that they had raised the issue repeatedly and reminded the committee that an independent traffic consultant stated that the closure would cause issues with emergency access and went on to describe a recent incident involving an emergency alarm sounding. She felt that eliminating 100<sup>th</sup> Ave would degrade emergency access and impair access to the community to the south. She stated that they need more than a drop-off it is not adequate for their needs (plumbers, guests, etc). 2) She felt the mini-Alaska Way Viaduct would create a 20-35 foot structure in front of their building. She reminded the committee that their independent consultant, Robert Thorpe, thought the structure would have a substantial impact on the view from the condos. 3) Vendor Kiosks: She felt the committee had failed to provide substantial control over what type these would be (could be hot dog stands) and questioned what it would say about Bellevue. 4) Process: She felt the committee's process was flawed. She felt the committee hadn't allowed enough time to integrate public comments. She felt that the public's comments and concerns had been trivialized and reminded them that she represented 1300 families.

**Betty Schwind** stated that she had come to every meeting since the beginning. She said that the committee looked like they were listening, but they weren't. At the present time, she felt that the committee was smothering a nice little bay. She said they were taking out a good pier that was useful to the people and bringing in a public pier and its garbage. The elevated pier and elevator is ridiculous. She felt they were ruining the nature of the area. She said they needed to have so many things when people can simply walk. She iterated that this was a park for nature, not all the conveniences of home. She didn't feel the committee was listening to the public. She stated that the steering committee was

not steering, they were being steered by an over aggressive parks department. She told the committee they were ruining a nice lake and making it hard on the neighbors and they should consider that.

**Rod Bindon** stated that he represented Meydenbauer Yacht Club and lived in Medina. He said they talked about stream daylighting, but when he visited the stream that day, the flow was about like a garden hose. Originally, they were excited to help design the park. He said they would leave today being disappointed in the plan. He continued and insisted that the steering committee should ensure that the whole community is engaged. He felt that was not well done from the beginning. The workshops were steered by consultants. No survey of the public was ever taken to see what the public wanted – the kiosks, the viewing platform... He brought up the fact that the DEIS was written by EDAW, the consultant that designed the park. He felt it was incomplete and misleading. He felt the traffic study was based on a model, not reality and didn't take into account other issues such as the tolls on 520. The noise piece was inadequate as no noise measurements were taken. Emergency access was not represented earlier. He concluded that the committee was being asked to approve a design that no one likes. He told them they were likely to start several lawsuits and suggested they delay the process, prepare a survey and see what the public wants.

**John Evans** from Whaler's Cove, up the hill from the marina, said that when they started this project, his first question was 'how much is this going to cost?'. He said he recently looked at a publication that states that this would cost ~\$44 million to build. It seems bad to pay \$44 million to lose 44 slips.

**Nathan Rimmer**, 1 100<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, pointed out that on the preliminary drawings there wasn't any access shown to the east side of their property from 100<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. He said that in the land use plan the committee proposed increased density by expanding lot line allowances and keeping height limits that may have adverse effects on their property. He is opposed to any changes to dimensional standards that could impact views. One comment he wanted to have on the park design concerned the lack of pervious surfaces on the street level. He understood that it may be early in the design process, but they would like to see more green space.

He said the other property of interest was the Chevron Station. He said the plan proposes to offer land use incentives to increase density, but the Chevron site already had full lot coverage, etc. The goal of increasing density would be tough to incur without increasing height limits. He said that in addition, fuel was difficult to come by in this neighborhood, and the importance of fueling stations should be recognized. He told the committee that 100<sup>th</sup> should be kept open to serve Chevron, and concerns could be addressed through design. 100<sup>th</sup> was one of the first streets in Bellevue and its significance should be preserved, not destroyed.

**Robert Thorpe** said he wanted to compliment the committee, the staff, and consultants. He thought they had done good things including preserving the existing ravine and infrastructure. However, his first question was why they would take pier 2 out at a considerable cost. In addition, he didn't think they could adopt a plan and then have to deal with the future shorelines plan. He thought they should be very careful to ensure that this had flexibility. He thought they should consider Bob MacMillan's comment to consider a one-way couplet. He thought they should pay attention to visual things, and felt the elevated pier was out of scale. As far as the EIS was concerned, he had never before seen an EIS done by the same firm as was the case here. He'd done EIS's before and thought they were opening themselves up to a possible SEPA appeal. He said he sensed a lot of frustration within the committee. He thought the committee should determine if they wanted more time. He thought they should send out a questionnaire and listen to the several people inputting. He thanked the committee for listening.

**Peter Marshall**, 3030 109<sup>th</sup> Ave SE. Regarding the comment on the same consultant preparing the EIS, had thought they did a fairly okay job. It looked like the committee will make a recommendation on the preferred alternative before the EIS was completed, but he didn't think there was anything in SEPA that requires that to occur. He believed waiting until the FEIS was completed before making a recommendation would help address concerns regarding the objectivity of the EIS. He said he heard a couple of comments, and wasn't a lakefront resident. He used the lake a lot as a pedestrian, a boater, and a kayaker. He felt that as far as the viewing platform/elevator – he personally agrees with the objections stated by others. Other citizens would help pay and as an outside taxpayer, this represented too much investment in structure and not in the open space aspects of the park. He said it was his understanding that the park would help to open views for the public. Having the view interrupted by a vertical structure may repeat the same mistake as the original coverages. He thought the park should be more of a respite from the structured environment of downtown Bellevue. On the floating boardwalk – his view was it was a redundant and unnecessary structure. It was a nice loop idea, but maybe a little loopy – looking at the back end of the boats. He said that he understood that a lot of boaters have a stake in how this plan turns out, but there a lot of people who don't have boats. He didn't think the boaters should have a privileged access to the views of the bay. He hoped the committee would take its time to agree on the final alternative, and maybe postpone the recommendation until after the Final EIS is done.

**Anita Neil**, 9302 S Shoreline Dr – She said she was just going to give the committee the cover letter from their comments (cover letter on file). 1) The DEIS failed to address our comments (Meydenbauer Bay Neighbor's Association – MBNA). 2) The DEIS compares alternatives to a No Action Alternative with actions. 3) The DEIS fails to follow the 12 planning principles. 4) The steering committee process is fundamentally flawed because the committee is making decisions prior to the completion of comments of the DEIS. 5) The DEIS fails to adequately address shoreline issues; specifically the critical areas ordinance. The committee must assume that permits would be issued. 6) Noise impacts are not addressed – the bay creates a unique amphitheater effect that magnifies all noise. 7) The DEIS fails to properly analyze adverse parking and traffic impacts. 8) The DEIS fails to address all the concerns noted in the document entitled Walkabout: Points of Impact. 9) The DEIS fails to address loss of moorage and the closing of 100<sup>th</sup>. She quoted their independent traffic consultant, “the DEIS fails to provide complete/proper information.” She said the committee should wait until a Main Street Plan was completed before adopting and completing the traffic study. She was concerned with the people that live off of 100<sup>th</sup> and Meydenbauer Way, and lastly, she showed the committee a picture of what the walkway would look like from pictures in Thorpe's analysis of the EIS (passed pictures around). She thanked the committee.

**Doug Leigh** thanked the public for their comments.

## **7. Discussion**

**David Blau** said it would be good to hear from the committee, taking the public's comments into account, and see how they would like to proceed into closure.

**Doug Leigh** said they should reaffirm their charge before we move on, in relation to the EIS. The final EIS would be issued before the final master plan would be. He said they wouldn't have a final EIS before they were to make a recommendation on a master plan based on the planning principles (final details wouldn't be completed). He just wanted to clarify that that's the process they would follow.

**Rich Wagner** asked if it mattered that there were significant concerns with the content of the DEIS? – content, adequacy, conflict of interest, etc?... He understood that that was the original charge, but in his mind the DEIS has significant problems. He stated there were several areas in the DEIS where it stated that there are ‘no significant impacts’, when we’re talking about a project that includes major structures, major impervious surface areas, and other improvements, and wondered how that could be true. Without a traffic analysis, he felt they were painted into a corner and didn’t know how they could proceed.

**Iris Tocher** understood. She said it was her understanding that they were charged with following the 12 planning principles and to come up with recommendations on a concept. They would make a decision on a hybrid and then do a final EIS on the hybrid. They are not the deciders. The city council made the final decisions. She said she heard the issues being raised in regards to traffic, but this was not a project about the traffic in Old Bellevue or downtown Bellevue. It was not the issue with this park. It was a greater issue. She continued by saying that noise on the water was another issue that wasn’t necessarily contingent on this park plan. It was happening already. She felt that this was still a concept that they were putting forth and there were further studies that were scheduled to occur. She understood that the neighbors were extremely concerned, but that the entire city was paying for it, not just the neighbors. It was very familiar – the anxieties and fears. She said they had made significant changes that were of concern in Downtown Park. She reminded the committee that this park wasn’t even going to be started for years, but to look at the other changes in downtown that will. She felt this was more about the vision.

**David Blau** asked if he could make some statements about the DEIS? He said that when SEPA implemented the idea of the EIS, the intent was to tie design and environmental work together. He said in the 1970s, when the legal community got a hold of it, there was a demand for them to be separated. What he had seen in recent years was a better integration between the EIS and the design team to get a better product. He stated that when the consultants work on the EIS, they set up an entirely separate team to do the EIS, with no designers involved. He iterated that an 8000 sf activity center underground does not fall into ‘significant impacts’. He reminded them that in an EIS, they are talking about air, water... He said the only fault that can be found in this level of EIS was that there wasn’t enough detail. This was common. He said the beauty of the programmatic EIS was that you can branch off and do further analysis. He felt compelled to defend the EIS. He sympathized with the issues of traffic, etc., but said they fall into a category of inconvenience, not significant impacts.

**Doug Leigh** asked for clarification of the EIS process.

**Mike Bergstrom** said once the committee arrives at a recommendation, the consultants will prepare the Final EIS and a draft master plan. Both documents would reflect the committee’s recommended plan. These would be completed before the recommendation would forward even for recommendation by the Parks Board on a master plan, so that they would have the benefit of the documents before forwarding their own recommendation to City Council. The Final EIS will address the comments submitted on the Draft EIS. A reason you have a Draft and a Final EIS is because the Draft EIS is never perfect, they seek input, and the Final EIS responds to that input. That combined body of information is forwarded to the review bodies, and ultimately the City Council takes the action they deem best.

**Doug Leigh** said they needed to come to a level of consensus on these issues.

**Stu Vander Hoek** asked if the fire department had offered their opinion on what they can service if 100<sup>th</sup> were closed.

**Warren Merritt, Bellevue Fire Department**, stated that they have been engaged since late 2007. They had been out to the site. They determined that they would need Meydenbauer Way kept at the current width. They need a turn around, clearance under the boardwalk, and power lines underground. They could use bollards that retract. He said that looking at the bottom of 100<sup>th</sup>, they could provide access to the building with the removable/retractable bollards. He said there was water access on the corner as well. The power lines caused a problem and they would prefer to put them underground. He referred to a letter that the Fire Department wrote in January 2008 regarding this project that is on file. He said that not every building in Bellevue has 100% access on four sides of the building. He'd been in the Bellevue Fire Dept. for 30 years, and a fireman for 35. He felt that the park would allow them to provide good access and service. The access up the bottom of 100<sup>th</sup> Ave SE would be enhanced. Their goal is to make sure the public is safe.

One of the members of the public asked if she could ask a question.

**Doug Leigh** apologized, but asked if they could respect that it was the steering committee's time.

**Hal Ferris** thought they were all coming up with new questions and thoughts on the hybrid plan. He thought they should take the plan away and come back with recommendations. He would expect to read the final draft text to make sure the language captures their discussion. He thought that the evolution would ensure this.

**Merle Keeney** agreed. He thought that he would like to have some time to think through the new hybrid - maybe even Thursday and have some time to mull it over before they make too many more comments, or certainly before they could vote on any type of consensus.

**Rich Wagner** wanted to comment about some specifics.

**Doug Leigh** interjected and said they could continue to discuss the issues tonight while they had the consultants there and then come back on Thursday with the comments. This would again require them to have another round of refinement. He asked if they could bring the consultants back.

**Robin Cole** said they could bring them back Thursday, but beyond that would delay the schedule into September. She wondered if there was a way to come up with questions and discuss them tonight, then finish on Thursday.

**David Blau** said it was his understanding that they would provide this concept level of drawing and then spend the next three months refining it into a master plan.

**Mike Bergstrom** said they'd been keeping notes on all topics. He knew what the larger issues were from the public, what the themes are. He said the comments that didn't lend themselves to graphics could be memorialized other ways. The question was whether some list of this would be sufficient in making sure that the language that gets the comments would be sufficient.

**David Schooler** didn't think so. He thought they'd been charged with coming up with a recommendation. He thought they should see its final form before agreeing and then allow the draft to

continue. He didn't want to have a finished product to say 'our version of holy water' to go to the parks/planning commission and city council. It feels unfinished before they have a finished product.

**Tom Tanaka** said he didn't know where the end point was. Where was the finish line? He said his understanding was that they come up with a recommendation. The plan was currently imperfect. The exercise was to narrow down and make a recommendation – i.e. general themes, what this park is about, etc.

**David Schooler** wanted to stop at the programmatic level, but wanted to see what they were endorsing before he endorsed it. I think there are four or five issues to make recommendations on before we are complete – water quality, NE 2<sup>nd</sup> improvements, traffic. Citing Kris Liljeblad, the traffic engineer, he said the traffic study assumed that 2<sup>nd</sup> was improved prior to the completion of the park which seemed integral to the Main St working. He would like to see how they were going to read before he said okay.

**Iris Tocher** said this could be a narrative or appendix.

**David Schooler** agreed.

**Stu Vander Hoek** said he was working on something. He was concerned with what would happen moving forward. He was able to let go and let the planning commission/traffic commission/city council do their work. On the last go-around, they gave recommendations and the consultants brought a hybrid back. He said he hadn't heard the committee say that they didn't like what they'd seen. I thought they had done what they were supposed to do.

**Doug Leigh** said they shouldn't get into more detail that's not their charge, and recognizes that the plan will change as a result of other reviewers.

**Rich Wagner** felt that the group understood he was frustrated. It was an honor to work with this group and on this plan. One of the assumptions he made when this started was that the public would be happy. He said that what they had were several groups that were unhappy. From every single group, the response was broadly negative, and some of it is pretty serious. He thought they should pay attention to Thorpe, the independent traffic consultant, and others. He was concerned that there was almost no support. He thought they should continue the process until there was some level of consensus among the public. There were some elements the group hadn't discussed. He said that David had stated that he was uncomfortable with an elevated structure or tower. He never did agree to it. He envisioned a green natural landscaped place with trails, and a major departure from downtown Bellevue hardscape. The elevator bothered him. He does not believe it will achieve what the public desires. Views will be of other nearby structures and structures across the bay. He said that public elevators tend to be dirty, and high maintenance. He is opposed to putting something like this right at the waterfront. With all due respect, he didn't believe the drawings were correct. He didn't think they are realistic. He said that he built structures – they needed to be built taller to make the elevator work. He thought the structure was out of character, out of scale, and unattractive. He thought it blocked the view – not just from the condos, but in general.

**Merle Keeney** said he appreciated what Rich was saying, but that he was dominating the meeting. He thought they should set up a format to let everyone get their opinions heard.

**Rich Wagner** agreed that all members should have as much time as reasonably needed to express their opinions.

**Iris Tocher** asked if they could do this Thursday.

**The Committee** said yes.

**David Schooler** asked were they to follow what Rich says, did they have a companion piece of what that (the shortened pier without the elevator) may look like. He said the consultants had said there were some things they could do between tonight and Thursday night. Would it be possible to do a sketch at the same level of detail as what they saw on screen; that would be between alternative one and alternative 2 – a little more hardscape than one and less than what is shown right now.

**Doug Leigh** thought they we're moving towards a design exercise. What he thought was that the concept was to get the public vertically above the water. The architecture was not necessarily anything like what was shown.

**David Blau** said he thought they had gone through that before and they may be describing what was described in Alternative 1.

**Iris Tocher** said that they recommended a variety of pedestrian experiences and asked David Schooler if he changed his mind?

**David Schooler** said yes.

**Doug Leigh** stated that between now and Thursday they should develop a detailed recommendation of what the structure would look like (light, lacy, does not impede views, expresses artful Northwest theme, etc).

**Robin Cole** said they had the graphics and the program (uses) to carry forward. They could make recommendations if the committee chooses.

**Rich Wagner** wanted to say that they needed more time to discuss this amongst themselves. He repeated that he doesn't like the elevated structure. He has other concerns as well. There wasn't enough time to discuss them tonight, but hopefully on Thursday there will be.

**Mike Bergstrom** said it was clear they needed more discussion. He said they could quickly wrap up tonight and pick up where the discussion left off on Thursday.

**Robin Cole** asked the committee if it would be helpful to print the graphic and then send the most current with a key tomorrow via email.

**The Committee** said yes.

**Doug Leigh** asked about the format for the next meeting. Did they want a similar format as the last meeting and go around the table and have each person speak and then take a vote?

**Hal Ferris** felt that committee members should have the opportunity to talk about what they like and don't like.

**Betina Finley** asked if there were any issues that they were unanimous or that they could eliminate.

**Doug Leigh** said that we're not unanimous on the closure of 100<sup>th</sup> and the structure on the kite parcel.

**Betina Finley** said she would add moorage to the list.

**David Blau** suggested going around and bringing up what they liked and what they didn't like about the hybrid. Then they could focus on the main issues.

**Rich Wagner** said the 'Ram-Rod' approach last time allowed people to voice their opinion and then didn't allow them to change it based on others expressions. He asked if they could add another round and then allow a little more discussion. Don't ask for a vote, just let us say what we want to say.

### **8. Meeting Adjournment**

**Doug Leigh** adjourned the meeting.

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPANTS (who signed in):**

Rod Bindon  
Sue Drais  
Pamela Ebsworth  
Nancy Ellison  
John Evans  
Kathy Hodge  
Rondi Holm  
Betty Lu Kulp  
Scott Lampe  
Dan Lewis  
Peter Marshall  
Betty Mastropaolo  
Anita Neil  
Ann and John O'Neil  
Bill Reams  
Nathan Rimmer  
Joanne Roddis  
Betty Schwind  
Ann Simpson  
Firman and Jean Smith  
Jay and Carol Starr  
Robert W. Thorpe  
Mark Williams