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Appendix A: Scoping Summary and Comments Received
Introduction
During October and November 2008, the City of Bellevue conducted a public and agency scoping process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) for the environmental impact statement (EIS) on the proposed Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan. The scoping period was initiated on October 9, 2008, by the publication of a Notice of Determination of Significance (DS) for the proposal, and extended through November 12, 2008. During the scoping period, the City solicited comments from interested individuals, agencies, and organizations, so that those comments could be considered in developing the EIS alternatives, study requirements, and mitigation measures. Comments received during the scoping period are included in this appendix.

Proposal Location
The proposal’s “primary study area” is generally bounded by 98th Place NE/Meydenbauer Beach Park on the west, NE 1st Street on the north, 101st Avenue SE on the east, and Meydenbauer Way SE and Meydenbauer Bay on the south. The primary study area includes approximately 10 acres of City-owned property, including the existing Meydenbauer Beach Park and the Bellevue Marina, in addition to privately owned property. A larger “secondary study area” arcing around the perimeter of the primary study area has also been identified.

Description of the Proposed Action
The proposal is to develop a long-range land use and park master plan for the study area. The basis for the proposal is embodied in the City of Bellevue Comprehensive Plan and Parks & Open Space System Plan 2003. Policies contained in these documents envision a graceful pedestrian connection from Downtown Park through Old Bellevue to Meydenbauer Bay; the recognition of Meydenbauer Bay’s historical significance in the region’s development; a visual and physical connection from Downtown Park to Meydenbauer Bay that provides unique recreation, retail, and tourism opportunities; increased waterfront access; and the provision of waterfront opportunities for future generations. The ultimate goal expressed by the Comprehensive Plan and the Parks & Open Space System Plan 2003 is to connect the City-owned properties along Meydenbauer Bay to the downtown area, creating a significant citywide park and waterfront destination. On March 19, 2007, the City Council, adopted planning principles to help guide the proposal, addressing 12 topics: Remarkable and memorable shoreline experience; spectrum of activities; complementary land uses; increased physical and visual access; pedestrian priority; economic vitality; superior design; environmental stewardship; history; neighborhood enhancement and protection; coordinated planning process; and commitment to implement. The proposal is intended to achieve the goals and policies expressed in the Comprehensive Plan and Parks & Open Space System Plan 2003 as well as the 12 planning principles.
Regulatory Background of Scoping
Scoping is a process defined by SEPA to determine the range of proposed actions, alternatives, and impacts to be addressed in an EIS. Because an EIS is required to analyze significant environmental impacts only, scoping is intended to identify and narrow the EIS to the potentially significant issues.

The required scoping process provides interagency and public notice of a DS, or equivalent notification, and opportunity to comment. The lead agency has the option of expanding the scoping process, but shall not be required to do so. Scoping is used to encourage cooperation and early resolution of potential conflicts, to improve decisions, and to reduce paperwork and delay.

The state regulations governing the scoping process are contained in Section 197-11 of the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). This section, known as the “SEPA Rules,” implements the State Environmental Policy Act, Chapter 43.21C of the Revised Code of Washington. The specific requirements of the scoping process are defined in WAC 197-11-408, which the City of Bellevue has adopted by reference as part of its Environmental Procedures Code (Chapter 22.02 of the Bellevue Municipal Code). This section of the SEPA Rules is quoted below in its entirety:

**WAC 197-11-408 Scoping.** (1) The lead agency shall narrow the scope of every EIS to the probable significant adverse impacts and reasonable alternatives, including mitigation measures. For example, if there are only two or three significant impacts or alternatives, the EIS shall be focused on those.

(2) To ensure that every EIS is concise and addresses the significant environmental issues, the lead agency shall:

(a) Invite agency, affected tribes, and public comment on the DS (197-11-360). If the agency requires written comments, agencies, affected tribes, and the public shall be allowed twenty-one days from the date of issuance of the DS in which to comment, unless expanded scoping is used. The date of issuance for a DS is the date it is sent to the Department of Ecology and other agencies with jurisdiction, and is publicly available.

(b) Identify reasonable alternatives and probable significant adverse environmental impacts.

(c) Eliminate from detailed study those impacts that are not significant.

(d) Work with other agencies to identify and integrate environmental studies required for other governmental approvals with the EIS, where feasible.

(3) Agencies, affected tribes, and the public should comment promptly and as specifically as permitted by the details available on the proposal.

(4) Meetings or scoping documents, including notices that the scope has been revised, may be used but are not required. The lead agency shall integrate the scoping process with its existing planning and decisionmaking process in order to avoid duplication and delay.

(5) The lead agency shall revise the scope of an EIS if substantial changes are made later in the proposal, or if significant new circumstances or information arise that bear on the proposal and its significant impacts.
DEISs shall be prepared according to the scope decided upon by the lead agency in its scoping process.

The Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan Scoping Process
The City of Bellevue opened the scoping period on October 9, 2008, by mailing a Determination of Significance and scoping notice to the Washington State Department of Ecology and other potentially interested agencies. The City also published a notice of the Determination of Significance in the Weekly Permit Bulletin for the week of October 9, 2008, and posted the notice on the City’s project website. A copy of the scoping notice is attached. The scoping comment period was initially scheduled to close on October 30, 2008, but was extended to November 12, 2008.

A scoping meeting was held on October 29, 2008, from approximately 5:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. at Bellevue City Hall, 450 110th Avenue NE. An overview of the proposal was presented by City staff. The meeting was attended by an estimated 50 to 60 attendees, 30 of whom signed in, and many of whom provided oral comment. A Certified Court Reporter from the firm of Central Court Reporting recorded the meeting and provided a written transcript (included in this appendix). Project consultants from EDAW summarized comments by hand on a wall-mounted paper sheet.

In addition to comments recorded at the scoping meeting, approximately 40 letters, emails, and petitions were received throughout the scoping period. All are included in this appendix.

EIS Scope
The DS issued by the City on October 9, 2008, preliminarily identified a broad scope for this EIS, with areas of analysis to include the following: earth, water resources, plants and animals, noise, land use and housing, shorelines, aesthetics, light and glare, recreation, historic/cultural preservation, transportation, public services, and utilities. Although the primary purpose of scoping is to narrow the focus of an EIS, it was clear from the comments received that the public has concerns about many aspects of the proposal, touching upon all of the areas preliminarily identified for analysis by the DS. The number and breadth of comments received support retaining all areas that were initially identified for analysis in the EIS, plus one additional area – air quality.

Many of the comments received were very specific, requesting analysis of specific impacts or at a detailed level. However, this is a programmatic, or “nonproject” EIS, as described in WAC 197-11-442, and therefore evaluates impacts on most elements of the environment qualitatively. This type of EIS evaluates the impacts of adopting planning documents and other agency actions that do not involve construction-specific projects. While this EIS is not intended to document impacts at the project level, individual development projects necessary to implement the proposal may be required to undergo project-level environmental review prior to permitting, in which case more detailed environmental analysis would occur at that time.

This EIS evaluates impacts of a no-action and two action alternatives. This allows the evaluation of a range of impacts, which could vary in degree among the alternatives. The proposed alternative, once identified, could be any one of these alternatives or could be a combination of
components from two or more alternatives, and could have lesser impacts than the “worst case” impacts identified in this EIS. Many of the recommendations included in the scoping comments, while not specifically addressed, fall within the range of alternatives (from no-action to either of the action alternatives) evaluated and their impacts are therefore considered covered by the scope of this analysis.
GENERAL INFORMATION REGARDING USE OF OPTIONAL DNS PROCESS

When the SEPA field indicates a Determination of Nonsignificance (DNS) is expected, the optional DNS process is being used and a DNS is likely. This may be the only opportunity to comment on the environmental impacts of the proposal. The proposal may include mitigation measures under applicable codes and the project review process may incorporate or require mitigation measures regardless of whether an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is prepared. A copy of the subsequent Threshold Determination for the proposal may be obtained upon request. The Threshold Determination will also be noticed in a subsequent issue of this Weekly Permit Bulletin.

Applications

NOTICE OF APPLICATION
L. L. Peterson Piling Replacement
Location: 6220 Hazelwood Lane SE
Neighborhood: Newport
File Number: 08-128273-WB
Description: Application for a Shoreline Substantial Development permit to repair three pilings on the north side of the northern dock and installing a ground based boat lift under the northern two covered boat slips on Lake Washington.
Approvals Required: Land Use Approval, Shoreline Substantial Development Permit, Concurrency Determination and ancillary permits and approvals.
SEPA: Exempt
Minimum Comment Period Ends: November 10, 2008, 5 p.m. Refer to page one for information on how to comment on a project.
Date of Application: July 24, 2008
Completeness Date: August 21, 2008
Applicant Contact: L. L. Peterson, 425-746-8486
Planner Email: mcross@bellevuewa.gov
Planner: Mark Cross, 425-452-6938

Decisions

NOTICE OF DECISION
Bellevue Tower
Location: 200 106th Ave NE
Neighborhood: West Bellevue
File Number: 07-132105-LD

Description: Design Review approval with SEPA to construct a 19-story residential tower with 252 units, approximately 16,000 square feet of retail space, and 309 below grade structured parking stalls on approximately 0.91 acre in the DNTN-MU zone.
Decision: Approval with conditions
SEPA: Determination of Nonsignificance
Appeal Deadline Ends: October 23, 2008 5 p.m.
Concurrency Determination: Meets Requirements
Notice of Application Date: October 4, 2007
Date of Application: September 6, 2007
Completeness Date: September 28, 2007
Applicant: Darcy Garneau, Legacy Partners, 206-275-4060
Planner Email: kthiem@bellevuewa.gov
Planner: Ken Thiem, 425-452-2728

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE, SCOPING MEETING, AND REQUEST FOR PUBLIC COMMENT ON THE SCOPE OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan
Location: The project’s “primary study area” is generally bounded by 98th Place NE/Meydenbauer Beach Park on the west, NE 1st Street on the north, 101st Avenue SE on the east, and Meydenbauer Way SE and Meydenbauer Bay on the south. The primary study area includes approximately 10 acres of city-owned property, including the existing Meydenbauer Beach Park and the Bellevue Marina, in addition to privately-owned property. A larger “secondary study area” arcing around the perimeter of the primary study area has also been identified.
File Number: 08-133559-LE
Description: The proposal is to develop a long-range land use and park master plan for the study area. The basis for the proposal is embodied in the City of Bellevue Comprehensive Plan and Parks & Open Space System Plan 2003. Policies contained in these documents envision a graceful pedestrian connection from Downtown Park through Old Bellevue to Meydenbauer Bay; the recognition of Meydenbauer Bay’s historical significance in the region’s development; a visual and physical connection from Downtown Park to Meydenbauer Bay that provides unique recreation, retail, and tourism opportunities; increased waterfront access; and the provision of waterfront opportunities for future generations. The
ultimate goal expressed by the Comprehensive Plan and the Parks & Open Space System Plan 2003 is to connect the city-owned properties along Meydenbauer Bay to the Downtown area, creating a significant citywide park and waterfront destination. The City Council, on March 19, 2007, adopted planning principles to help guide the proposal, addressing these twelve topics: Remarkable and memorable shoreline experience; spectrum of activities; complementary land uses; increased physical and visual access; pedestrian priority; economic vitality; superior design; environmental stewardship; history; neighborhood enhancement and protection; coordinated planning process; and commitment to implement. The proposal is intended to achieve the goals and policies expressed in the Comprehensive Plan and Parks & Open Space Plan 2003 as well as the twelve planning principles.

The proposal includes the development of a master plan for a public park on the north shore of Meydenbauer Bay, incorporating the existing Meydenbauer Beach Park and additional city-owned property along Meydenbauer Bay, and a land use plan for nearby upland properties to improve visual and physical connections to the waterfront. Substantial opportunity for public comment is provided through Steering Committee meetings, meetings of the Planning Commission, Parks & Community Services Board, and City Council, and public workshops and open houses. Once the final recommendations resulting from the planning process are accepted by the City Council, implementation of these recommendations will begin, likely in late 2009. These implementing actions are expected to include amendments to the City’s comprehensive plan, sub area plans, and Land Use Code, and may include amendments to other City policy or regulatory documents.

EIS Required: The City of Bellevue (Lead Agency) has determined that this proposal is likely to have a probable significant environmental impact and an EIS is required.

Alternatives: A No Action Alternative will assume the continuation of existing zoning within the study area, existing boundaries and uses of Meydenbauer Beach Park, committed and planned transportation system changes (unrelated to this project), and adopted regional growth assumptions. The No Action Alternative will provide a baseline for comparison with up to four alternatives or sub-alternatives including varying assumptions of types, forms, locations, and intensities of program elements, and pedestrian and vehicle circulation.

Approvals Required: City Council Adoption
SEPA EIS Scoping and Comment Deadline Ends: October 30, 2008 at 5 p.m. Comments are invited on the scope of this Environmental Impact Statement pursuant to WAC 197-11-408. Comments on the scope of the

impacts to be analyzed may be submitted in writing through October 30, 2008 and should be addressed to the Lead Agency contact below. Agencies, affected tribes, and members of the public are invited to comment. Comments on the scoping of the EIS may address: reasonable alternatives; probably significant adverse impacts; mitigation measures; and impacts that are not significant and may not be eliminated from detailed study. Areas of analysis preliminarily identified by the Lead Agency include: impacts to earth, water resources, plants, animals, noise, land and shoreline use, housing, aesthetics, light and glare, recreation, historic/cultural preservation, transportation, public services, and utilities.

Public Meeting: Wednesday, October 29, 2008, 5:00-6:30 pm. Bellevue City Hall, 1E-108/113, 450 110th Avenue NE

Applicant Contact Email: mbergstrom@bellevuewa.gov
Applicant Contact: Michael Bergstrom, 425-452-6866 and Robin Cole, 425-452-6195
Lead Agency Email: mpaine@bellevuewa.gov
Lead Agency Contact: Michael Paine, 425-452-2739

NOTICE OF DECISION
ClearWire Mini Park
Location: 12843 SE 60th St.
Neighborhood: Newport
File Number: 07-103905-LA
Description: Administrative Conditional Use permit approval to install 3 panel antennas, 2 microwave antennas, and 3 amplifiers on an existing Puget Sound Energy utility pole. The proposal will increase the pole height from 51.2’ to 72.2’. Associated mechanical equipment will be located in an underground vault screened by landscaping.

Decision: Approval with conditions
SEPA: Determination of Nonsignificance
Appeal Deadline Ends: October 23, 2008 5 p.m.
Concurrence Determination: N/A
Date of Application: January 12, 2007
Completeness Date: February 21, 2007
Notice of Application Date: May 3, 2007
Applicant: Clearwire LLC
Applicant Contact: Craig Wilson, Parsons Inc., 206-218-6940
Planner Email: dfolsom@bellevuewa.gov
Planner: Drew Folsom, 425-452-4441
Bergstrom, Michael

From: Dale Ahrens [daleahrens@comcast.net]
Sent: Tuesday, November 11, 2008 5:11 PM
To: Bergstrom, Michael
Subject: Meydenbauer Bay EIS Scoping Comments

Mike,

I am a current tenant in the marina. In reviewing the design alternatives presented to date one thing appears clear, there seems to be a predetermined effort to eliminate as much of the existing marina as possible. Why is that? I am supportive of the marina remaining "as is" and if anything, INCREASING the number of slips available. I understand there is a requirement to add 14 transient slips which is fine, but why tear out a valuable existing resource? Add the transient moorage and leave the existing marina intact. There is a real shortage of available slips on the lake, particularly larger slips like the one I lease. If you don't like the covered moorage aesthetics, remove the roof, but don't tear out the slips!

There are revenue bonds that were issued to purchase the marina in the first place. These are being paid for through 2018 by the lease payments these slips generate. It would be a shameful waste of money in these difficult times to destroy this valuable resource that is paying for itself. What has to be cut out of the city budget to do this? What a colossal waste of money!

It also appears to me that parking is a complete afterthought in all of this. We need more parking for loading/unloading at the marina along with available parking in order to take your boat out or go to the park.

I hope the city rethinks it's priorities and recognizes the marina for the self-funding, valuable resource that it is. Please don't destroy it!

Thank you,

Dale Ahrens

11/12/2008
October 29, 2008

TO: Meydenbauer Bay Marina Park Consultants, Staff, etc.

FROM: Sandra Boyd, Ten Thousand Meydenbauer Way SE, Bellevue

RE: Environmental Review

The city and its consultants must show what the impact is and how to mitigate those impacts for the following:

1. The closure of Bellevue Place/100th Avenue SE

2. Turning Meydenbauer Way & 100th into a one-way road

3. Traffic control at 101st SE at Main Street
   a. No action
   b. 3-way stop signs
   c. Caution light
   d. Stop light

4. Transient moorage
   a. Number of slips
      1. Maximum number
      2. Minimum number
   b. Location

5. Public Pier

6. Commercial Aspects
   a. Impacts on residential feel to area
      1. Retail
      2. Restaurants
      3. Recreation
   b. No commercial

Thank you for your consideration.
Meydenbauer Bay
Park and Land Use Plan

EIS Scoping Comment Form

Name: Robert Buckley
Address: 9901 Lake Washington Blvd, Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:
Alternative 2 Element Number 08 Restroom

Relocate next to Element Number 05 Play Area. Current location is too far from play area. Also, Element 18 Whaling Building has restrooms which is close to the current proposed location for 08
Meydenbauer Bay
Park and Land Use Plan

EIS Scoping Comment Form

Name: Robert Buckley
Address: 9901 Lake Washington Blvd, Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:
   Alternative 1 Element Number 12 Restroom

Relocate next to Element Number 12 to an area north of Element 19 Swim Beach. Current location of the restroom is to far from Element 19 and Element 09 Picnic Area. Also, Element 17 Whaling Building has restrooms which is close to the current proposed location for Element 12
EIS Scoping Comment Form

Name: Robert Buckley
Address: 9901 Lake Washington Blvd, Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:
Alternative 1 Element Number 16 Parking Garage

Relocate and combine with Element Number 06 View Terrace with entrance and exit directly onto Lake Washington Blvd. The relocation would improve parking for Element 10, Education Center. Using 99th increases risks as the street is extremely steep and the intersection with Lake Washington Blvd can be dangerous due to poor visibility.
Meydenbauer Bay
Park and Land Use Plan

EIS Scoping Comment Form

Name: Robert Buckley
Address: 9901 Lake Washington Blvd, Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:
Alternative 2 Element Number 04 Parking Garage

Relocate and combine with Element Number 24 View Terrace with entrance and exit directly onto Lake Washington Blvd. Using 99th increases risks as the street is extremely steep and the intersection with Lake Washington Blvd can be dangerous due to poor visibility.
Meydenbauer Bay
Park and Land Use Plan

EIS Scoping Comment Form

Name: Robert Buckley
Address: 9901 Lake Washington Blvd, Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:
Alternative 2 Element Number 04 Retreat Center

Opposed to a retreat center, other large structures or any commercial activity.
Meydenbauer Bay
Park and Land Use Plan

EIS Scoping Comment Form

Name: Robert Buckley
Address: 9901 Lake Washington Blvd, Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:
Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 Future 99th Street

Relocate the entrance to 99th street, from Lake Washington Blvd, west and retain current on street angle parking as zone permit parking.
Meydenbauer Bay
Park and Land Use Plan

EIS Scoping Comment Form

Name: Robert Buckley
Address: 9901 Lake Washington Blvd, Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:
Alternative 1 (Element 22) and Alternative 2 Element 27) Enhanced Streetscape

From 100th west to the end of the park project, remove as much of the overhead utilities as possible and bury them underground. This will open up the views and improve the appearance of the park.
Meydenbauer Bay
Park and Land Use Plan

EIS Scoping Comment Form

Name: Robert Buckley
Address: 9901 Lake Washington Blvd, Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:
  Alternative 1 Element 01, Fully day-lighted stream, Element 02, Ravine, and
  Element 04 Relocated wetland.

Only partially day-light stream and save existing parking. Retain existing restroom and
retain existing public pier. Wetlands can be directed a little east to accommodate
retaining these existing features.
Meydenbauer Bay
Park and Land Use Plan

EIS Scoping Comment Form

Name: Robert Buckley
Address: 9901 Lake Washington Blvd, Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:
Alternative 2 Element 01, Partially day-lighted stream
Retain existing restroom.
Bergstrom, Michael

From: Linda & Paul Burg [studio_lb@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2008 9:04 AM
To: Degginger, Grant; Balducci, Claudia; Chelminiak, John; Noble, Phil; Davidson, Don; Lee, Conrad; Bonincontri, Patsy; Sarkozy, Steve; Terry, Matthew; Foran, Patrick; Bergstrom, Michael; Cole, Robin; Brennan, Mike; Paine, Michael; 'Doug Leigh'; 'Iris Tocher'

Subject: Meydenbauer Bay SEPA Notice and 10/29 scoping meeting

Dear Michael Paine,

This letter is addressed to Michael Paine as the Lead Agency Contact as specified by the SEPA Notice. It is also being sent by the October 30th date for responses on that notice. I was unable to attend the October 29th meeting as I was at work during that time.

I reside in a house across Meydenbauer Bay from the proposed development of Meydenbauer Park. We live on the south shore of that bay and so we are very familiar with the changes in the bay and the effect on our portion of the bay and it's shoreline. It is this concern that I wish to address. I am someone who sees the south shoreline on a regular basis and has for the past 10 years, in all seasons.

First is that there are no tidal changes in Meydenbauer Bay. Wind enters the bay from the west and pushes everything to the north side of the back of the bay. Then whatever constitutes everything, drifts into the calm water on the south shore and settles. What ever the city decides to do with Meydenbauer Park will have all it's debris and disturbance settling on the south shoreline. This fact is evident by the amount of trash we pull from the waterfront in front of our house during the summer. It is also evident by the amount of silt that has built up on that shoreline. The silt just 15 feet off the shoreline is approximately 4+ feet deep and that is just 3 feet below the waters surface. This has been built up from years of this lack of circulation and settling of wind swept water into the bay. About 5 years ago, the lily pads, in the shallow mud flats at the back of the bay, were cut back. This let loose roots free in the bay. These roots settled on the south shoreline and have now established themselves making it impossible to go from the shoreline, out into the water to take a swim. Additionally this action has now infested the south shoreline so bad that during the summer months the lilies are so thick that there is no sunlight entering the water which is something that is potentially detrimental to the aquatic life that tries to live in the waters of Lake Washington and in Meydenbauer Bay.

By incorporating changes to the park's waterfront and by tearing out the new marina, the city just built, for a yet newer version of it, there will be adverse effects to the very protected and vulnerable environment of Meydenbauer Bay. This is home to Osprey, Geese, variety of Ducks, Catfish, Salmon, Eagles, Hawks, Lake Snails, Turtles, Beavers, Muskrats, Other fish, Swallows, Herons, Mud Hens, and numerous birds to name some of the animals that rely on the stability of the bay's ecosystem for their existence. Eagles and hawks fish each day during the summer, how will the added traffic effect their existence. The Ducks and Geese feed off the grass in the bay, how will that change when excess people feed them Cheetos?

I have just mentioned the immediate yet long term effect of the purposed construction. I did not mention the effect of the added people you intend to draw to the park. I am sorry but people bring trash and disruption. Trash often gets away from the most conscience person, no to
mention all the people who will just litter because it is easier and they don't care. The things we fish out of the lake on any summer day are generally enough to fill a five gallon pail by the end of the week and this is just in front of my house, 50 feet of shoreline. Meydenbauer Bay is a CLOSED IN bay where everything from the entrance and back is pushed to the back of the bay and then it settles into the mud along the east and southeast shoreline. This is not and exposed area like Kirkland or Renton's waterfront. On those break waters the trash goes into Lake Washington, Mile wide and miles long and well over a hundred feet deep. In Meydenbauer Bay the same trash will end up in a lagoon, couple hundred feet wide, couple thousand feel long and typically less than 30 feet deep. The size difference is a factor in excess of a hundred times. It is merely a small lagoon where you want to create activity in excess of what it's ecosystem can handle. Everything you choose to do at the waterfront and into the water will greatly change the water and shoreline across the bay from your endeavors.

Too often we make choices that later have an effect that we didn't see in the months we did our evaluation. Well you have a whole shoreline of residence who can tell you from experiences what you can reasonably expect from your purposed changes.

I have mud at least 4 feet deep. the mud starts just a couple feet below the water surface. If you rent canoes, and someone gets out to try to swim in these areas they can easily get their feet caught in the mud and be unable to get out without assistance. If they were careless they could get stuck with their below water and drown. That could be someone swimming down and then thinking they can push off the bottom, but gets their legs stuck in the mud. This would be a law suit the city and a family would not soon forget.

I can not stress enough that Meydenbauer Bay is a small closed in body of water that can not take too much stress. Have people come down like they do to the city park. Keep buffers to keep the people away from the sensitive water that you can not clean up at night with a crew. Keep it sparse, this limits the ill effect visitors can invoke. No food concessions, no boat rentals, no game type activities. You can not clean the damage and pollution you allow into the lake. You though this through with the city park by having burms that keep people from dirtying up the water features. You still have necessary filters and necessary cleaning program for that water which you can not do for the bay.

Please consider these things. They come from one person's monitoring of the bay for 10 years, which is probably more days than all your designers or your consultants have been at the waters edge combined, and I am just one shoreline resident.

The bay is sensitive and is a small enclosed area with a very sensitive ecosystem. The city is planning a major intrusion on that closed ecosystem and there will be adverse effects both from the short term development and the long term increase in people and the adverse effects they bring with them.

Make a path to the waterfront from the city park, improve the surrounding areas, but don't create a destination location to attract masses within the bay. It is too small and sheltered for the ecosystem to absorb the excessive intrusion.

Paul Burg
9624 SE Shoreland Drive
Bellevue, WA 98004

10/30/2008
October 29, 2008

Michael Paine
City of Bellevue
mpaine@bellevuewa.gov

RE: Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan 08-133559-LE (Ecology #08-7597)

Dear Mr. Paine:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Scoping Notice for the Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan as proposed by the City of Bellevue. The Department of Ecology (Ecology) reviewed the environmental checklist and has the following comment(s):

Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program:
Dave Radabaugh, Shoreline Planner 425/649-4260

Ecology notes that portions of the planning and eventual plan implementation for the Meydenbauer Bay Park are within shoreline jurisdiction. The City of Bellevue is presently engaged in planning for Meydenbauer Bay Park as well as updating its shoreline master program. It would be advisable that coordination occur between the two planning efforts in order to minimize the potential for inconsistencies between the two plans.

Ecology’s comments are based upon information provided by the lead agency. As such, they do not constitute an exhaustive list of the various authorizations that must be obtained or legal requirements that must be fulfilled in order to carry out the proposed action.

If you have any questions or would like to respond to these comments please contact the appropriate reviewing staff listed above.

Greta Stough
SEPA Coordinator
Department of Ecology
Northwest Regional Office
(425) 649-7131

(S#: 08-7597)

CC: Dave Radabaugh, SEA
October 29, 2008

Honorable Mayor Grant Degginger
sdeppinger@bellevuewa.gov
450 110th Ave NE
PO Box 9012
Bellevue Wa, 98009-9012

CC: Michael Brennan MBrennan@bellevuewa.gov
    Michael Paine MPaine@bellevuewa.gov
    Michael Bergstrom MBERGSTROM@bellevuewa.gov

City Council Members
Claudia Balducci CBalducci@bellevuewa.gov
John Cheminiak JCheminiak@bellevuewa.gov
Phil Noble PNoble@bellevuewa.gov
Don Davidson DDavison@bellevuewa.gov
Conrad Lee Clee@bellevuewa.gov
Patsy Bonincontri PBonincontri@bellevuewa.gov

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement for the Meydenbauer Park and Land Use Plan

Dear Mayor Degginger:

My husband and I are most pleased that you will be doing the Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Park on Meydenbauer Bay and Land Use Plan. I would like to go on record with my concerns as a neighbor who has lived on the Bay since 1974. The following are my concerns after following many steering committee meetings and plans for the Park.

1. The water level of the Lake was lowered in 1914, creating a “bowl” in the area we now call Meydenbauer Bay. This unique eco system creates the potential for a perfect Park but not R-60 development or transient moorage. The “Bowl” is a wonderful conductor of noise. We hear the birds, the wind, and wonderful natural sounds. It also conducts boat noise to a level that is unbearable if a newer type engine is in use.

   I am also worried about the pervious parking area in the new Park mentioned in the last plan. This could really add to the noise level. Consider the use of a quiet plan that includes large grassy areas, trees, kayaks, and boats. Restricting incoming and outgoing traffic and fast boats is a must for noise level control. Keep 100th open, with the traffic diverted from the Bay. Create more parking in the lots that exist at the Downtown Park and please restrict party people in noisy boats who are typical transient moorage users.

   After listening to several of the Steering committee meetings it is obvious that there is no understanding of the Meydenbauer Bay environment by the people planning the Park. We have lived on the Bay for years and are very aware of the unique problems that exist for development of any kind, whether referred to as a “Park” or not.

2. This unique structure of the Bay is a waterfront “dead end”, for want of better words. The Bay stops at SE 101st, where the Yacht Club and the Bayshore Condominiums are located, plus 101 Meydenbauer and several houses. There is also a salmon spawning stream in this location. Through the years, silt has been building up in this area, snothering the salmon spawning stream and suffocating the Bay. This silt comes from construction on the Bay and upland a few blocks. This must be controlled when the Park is constructed. Debris thrown into the lake accumulates in this “dead end” from boats and the existing parks. This debris must be controlled.

3. Eagles, Osprey, Sharpshin Hawks, Kingfishers, Great Blue Herons, Peregrine Falcons, several duck species, Otters, Beavers, Muskrats, Turtles, and many more all call this Bay home. We have seen all of these species. Even two coyotes. The City has allowed the drains from car washes, construction sites, oil changes, and street run off to pollute our Bay. This would be an excellent time to bring the Bay back with a storm Water run-off treatment facility.

   Let this new Park be a place that teaches children about their environment and makes a statement to everyone that Bellevue is progressive in environmental issues. I have lived in Bellevue since 1952. I learned how to swim in this lake when it was polluted. Lake Washington was held up as a wonderful example of a City that learned how to clean up its waters, through the implementation of a sewer system. This Park should be a fine example of clean water management, noise management, and habitat protection of our unique estuary by the City of Bellevue.

Respectfully,
Rondi Egenes Holm
We welcome the idea of having a Meydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park that all Bellevue residents and visitors can enjoy. We live nearby at Bayshore East Condominiums and enjoy walking in this area. This park could be a daily destination point for us, and even for our visitors. The vision that the City Council and Parks Department have in planning such a park is highly commendable. We are grateful that we can participate in the planning sessions of the City's Steering Committee and that we can contribute our ideas and concerns since the nearby location of the park will impact our every day quality of life.

Our major concerns are:

- Transportation – Main St. is currently severely congested during commuter rush hours and when residents drive to their shopping or errand destinations. We would like to see a comprehensive transportation plan that would assess both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion along Main Street that would address current conditions and future conditions with the addition of the Park. Along with this idea, we oppose the closure of 100th/SE Bellevue Place.

- We do not support the loss of permanent moorage at Bellevue Marina. Going from 87 permanent moorage slips down to 18-58 slips will displace 29 to 69 boats. Safe boating in the Bay should be encouraged. Preserving space for the Meydenbauer Yacht Club's program for young sailors each year is important. Transient boaters often create a disruptive, unsafe environment for families.

- We do not support commercial/retail development in the park or in the residential areas near the park. Because of our amphitheater-like location, these types of development could create noise that would be bounced around the Bay and destroy our tranquility.

- Parking – Parking spaces currently used by residents should be maintained and parking for park users should be created without increased traffic flow to the currently clogged Main St.

- We support a limited number of new low profile structures built in the Park.

- Water quality – The water quality of the Bay needs to be addressed. The build-up of silt has long been a problem. Noxious weeds such as milfoil, water lilies, purple loosestrife, and yellow iris need to be contained. Private money has been spent to treat these noxious weeds, whereas public funds should be used to treat the entire Bay. Meydenbauer Creek, which flows into the Bay from our shoreline, and many aged storm drains empty into the Bay causing pollution of the water. The current conceptual plans for the park address only a small number of the streams and drains that flow into the Bay and should address all of these in order to improve the water quality of the whole Bay.

- Pollution - During periods of heavy rain, water gushes through this creek looking like a mini-Snoqualmie Falls. During periods of no rainfall, the water along the shore becomes stagnant. Prevailing winds flow directly at our buildings so any garbage or diesel spills get trapped along our shoreline.

The new Waterfront Park should be designed to allow Bellevue residents and visitors to visit and escape the busy hustle and bustle of daily life and connect with nature. A low profile display of the historical value of Meydenbauer Bay would be enriching to everyone.

Signed: Carol Elson

Address: 347 - 101st Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98004

Don't Carillon Meydenbauer Bay
Please keep it as natural as possible so the birds, waterfowl and animals that call it home are not evicted.
From: Pat Flug [mailto:paflug@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, October 23, 2008 11:05 AM
To: Anita Skoog
Subject: Meydenbauer Bay

October 21 2008

To whom this may concern,

Last evening I attended a meeting of concerned citizens having to do with possible changes in the use of Meydenbauer Bay and its environs. I am a resident of Medina with no say in matters concerning Bellevue. I am, however, a tax paying member of the Meydenbauer community and feel the right to share with you my observations concerning future development in the area. It is, after all, my neighborhood as well.

During my many years on this earth I have lived in several waterfront communities around the country; some that celebrated their location, some that did not. Bellevue, from its inception, seems to have been a town which undervalued the need for the business community to have a waterfront presence. In that light, major commercial development was undertaken a distance upland of Meydenbauer Bay. That development could have reasonably started in other areas on Lake Washington or perhaps on Lake Sammamish. It did not.

Fortunately, in the course of private development of the Meydenbauer waterfront, there were two thoughtful and beautiful parks established for the enjoyment of the local citizenry. For many years these parks have been cherished neighbors with little to no impact on either our little eco system or the peace and tranquility of the contiguous neighbors.

There was historical precedent for establishing moorage and as a result many Bellevue citizens happily avail themselves of the small number of public slips or membership in the yacht club allowed in our little bay.

Fast forward to last night: Many of the speakers at the gathering fear the behemoth that has become ‘The City of Bellevue’ has suddenly awakened to a need for a commercial presence on the waterfront. May I submit to you: That boat has sailed.

Meydenbauer Bay, while being the closest body of water to the commercial core, is not an appropriate target. It’s entirely too small for a commercial presence. It’s barely a pond. Apparently there are those who dream of an “iconic” structure. It’s possible for such a structure to become known as ‘The Bellevue Folly’.

There is nothing, of a commercial nature, that Bellevue could accomplish in Meydenbauer Bay that wouldn’t be a sad waste of taxpayer dollars. No amount of additional parking or suggested activities or entertainment or boutique hotels or trendy eateries will alter the fact that Bellevue is too large, Meydenbauer is too small, and the time for Bellevue having a commercial waterfront, has passed. There seems no justification for such an undertaking. The tragedy of even a modest portion of such a scheme would be the loss to the local community.

In this the era of thinking green, let us proceed with a more realistic and reasonable ideal. Let’s clean up the bay, extend the parks, leave the dedicated streets and moorage as they are, accept our lot as a missed opportunity and move on.

Sincerely, Patricia Flug

My mailing address is PO Box 596 Medina, WA 98039.
I live in Medina at 322 Overlake Drive East.
From: Madelaine Georgette [studiogeorgette@mac.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2008 2:22 PM
To: Degginger, Grant; Bergstrom, Michael; mpaine@belle vue.gov; Cole, Robin
Subject: EIS scoping for Meydenbauer Waterfront Park

Dear Ms. Cole, Mr. Bergstrom and Mr. Paine:

The following questions and comments related to the EIS for the Meydenbauer Waterfront Park:

1. While I applaud the City's decision to do a full EIS rather than a SEPA checklist on this project, I would like to know how this decision was arrived at? Who made this decision? What was it based on, i.e. what inputs did you have?

2. How do you reconcile instructing the Steering Committee at their September meeting that were to be thinking about this decision which they were to make at their next meeting October 30th and then have the City make the decision? What does this say about your process? What does this say regarding your credibility with the public with respect to statements we hear and contradictory actions that are taken by the City?

3. Formerly I worked for a variety of local cities and King County as a public involvement facilitator and have been responsible for numerous EIS scoping meetings. In order to truly serve the public interest and to make the public involvement process meaningful, it was general acceptable practice to hold the Scoping meeting on a proposed project at least ten days to two weeks prior to the final deadline for comments. The scoping meeting was to inform the public of the project's final alternatives and the EIS process and how the public could participate in the scoping process.

Personally, I'm not only extremely disappointed but outraged that the City is holding this meeting tonight, 24 hours before final comments are due. How do you expect the public to digest the final alternatives as well as the scoping/EIS information and to respond in 24 hours?

Is this really serving the public or are you just following the law, but it's all for appearances and ends up manipulating the public into believing they have opportunities for input, but that in reality, these opportunities are actually very difficult to exercise in a meaningful way? You really have subverted the intent of the law even though you have conformed to it's requirements. Is this how the City of Bellevue wishes to be perceived?

By handling the process this way, what does this say about your genuine intentions and credibility? How do you expect to 'work with the public' when your process, in reality, only confuses and irritates the public and actually limits public input rather than allowing for a reasonable time frame in which to respond?

Please don't address these questions by telling me the information was on the website; this may fulfill your legal requirements, but let's face it most people don't follow these types of projects on-line. Please address who designed the public involvement program and explain why you have implemented it in such a way as to minimize opportunities for public input? Who is responsible for doing this?

Sincerely,

Madelaine Georgette
EIS SCOPING COMMENT FORM (optional)

You may use this form to write down your comments/suggestions regarding the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement to be prepared for this project. Drop your completed form in the box by the entry prior to leaving tonight’s meeting, or drop off at the Service First desk, 1st floor City Hall, by 5:00 pm Thursday, October 30, 2008, c/o Michael Paine, SEPA Responsible Official, Development Services Department.

Your name: A. Scott Gilson

Your full address: 9340 Shoreland Dr SE
Bellevue WA 98004

Comments:

1) Condition of Meydenbauer Bay
   - Sediment and weeds in the bay need to be removed

2) No commercial use of proposed park
   - Increase in noise levels
   - Increase in pollution

3) No transient boat use of proposed park
   - Increase in noise levels
   - Increase in pollution

4) Keep 100th open for reseeding and access

continued on back

[Signature]
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EIS SCOPING COMMENT FORM (optional)

You may use this form to write down your comments/suggestions regarding the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement to be prepared for this project. Drop your completed form in the box by the entry prior to leaving tonight’s meeting, or drop off at the Service First desk, 1st floor City Hall, by 5:00 pm Thursday, October 30, 2008, c/o Michael Paine, SEPA Responsible Official, Development Services Department.

Your name: Susan Gilson

Your full address: 9340 S.E. Shoreland Dr.
                  Bellevue, WA 98004

Comments:

1. My highest EIS priority is the quality of the water in the bay & the danger of silt & weeds that will choke the beauty of the bay.
2. Keep 100th open.
3. Do not increase density allowed in structures.
4. Consider before it is too late the ramifications of traffic, congestion, noise. As population grows, residents need a tranquil setting to enjoy. Downtown Bellevue has lost that - our only hope is to keep the bay as a balance to the hubbub in the city.

continued on back
EIS SCOPING COMMENT FORM (optional)

You may use this form to write down your comments/suggestions regarding the scope of the Environmental Impact Statement to be prepared for this project. Drop your completed form in the box by the entry prior to leaving tonight’s meeting, or drop off at the Service First desk, 1st floor City Hall, by 5:00 pm Thursday, October 30, 2008, c/o Michael Paine, SEPA Responsible Official, Development Services Department.

Your name: Peter Marshall
Your full address: 3030 109th Ave. SE
Beltline, WA 98004

Comments: The EIS should definitely address the visual and recreational as well as habitat impacts of the public dock/transient moorage structure in Alt. 1. Also these impacts should be addressed for retaining the marine facilities over the water in both Alternatives 1 and 2. (A reasonable alternative is to phase out those marine moorage facilities to leave the water view from the shoreline completely open).
Bayshore East Condominiums, which was established in 1973, has forty owners. Our location is quite unique. Our property is made up of four 3-story buildings, built around the very end or bottom tip of Meydenbauer Bay, an outdoor swimming pool, a cabana, a little bridge over Meydenbauer Creek and an extensive lawn area along the shoreline. This area along the shore is just above the water level of Lake Washington, and the ground gradually gets higher as it reaches the street level. As we look out toward the Bay, the land elevation rises steeply to the left along Shoreland Drive and to the right along Lake Washington Blvd., giving us an amphitheater-type view. Sitting on our decks or patios, we enjoy views of the Bay, watch the osprey, herons, eagles and kingfishers hunt and listen to the songs of the red-winged blackbirds. Each season brings numerous waterfowl to the Bay, such as gadwalls, mergansers, wood ducks, buffle heads, and of course, coots, mallards and Canadian geese. Turtles enjoy the shoreline, even the parking lot. In the evenings we enjoy the silence of the Bay.

We welcome the idea of having Meydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park nearby that all Bellevue residents and visitors can enjoy. We enjoy walking in the area and this park could be a daily destination point for our visitors and us. The vision that the City Council and Parks Department have in planning such a park is highly commendable. We are grateful that we can participate in the planning sessions of the City's Steering Committee and that we can contribute our ideas and concerns since the nearby location of the park will impact our every day quality of life.

Our major concerns are:

- **Transportation** – Main St. is currently severely congested during commuter rush hours and when residents drive to their shopping or errand destinations. We would like to see a comprehensive transportation plan that would assess both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion along Main Street that would address current conditions and future conditions with the addition of the Park. Changing the traffic lights to include a four-way pedestrian only crossing would streamline foot traffic. We strongly oppose the closure of 100th/SE Bellevue Place. We call this our "escape route" to get into or across Main Street. Instead of using 100th/SE Bellevue Place for a pedestrian plaza, it would be better to leave this street open to one-way vehicular traffic AND to tear down the apartment complex the City recently purchased to create a gorgeous vista of the Bay. It could also be the pedestrian
plaza that was in the conceptual plans, have no tall trees, only low shrubs and grass…
a viewpoint from the street inviting people to walk down to the water and enjoy the
peaceful nature of Meydenbauer Bay.

- We do not support the loss of **permanent moorage** at Bellevue Marina. Going
  from 87 permanent moorage slips down to 18-58 slips will displace 29 to 69 boats.
  This is almost as nasty as displacing people from their homes since boaters often
  live on their boats during a voyage. **Safe** boating in the Bay should be encouraged.
  Preserving space for the Meydenbauer Yacht Club's program for young sailors
  each year is important for future boaters to learn water safety and protection of the
  environment.

- We do not support **commercial/retail development** in the park or in the
  residential areas surrounding the park. Because of our amphitheater-like location,
  these types of development could create noise that is bounced around the Bay,
  destroy our tranquility and add to the pollution along our shoreline. If people want
  to shop or eat, there are many shops and cafes already along Main St. competing
  with Bellevue Square, the Bellevue Collection, and the other shops and restaurants
  along Bellevue Way. All of the new buildings under construction in the downtown
  area also include office, retail and residential plans and would add to the growing
  list of shops and restaurants within walking distance. So there would be no reason
  to expand the shopping and eating areas; after people do their shopping and eating
  in the upland area, they can walk to the Waterfront Park to rest, meditate, and
  enjoy the water view.

- **Parking** – Parking spaces currently used by residents should be maintained and
  parking for park users created without increased traffic flow to the currently
  clogged Main St.

- We support one or **no new** low-profile structures to be built in the Park.

- **Water quality** – The water quality of the **whole** Bay needs to be addressed. The
  build-up of silt has long been a problem. Noxious weeds such as milfoil, water
  lilies, purple loosestrife, and yellow iris need to be contained. Private money has
  been spent to treat these noxious weeds, whereas public funds should be used to
  treat the entire Bay. Meydenbauer Creek, which flows into the Bay from our
  shoreline, and many aged storm drains empty into the Bay causing pollution of the
  water. The current conceptual plans for the park address only a small number of
  the streams and drains that flow into the Bay (those on City owned property only)
  and should address all of these in order to improve the water quality of the whole
  Bay.

- **Animals** – We do not support a lot of noisy activity in the park. This will
discourage the eagles, osprey, herons, kingfishers, many types of ducks, otter, etc.
from visiting the Bay. Isn't the viewing of these animals one of the main reasons
for creating access to the waterfront?

- **Pollution** - During periods of heavy rain, water gushes through this creek looking
  like a mini-Snoqualmie Falls. During periods of low to no rainfall, the water along
  the shore becomes stagnant. Prevailing winds flow directly at our buildings so any
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garbage or diesel spills get trapped along our shoreline.

- During the early planning stages of the park, documents from the July 2007 Open House show a **public pedestrian path** or connector trail that went through private property. We do not support a public path through our property. What has happened to this idea?

The new Waterfront Park should be designed to allow Bellevue residents and visitors to share the same tranquil quality of life that we, at Bayshore East, and our neighbors along Shoreland Drive and Lake Washington Blvd. enjoy. A low profile display of the historical value of Meydenbauer Bay would be enriching to everyone. In summary, I quote words from the Sept. 18th meeting of the Steering Committee: ["Bellevue's Meydenbauer Bay Park should be a waterfront oasis for all citizens"] so visitors to the park could escape the busy hustle and bustle of daily life and connect with nature.

Thank you.

Betty Mastropaolo
341 101st Ave SE
Bellevue, WA 98004
October 15, 2008

Honorable Mayor Grant Degginger  
gdegginger@bellevuewa.gov  
450 110th Ave. NE  
PO Box 90012  
Bellevue WA, 98009-9012

CC:  Michael Brennan  MBrennan@bellevuewa.gov  
Michael Paine  MPaine@bellevuewa.gov  
Michael Bergstrom  MBergstrom@bellevuewa.gov

City Council Members  
Claudia Balducci  Cbalducci@bellevuewa.gov  
John Chelminiak  JChelminiak@bellevuewa.gov  
Phil Noble  PNoble@bellevuewa.gov  
Don Davidson  DDavidson@bellevuewa.gov  
Conrad Lee  CLee@bellevuewa.gov  
Patsy Bonincontri  PBonincontri@bellevuewa.gov

Subject: **Scope of Environmental Impact Statement – Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan**

Dear Mayor Degginger:

We are pleased to see that the City has decided to do an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed Meydenbauer Waterfront Park expansion and Land Use Plan. We know that the environmental review process provides for a full and thorough analysis of issues of concern to citizens regarding the proposed project. The Meydenbauer Bay Neighbors Association would like to submit this list of issues and questions -- which we believe must be addressed by the City and their consultants -- regarding the potential impacts of the Meydenauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan to Meydenbauer Bay and other surrounding communities and that need to be included within the scope of the EIS.

Please note that this letter contains questions pertaining to the three proposed alternatives (as currently provided to the public) and we trust that each question will be addressed under the analysis of each individual alternative. We may follow up with some additional questions related to each specific alternatives following the **October 29th and 30th meetings**.

**Definitional items.** When using the following terms in this letter:

**“Adjacent Properties”** shall refer to all properties inside the Primary Study Area (including without limitation, The Astoria, The Seasons/Amli, Bayside Place, The Vue, Ten Thousand...
Meydenbauer, The Meydenbauer Apartments, Whalers Cove Condominium, Bay View Village, Blvd. 99, Meydenbauer Bay Terrace, The Tantallion, The Oasis, Lochleven, Bauer Crest, One on Main, The Meydenbauer Building, The Heller Building and all City-owned residences (apartments and single family homes) within the Primary Study Area); and those properties directly adjacent to the Project (including The Meydenbauer Bay Yacht Club, 101 Meydenbauer, Bayshore East, Meydenbauer Bay Condominiums, Klahanie Apartments, and all single-family houses directly bordering the Park).

“Bay” shall refer to Meydenbauer Bay, including the cove identified by the USGS as Whalers Cove.

“Marina” shall refer to the existing Bellevue Marina and the proposed waterside areas of the Project that are to be used for marine activities of any type.

“Park” shall refer to the existing Meydenbauer Beach Park and the proposed park-like areas of the Project.

“Primary Study Area”, “Secondary Study Area” and “Uplands” shall refer to the areas specified by the City. We may also refer to the Primary and Secondary Study Areas, collectively, as the “Study Areas.”

“Project” shall refer to the Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan;

“Surrounding Properties” shall refer to properties both inside and outside the Study Areas, including, without limitation, Old Bellevue and all properties in the Uplands, on the shores of Meydenbauer Bay and in the communities South, West, East and North of Meydenbauer Bay.

If no specific reference is made, the applicable concern should be deemed to refer to the Study Areas and the Bay, collectively.

A. LAND USE

1. What is the current and proposed zoning inside the Study Areas? Please specify exact boundaries of any proposed zone changes and proposed commercial locations (office, retail and mixed use)

2. How many people currently, and at the completion of the Project are expected to, use, live and work in the Study Areas, considering any potential rezoning and incentives proposed to be provided by the City to developers of properties inside the Study Areas?

3. What homes, apartments and condominiums inside the Primary Study Area are to be removed, demolished or converted to non-residency use (such as the City-owned residences (apartments and single family homes) and Bayvue Village Apartments)? And when will this occur?

4. How many citizens have been and will be displaced by the removal, demolition, conversion or redevelopment of residences in the Primary Study Area for or in connection with the full
build-out of the Project, including through rezoning and incentives provided by the City to developers? When will these citizens be removed from their homes, and under what processes? What accommodation is being made to relocate these citizens? What requirements will be placed on builders and developers and apartment owners to assist in the relocation of these citizens?

5. How many low-to-medium-income housing units (including those used by senior citizens on fixed incomes) have been and will be eliminated by the full build-out of the Project, including through rezoning and incentives to developers? When will these units be eliminated? What accommodation is being made to build equivalent and replacement housing units in Bellevue? What requirements will be placed on builders, developers and apartment owners to provide the same number of equivalent and replacement housing units?

6. What other structures inside the Study Areas and in the Bay are to be removed or demolished and when?

7. Which structures will remain in the Study Areas and are any of them to be relocated within the Study Areas?

8. What new structures are proposed for the Park?

9. What new structures are proposed and likely in the Primary Study area due to the full build-out of the Project?

10. How many docks will be removed from the Bay?

11. How many new docks will be added, and for what purpose?

12. What is the current number of permanent and transient public, private and government (City, County, State, Federal) moorage slips at the Marina and Park? What will be the final number of permanent and transient public and government (City, County, State, Federal) moorage slips in the Project?

13. How many boats will be displaced by the permanent removal of any docks in the Bay?

14. What is the plan for the temporary removal and relocation of boats due to any dock reconstruction and/or reconfiguration?

15. What is the plan for the permanent removal and relocation of boats due to any dock removal?

16. Is any commercial boating use planned or intended in the Park or otherwise by the Project?

17. Please provide specific configurations for the final dock configurations (including any new docks and any existing docks being retained or modified).
18. Please demonstrate the compatibility of the proposed Park with the anticipated development of the Uplands.

B.  AESTHETICS

1. What is the maximum height and square footage of any proposed new structures inside the Park?

2. What is the maximum height and lot coverage of any potential new structures allowed by the Project?

3. What views will be impacted by the proposed and potential structures identified in #1 and #2 and/or by the relocation of existing structures (i.e. viewing platforms, elevated access structures, additional docks, boardwalks, storage facilities, community buildings, retail establishments, new residential, office, retail and mixed use buildings etc.)?

4. Please describe impacts to the views from the Adjacent Properties.

5. Please describe the impacts to the views from properties in the Secondary Study Area and other Surrounding Properties, including across the bay from the Park.

6. What mitigation plans does the City plan to implement to minimize and/or ameliorate potential loss of views or the creation of unsightly views from each of the properties and locations listed in #4 and #5 above?

7. What does the City propose to do to establish the value of the homes listed in question #4 and #5 pre and post construction of the Project in order to assess whether property values are affected by changes to the views?

8. Does the City have a compensation plan to mitigate any losses in value to Surrounding Properties and if so, please describe what this plan is and how it will be implemented?

9. Please describe the impact to Surrounding Properties from the mass of any new docks extending into the Bay and intruding into current open space, and how this impact is to be mitigated.

10. What impact will the new docks and any other overwater walkways have on water quality? How will any detrimental effects be mitigated?

C.  LIGHTING

1. What kind of lighting is proposed for the Project? Please demonstrate its appropriateness for a residential setting? Please indicate the hours that lights would be on during the different seasons of the year.
2. To what extent is the proposed lighting sufficient to provide good security yet remain appropriate for a residential area?

3. What type of lighting is proposed for the shoreline areas of the Project and for any docks extending into the Bay?

4. Please describe the impact of the lighting to the views from the Adjacent Properties.

5. Please describe the impact of the lighting to the views from the Surrounding Properties.

D. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL PRESERVATION

1. What plans are there to preserve the historic structures related to the historic whaling station, boat building, military and marina activities inside the Park?

2. Are any of the older homes inside the Park, that might be considered of historic status, to be kept as community buildings, and if so, please identify the homes and the uses to which they would be put?

3. What plans does the city have for archaeological protection of Native American and other historic remains known to be on site?

E. EARTH

1. What are the slopes with respect to the proposed terracing of the Project?

2. What will be the steepest slope inside the Project?

3. What filling or grading will be required to complete the Project?

4. How many estimated truck and barge trips will there be during construction to complete the required filling and grading?

5. What mitigation measures will be used to limit the noise and air pollution impacts of these specific construction trips?

6. Are there any existing underground storage tanks for oil or other liquids inside the Study Areas or in the Bay?

7. Will these be removed? And if not, what guarantees are there that these will not leach into the soils and/or the lake?

8. Are there any septic tanks presently within the Study Areas? What are plans for the venting of these or will they be removed?
9. During construction, what plans are there for preventing and/or mitigating erosion due to steep slopes and/or soil types?

10. What percent of the proposed Project site will be impervious surfaces?

11. If there is any open parking to be provided, what measures will be taken to deal with runoff?

F. AIR

1. What types of emissions would result from construction? Include impacts to Surrounding Properties, boats, pedestrians, vehicles in transit and people residing and working both inside and outside the Study Areas from the dust, dirt and air pollution?

2. Specify and estimate what the increased environmental health hazards from dust and other airborne substances generated during construction might be on people residing and working both inside and outside the Study Areas?

3. What types of mitigation measures are being planned to reduce these impacts; e.g. use of tarps to cover trucks carrying soil/debris into/out of the Project site? Please specify the mitigation measures for people residing both inside and outside the Study Areas; to Surrounding Properties and en route to the Project which construction trucks will be using; to the boats in the Bay; and to pedestrians.

4. What is the estimated number of truck and barge trips to and from the Project site during construction for demolishing, bringing in soil, new construction materials, etc?

5. Post-construction, what plans does the City have to mitigate damage to surrounding buildings/structures/boats as a result of the dirt/air pollution and wave/wake activity generated by construction of the Project? e.g. plans for the City to pay for the cost to clean and/or repaint surrounding buildings/structures/boats/docks? Plans for the City to pay for the cleaning of windows, etc.? Plans for the City to pay for the cleaning of boats at the Marina, at the Meydenbauer Bay Yacht Club and at private residences?

G. NOISE

1. What will be the increased noise from traffic due to changes in circulation patterns and increased noise from the traffic associated with the intensified use of the roads inside the Study Areas and Surrounding Properties?

2. What will be the increased noise from marine traffic, including transient moorage, associated with the intensified use of the Bay?

3. What types and levels of noise will be generated during the construction phases of the Project?
4. What mitigation measures are proposed to reduce these impacts identified in #1, #2, and #3?

5. What additional noise will be generated by maintenance of the Project, including in the Park due to the use of maintenance equipment such as leaf blowers, street cleaners, etc.? Would the city consider not using leaf blowers in the course of Park maintenance?

6. What other mitigation measures would be put in place to reduce noise impacts post construction?

7. Is there a plan for limiting the hours for Park use and Park maintenance to restrict them to the same hours as those of existing residential noise guidelines? Please specify the current residential noise guidelines and any differences to those that will apply to the Project. Please include schedules for weekends as well.

8. What are the types and levels of noise to be permitted post construction; i.e., operational hours of the Park? Are there mitigation measures to reduce/control these to daylight hours?

9. Are there any plans for buffering noise to the Adjacent and Surrounding Properties due to the amplification of noise due to the effect of noise on water?

H. WATER

1. Describe any and all construction activity that will affect surface water bodies in and around the Project site, including the Bay, lake, streams, wetlands, storm drains, etc.?

2. Please provide the construction steps the City will take in order to open up the stream and any potential impacts on the Uplands.

3. Regarding any fill and dredge materials to be used, please describe the materials themselves, the volumes, the duration of this activity and the noise, air and other impacts associated with these activities.

4. What mitigation measure is the city planning to take to reduce and/or ameliorate these impacts?

5. What water withdrawals and/or diversions will have to be taken? Describe the impacts of these and mitigation measures?

6. Describe plans for the relocation of the existing in-lake sewer lines and/or other discharge waste facilities currently inside the Project site and in the Bay, or proposed as additions by the Project?

7. What plans are there to incorporate filtration for existing and/or new storm drains on the Project site and/or flowing into the Bay?
8. What will be the impacts to moorage and marine traffic during construction/relocation of existing and/or proposed sewer lines? What mitigation measures are proposed to minimize these impacts to boats currently moored in the Bay (including the Yacht Club and private residences)?

9. What would be the increased load on the storm drainage system from increased vehicular traffic changes in traffic patterns, and any increased housing density, during construction and following Project completion?

10. What are the City’s plans to better control the milfoil, water lilies and other noxious weeds and the potential loss of oxygen in the Bay?

11. Please describe the impacts on fish, turtles, otters, and other animals from the lack of control of oxygen due to poor maintenance?

12. Does the Project include plans to re-circulate water from any streams to the lake and vice versa? If so, please describe this plan and any adverse impacts that might affect the Surrounding Properties and the Bay in order to accomplish this?

13. Please describe the City’s proposed coordination plans with all relevant, State, Federal and local agencies regarding the maintenance of the Bay? e.g. Washington State Department of Fisheries, EPA, etc. but not limited to these. We are fully aware that the City does not have complete responsibility for maintenance of the Bay, but we are eager to understand what specific plans the City has to work with and bring together the relevant organizations to improve the maintenance of the bay. Since the proposed Project is designed to be Bellevue’s main waterfront park to serve the entire city, we are anticipating the City will take a strong leadership role in coordinating and managing this interdepartmental coordination. Please demonstrate how the City plans to accomplish this. Which agency will have the ultimate responsibility for maintenance and what plans are there for oversight of this role?

I. FLORA

1. What amount of vegetation will be removed or altered by the Project? Please provide annotated sketches to assist with the description?

2. What is the tree retention plan inside the Study Areas?

3. For any trees to be removed, please list the anticipated impacts on the birds which currently nest in these trees and on birds which forage in these trees?

4. Are there proposed height limits to the mature vegetation whether newly proposed or now existing in order to preserve and protect current views of the Surrounding Properties?
G. ANIMALS

Mammals

1. What does the City propose to do to prevent the risk that temporary and permanent disturbance to animals (beavers, otters, etc.) residing along the shoreline and in wetlands adjacent to the Park and Project?

2. Please describe the impact on the Adjacent Properties from the increase of rodents, insects and other animals attracted by any food and beverage sales in the Park or increased food and beverage sales caused by the Project, and increased garbage caused thereby or from the intensified use of the Park.

3. Please describe the impact on the animals (mammals, fish, birds, etc.) from the increase of rodents, insects and other animals attracted by any food and beverage sales in the Park or increased food and beverage sales caused by the Project, and any increased garbage caused thereby or from the intensified use of the Park.

4. What mitigation measures are proposed by the City to reduce these impacts described in #2 and #3?

Fish

1. With respect to Fish - what will be the impact to Sockeye salmon and Chinook salmon with respect to their migration routes and spawning sites?

2. What mitigation measures are proposed to reduce these impacts and protect the current volumes of each species of fish currently living in the bay?

3. What will be the time frames for construction such that they will take into account fish migration patterns?

4. What are the plans for daylight diffusion of existing and proposed docks?

Birds

1. With respect to Birds - please describe the degree of disturbance to bird habitat during construction?

2. What does the City propose to do to prevent the risk that temporary disturbance to rare bird species, e.g. Osprey, Great Blue Heron and Eagles, could result in permanent loss of these or other species from the Project site and larger Lake Washington community? The City should note that this might be a permanent irreversible adverse impact.

3. What does the City propose as mitigation to possible permanent irreversible adverse impacts due to either the permanent or temporary removal of habitat?
4. How will the proposed increased land use density and intensity affect birds, animals and fish populations?

5. What is the impact of construction noise on birds?

6. Please describe the impact on the resident bird population from the increase of any scavenger or predatory birds attracted by any food and beverage sales in the Park or increased food and beverage sales caused by the Project, and any increased garbage caused thereby or from the intensified use of the Park.

J. PUBLIC SERVICES

1. Please explain the plan to provide security, police and emergency services to users of the Park and aquatic activities and to residential neighbors of the Park due to the increased use of the Park and any increased density in the Study Areas from the Project? Specifically describe the safety and security features that will be employed such as patrol services, surveillance cameras, etc.

2. What plans are there to establish a Bellevue City Marine Safety Patrol (Police, Fire and Rescue) to ensure a safe boating and marine environment inside Bellevue waters because of increased marine traffic and transient marine use of the Park? What equipment (boats, zodiacs, fireboats, jetskis, emergency medical equipment) will need to be acquired by the City? How many additional Police Officers and Firefighters/EMT’s will be hired? Where will the required marine safety and rescue support facilities be located?

3. What plans are there to establish a Bellevue City Environmental Response Unit to maintain the marine environment inside Bellevue waters and respond to emergency environmental issues (spills, collisions, sinkings) arising from the increased marine traffic and transient marine and any commercial (marine, barge and service vehicles) use of the Park? Where will the required support facilities be located? What equipment (boats, zodiacs, jetskis, booms) will need to be acquired?

4. How will emergency evacuation services be provided for the Park and for the Adjacent Properties (especially those bordering the Park or whose accesses will be or have been altered)?

K. FUNDING

1. What is the total budget for the completed Project? Please provide line items for major components of the Project development for each phase of the Project from construction through final completion and full build out of the properties within the Primary Study Area?

2. What is the time frame for each phase of the Project from construction through final completion? Please provide dates by month/year, and not just overall length of time for
each phase, showing estimated dates of construction and estimated dates of completion for each phase?

3. What specific actions are to be taken under each phase? i.e. what is being done, by whom and when?

4. How much capital has been invested in the Project, to date, including for the purpose of acquiring and maintaining properties in the Primary Study Area?

5. What are the City’s sources of revenue for the Project?

6. What sources of revenue will be terminated due to the Project?

7. How does the City propose to fund this Project specifically?

8. How does the City propose to fund the capital equipment, personnel (uniformed and other), training costs and facilities necessary for the additional security, police and emergency services due to any increased use of the Park and increased density and intensity of use of the Park and Surrounding Properties?

9. How does the City propose to fund the capital equipment, personnel (uniformed and other), training costs and waterside facilities necessary for marine safety patrol (police, fire and rescue) activities?

10. How does the City propose to fund the capital equipment, personnel (uniformed and other), training costs and waterside facilities necessary for emergency marine environmental response team?

11. If there is to be a general park bond issue(s) that is/are to include revenues to support portions of the construction of this proposed Project, please specify what exact amounts are being sought for this Project? What would be the estimated amount per $1,000 assessed value JUST FOR THIS SPECIFIC PROJECT?

12. We request the city provide a detailed funding/expense plan for the proposed Project so the community knows exactly what we are paying for, what we can expect to get for these expenditures and in what time frame they are expected to occur, and to ensure the community that the Project can be completed in full, once started?

L. TRANSPORTATION

1. Given 100th Ave SE/SE Bellevue Place may be closed under each alternative, what is the proposed access and circulation plan?

2. If 100th Ave SE/SE Bellevue Place is closed or one way, what is the proposed access and circulation plan?
3. What will be the main and secondary vehicular access to the Park?

4. What will be the main and secondary vehicular access to the Marina?

5. What will be the main and secondary vehicular access to the Project?

6. What will be the main and secondary, tertiary pedestrian access routes to the Park, the Project and the Marina?

7. Will any vehicular or pedestrian access require land use changes? Please explain in detail what these land use changes will be?

8. What are the anticipated construction impacts on traffic circulation? What mitigation plans will be implemented to reduce these impacts?

9. Please show in annotated drawings the access to The Vue condominiums?

10. Please show in annotated drawings the access for emergency services, other services and visitor parking for the Ten Thousand Meydenbauer condominiums?

11. Please show in annotated drawings the access for emergency services, other services and visitor parking for the Whaler’s Cove condominiums?

12. Please show in annotated drawings the ingress and egress for the Meydenbauer Apartments?

13. For the prior four items please provide annotated drawings for both the construction phase(s) and the completed Project state?

14. What changes, if any, are proposed for Old Main Street? Please include changes of direction, number of lanes, number of on-street parking spaces, and changes in ingress/egress?

15. Will the proposed Project require the construction of any new roads/streets or any improvements to or limitations/restrictions to existing roads, whether public or private, during either construction (i.e. temporary changes) or after Project completion (i.e. permanent improved state).

16. What is the estimated number of vehicular trips per day generated by the completed Project? What is the basis for this estimate? i.e. please provide underlying assumptions and recorded and other data used in completing this analysis?

17. When will peak volumes occur? What are these peak volumes estimated to be?

18. Will there be public transportation provided to the Park?
M. PARKING

1. What is the estimated number of new parking spaces to be? Please describe type (surface, underground or raised structure) location and number of spaces?

2. How many parking spaces will be eliminated by the Project and any other City projects inside the Study Areas (Downtown Park reconfiguration, Great Streets Project, planned and proposed sidewalks in lieu of parking)?

3. If off-site parking (parking lots or structures) is a part of the plan, where will it be located? How many spaces will there be? What will be the impacts on circulation in the surrounding streets and neighborhood?

4. What provisions will the city make for temporary unload and loading zones for boaters and handicapped persons?

5. Will parking be allowed on 100th Ave SE/SE Bellevue Place?

6. What parking accommodations will be made for handicapped residents of the Adjacent and Surrounding Properties and for Marina and Park visitors?

7. What is the “net” increase or decrease in parking spaces in the Primary and Secondary study areas proposed between the date hereof and the completion of the Project?

8. What parking spaces and locations are designed to serve the Park? What parking spaces and locations are designed to serve the Marina? What parking spaces and locations are designed to serve the Project, not including the Marina and the Park? What parking spaces and locations are designed to support Old Bellevue?

[Signature Page Follows]
We trust that the City will carefully analyze each and every one of these issues for each of the three proposed alternatives. In this way, the City and the community will be able to proceed with the proposed project in an atmosphere of complete transparency with opportunities for full and fair public input and appropriate City response.

Respectfully,

[Signature]

Marvin B. Peterson
President

[Signature]

Madelaine Georgette
Advisor for Environmental Affairs

cc: City Manager, Steve Sarkozy  SSarkozy@bellevuewa.gov
    City Planning Director, Matt Terry  MTerry@bellevuewa.gov
    City Parks Director, Patrick Foran  PForan@bellevuewa.gov
    City Clerk, Myrna Basick  MBasich@bellevuewa.gov
    David Bricklin, Esq.  Bricklin@bnd-law.com
    EDAW, Brian Scott, Director of Urban Design, brian.scott@edaw.com


**Park Program Elements** — See Narrative for Changes

1. Fully up-lit stream with interpretive/education nodes along adjacent pedestrian path provides important pedestrian experience.
2. Barns enhancements (Contiguous canopy forested areas to be retained and enhanced, invasive plants removed) provides improved habitat for Key species.
3. Shade structure provides cover for pedestrians at mid-level terrace.
4. Elevated Wetland (incorporation of wetlands with the stream/channel delta to form a contiguous surface water structured provides improved aquatic habitat.
5. Significant stormwater feature extending from Downtown Park along 100th Ave. NE through the park terraces provides a visual connection between the two parks.
6. Upper viewing terrace with vehicular pull-off (1/4-1/2 short-term parking spaces) provides space for future events, etc. Rooftop terrace located under provides additional space for community activities.
7. Gravel viewing plaza at 100th Ave. NE and mid-tier terraces with ADA access to the shoreline allows pedestrians to enjoy multiple views of the bay.
8. Custom-designed playground (for school-aged children) blends with other park features and enhances the natural character of the park.
9. Grassplains area with shade structure provides close visual proximity to the beach and playground.

**Environmental Education Center** — Restrooms, gathering space, outdoor education green, and Terraced garden

**Environmental Redevelopment District**

**Park Program Elements**

1. Continuous waterfront promenade extends the full length of the park shoreline with pedestrian & emergency vehicle access behind the marina.
2. Restrooms (with green roof)
3. Short-term marina parking (64 spaces) and drop-off area
4. Removal of Pier 3
5. Public dock with viewing platforms and transport service
6. Parking garage tucked into hillside (100 spaces) and grand viewing park terrace above.
7. Whaling Building Historical/Cultural Maritime Center
8. Enhanced hillside woodland (Removal of invasive species, preservation of significant trees, and planting of native forbs, shrubs and trees)
9. Swim beach with people-piloted water barge
10. Sustained shoreline (Improved nearshore habitat and addition of native riparian vegetation, including evergreen trees and woody shrubs)
11. The Lake to Lake Trail system Downtown connection terminates
12. Enhanced streetscape with improved sidewalks, additional street trees and site furnishings for added pedestrian comfort along streets connecting to surrounding parks.
November 12, 2008

The City of Bellevue
450 110th Ave. NE
PO Box 90012
Bellevue WA, 98009-9012

Attn: Michael Brennan MBrennan@bellevuewa.gov
      Michael Paine MPaine@bellevuewa.gov
      Michael Bergstrom MBergstrom@bellevuewa.gov

City Council Members
   Hon. Mayor: Grant Degginger GDegginger@bellevuewa.gov
   Claudia Balducci CBalducci@bellevuewa.gov
   John Chelminiak JChelminiak@bellevuewa.gov
   Phil Noble PNoble@bellevuewa.gov
   Don Davidson DDavidson@bellevuewa.gov
   Conrad Lee CLee@bellevuewa.gov
   Patsy Bonincontri PBonincontri@bellevuewa.gov

Subject: The City of Bellevue’s Waterfront Park - A Park for the 21st Century

The Meydenbauer Bay Neighbors Association (MBNA) would like to propose a new alternative to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed Meydenbauer Waterfront Park expansion and Land Use Plan. The new alternative is a variation of Alternative 1 - known as the “Environment and Educational Alternative”, but it further minimizes the impact that the proposed park and land use will have on the environment.

Concept:

Bellevue is growing into a cutting-edge 21st Century City and has a consistent history of providing a truly exceptional parks system along with extensive programs to raise awareness and educate their citizens on the importance of the environment. In keeping with these two concepts and now faced with rapid global climate change, environmental stewardship and education become major urgent priorities for all.

MBNA has developed a conceptual plan which melds these realities and priorities into a waterfront park and land use plan that is fully consistent with, and promotes to the fullest, the City’s twelve planning principles. A primary goal of creating connections between the park and the downtown through the intervening ‘upland’ area is achieved in ways that visually and physically connect the waterfront to the downtown, create pedestrian-oriented spaces, and enhance and protect neighboring residential areas and the environment, consistent with these principals and the City’s goals and objectives.
**Description of Alternative:**

This alternative preserves most of the basic elements of Alternative 1 with the changes set forth below and in the attached drawings.

MBNA proposes creating an enlarged grand entrance to the park and connecting it to a dedicated permanent Environmental Education Center. The center is to be used to educate citizens on the importance and means to enhance environmental stewardship, to learn about the impacts, dangers and ways to mitigate global climate change, to become informed about new technologies that will be employed to deal with this challenge to our very way of life and to draw on the myriad of high tech businesses and professional expertise within our own community to create a major city amenity, and to show that man and nature can co-exist in the urban setting. This grand entrance, connected to such an amenity, will give the City the ‘**wow experience**’ they have been striving so hard to achieve and will simultaneously meet the City’s goals, and the residential and environmental needs of the greater community.

**Advantages:**

This plan has numerous advantages over what has been proposed to date. By adopting this alternative, you can ensure the following results:

- Bellevue develops a waterfront park with a stunning grand entry that cascades down from Main Street to the waterfront in an unusual, sweeping, terraced landscape with easy access for pedestrians, ADA and transportation.
- Bellevue achieves linkages of waterfront and downtown in a way that demonstrates environment stewardship in conjunction with new 21st Century global climate change realities.
- Circulation patterns are not disrupted and traffic flows can continue unimpeded.
- The “Uplands” and developable areas South of Main Street become a new Environmental Development District, showcasing Bellevue’s ability to be a leader in 21st Century environmental urbanization.
- The essential character and charm of Old Bellevue will be preserved, regardless of development pressures.
- The City will showcase its new high tech Environmental Education Center; complete with permanent and changing exhibitions thus providing year round use of the park.
- Citizens and visitors to our fair City, alike, will be able to enjoy the park and its views with exceptional ease of access - a real bonus to seniors, the disabled (ADA) and those who may not wish to actually enter and use the park.
- Bellevue showcases its marine history in a setting that is unrivaled in Puget Sound.
- The City of Bellevue becomes a “financial” steward as well as an “environmental” steward by eliminating the need to spend public funds removing and then rebuilding existing infrastructure.
MBNA PROPOSAL:

MBNA’s proposal begins with the City’s Alternative #1 (Road Open Variant) and makes the following changes:

Park Features:

1. Rezone and use the parcel now known as the Chevron station as parkland.
2. Since the City has purchased both the large and small Bayview properties as park, rezone both parcels and use them as parkland.
3. Utilizing these two parcels and as set forth in the City’s Item 10 (of Alternative 1), create an Environmental Education Center, not to exceed two stories in height, on the Chevron parcel, with underground parking consistent with the shared parking regime proposed in the Preferred Land Use Plan alternatives presented in May of 2008; however, the number of parking spaces should not exceed 150 spaces (instead of the 500 proposed under the Preferred Land Use Plan). The City should consider public-private partnerships in developing this center in order to create a state-of-the-art Environmental Education/Resource Center that will serve as a major destination amenity for the City.
4. Create a grand plaza with terraces, benches, fountains and public art consistent with the City’s Item 07, but locate this around the Education Center, adding a cafe (also located on the Chevron property) providing an easily accessible viewing point and place where people can enjoy the views of and from the park.
5. Extend the terracing and zig-zag pathways on both sides of 100th Ave SE/SE Bellevue Place and connect them with two pedestrian bridges across 100th Ave SE. This will provide for a more gradual, gentle slope with which to access the waterfront, ADA access and stunning viewing points. This can be accomplished more easily by re-grading the slope of the parcel on the west side of 100th Ave SE.
6. Continue with ADA pathways connecting the park to Wildwood Park as proposed.
7. Eliminate all structures from the park properties west of 99th Ave SE (i.e. no historic housing structures; no retreat/conferece center and no shade or rain structure as set forth in the City’s Items 03, 10 and 06; creating additional usable natural parkland.
8. Eliminate the Vehicular Viewing Terrace/Vehicular Pull-off along Lake Washington Boulevard set forth in the City’s Item 06, and create additional usable natural parkland.
9. Partially daylight the stream consistent with the City’s Items 01, 02 and 03 of Alternate 2, in order to retain the 20+ parking spaces and additional access to the park. This minimizes changes to this already sensitive area, and also enhances safety and security in this area of the park.
10. Consistent with the City’s Item 16, create underground parking for approximately 40 parking spaces (maximum) on the north side of 99th Ave SE with access from 99th (or Lake Washington Blvd) to support park visitors, residents and marina users.
11. Retain on-street parking on 99th Ave SE, but as “permit” parking (as exists further up 99th) to support delivery, service and visitors to adjoining residential properties.
12. Retain on-street parking on 100th Ave SE, but as “permit” parking (as exists on 99th) to support delivery, service and visitors to adjoining residential properties.
13. With respect to Item 14, retain Pier 3 (as well as Piers 1 and 2). Remove all dock roofs, and install dock access ramps to improve the near shore habitat, consistent with Item 20. Pier 3 should be retained in a low profile configuration for smaller boats. The City should
perform such maintenance as is necessary without removing existing pilings and disrupting the existing habitat.

14. With respect to Item 12, locate any restrooms a sufficient distance away from existing residential properties to support the Marina and Swim Beach areas.

15. With respect to Item 15, limit the length of the public dock with viewing platform (and transient moorage) to extend no further into the Bay than existing Pier 1.

Retain all other features of Alternative 1

Upland Features:

In support of the “Preferred Land Use Plan” alternatives presented to the community in May of 2008 – Develop the areas identified as the Uplands and areas South of Main Street as follows:

1. Create a New District (Overlay) under Bellevue Land Use Code identified as “The Environmental Redevelopment District” demonstrating and implementing development policies that are suitable for a cutting-edge 21st Century City in a climate of rapidly accelerating global climate change. The Overlay would include the areas identified as the Upland Block and the areas South of Main Street and East of 100th that are inside the Primary Study Area (excluding the Chevron and Bayview (East) properties which will have been designated parkland).

2. All new construction and major renovation projects in this Overlay must achieve a LEED™ Gold rating.

3. All rezoning in this Overlay shall not exceed R45, with no change to existing allowable building heights and allowable uses.

4. Rezone the parcel (currently occupied by a photography studio) on the NE corner of Main and 100th Ave NE as parkland, creating a gentle connection as one walks from the Bellevue City Park down 100th Ave NE toward the waterfront.

[Signature Page Follows]
We trust that the City will carefully consider our proposals with respect to Alternative #1, and will analyze this additional environmental alternative within the scope of its Environmental Impact Statement. The members of the Meydenbauer communities have participated in all meetings to date, and have studied, analyzed and considered the best way to build a park and develop this district (our community) as a cutting-edge 21st Century Environmental and Urban Standard.

Respectfully,

Marvin B. Peterson
President

Madelaine Georgette
Advisor for Environmental Affairs

cc: City Manager, Steve Sarkozy  SSarkozy@bellevuewa.gov
    City Planning Director, Matt Terry  MTerry@bellevuewa.gov
    City Parks Director, Patrick Foran  PForan@bellevuewa.gov
    City Clerk, Myrna Basick  MBasich@bellevuewa.gov
    David Bricklin, Esq.  Bricklin@bnd-law.com
    EDAW: Brian Scott, Director of Urban Design  brian.scott@edaw.com
          David Blau, Regional V.P.  david.blau@edaw.com
My husband, Tom, and I attended the meeting on Monday evening of the Meydenbauer Bay Neighbors Assoc. at Overlake Golf and Country Club. Everyone there is concerned about the Plans for the Meydenbauer Bay Park. We have been to two of the meetings held to involve Bellevue residents in the plans. At those meetings the people there were all from this neighborhood that will be impacted by the plans. People listened very carefully to what we all said at the first meeting. At the second meeting it was the same format ... very careful listening, but seemingly spouting the same plans ie: closure of 100th SE, (south of Main St.), Dock removal. Commercial enterprises, perhaps a hotel!!!. Increased noise and pollution, And all this in a residential area! The plans # 1,2 and 3 were not modified, as far as we could tell.

We were surprised that You were not represented at this meeting. We feel this project is being forced down our throats. We support the park project concept, BUT not with the addition of commercial entities. Traffic on Main street is horrendous now, and parking is very limited and this project sounds as if it would be gridlock personified! A parking garage using residential property should not be an option. And more commercial 'stuff' in this area of Bellevue is not necessary. We don't want boats coming in from 'abroad' to mess up our park and Bay. The Bay needs attention soon or it will be only a swamp! We have always been good supporters of parks in Bellevue and we do use them. Wildwood Park at 101st Ave and S.E 3rd is a jewel and the Downtown Park is super ... I walk there every morning and Tom and I walk together every afternoon. We hate it when we have to miss our walk because of other activities. Another great park is Chisim ... we used it often when we lived on Killarney Way. Enatai, Chesterfield, and Killarney are also GREAT!

However, We are voting NO on Bellevue Parks this year. The story in todays Times (Monday, Oct 27) mentioned all the good things the money would be used for, and to buy new property ... no mention of the Meydenbauer Bay project ... but we suspect it is included and we don't want it as planned right now. I think lots of people would vote NO if they realized what you have in mind. Leave the residential areas alone in that particular spot. The Ospreys will leave for sure!

VOTE NO ON BELLEVUE PARKS! Save Old Bellevue! Save Meydenbauer Bay!

Thank you for hearing me out!

Ellenor Naden
10 1 Medenbauer, Bellevue, WA 98009

**************
A Good Credit Score is 700 or Above. See yours in just 2 easy steps!
(http://pr.atwola.com/promoclk/100000075x1211625659x1200715650/aol?
redir=http://www.freckreditreport.com/pm/default.aspx?
sc=668072&hmpgID=82&bcd=emailfooter)
November 11, 2008

City of Bellevue
Development Services Department
P.O. Box 90012
Bellevue, WA 98009

Attn: Michael Paine

Subject: Environmental Impact Statement
File Number: 08-133559-LE

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The following are PACCAR comments on scoping for the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan.

PACCAR, a multinational, Fortune-200 company headquartered in Bellevue, has moored our corporate yacht at the Meydenbauer Bay Marina ("Marina") since 1973. The proximity of the Marina to our corporate headquarters in downtown Bellevue provides our guests with excellent access to our corporate yacht. On an annual basis we have approximately 450 guests access the Marina for events on our vessel. PACCAR and our guests appreciate Meydenbauer Bay and feel our use embodies many of the goals expressed in the Comprehensive Plan and Parks and Open Space System Plan 2003 (Comprehensive Plan).

While we are generally in favor of the park and Marina upgrades being studied, we have some concerns with the plans that we believe should be addressed.

First, PACCAR supports the vision of a Meydenbauer Bay Park with good public and pedestrian access and strong visual and physical connection to Meydenbauer Bay. However, PACCAR is disappointed in the apparent lack of analysis, planning and development behind the Marina portion of the project. The two alternatives presented greatly reduce the amount of moorage provided in the Marina. The amount and type of moorage has a significant impact on the character of the park and park economics. Marina operations require access, parking and infrastructure different from that required for other areas of the Park. Analysis, planning and development for the Marina should be addressed in the EIS. Specific comments follow.
Environmental Impact Statement
File Number: 08-133559-LE
November 11, 2008
Page 2

Land Use - Pursuant to the Steering Committee Agenda Package dated October 30, 2008 the Marina has 25 “not in service/transient” slips (the documents are unclear as to what these slips are), 87 long-term moorage slips and no people propelled vessels (PPV) slips. Alternatives 1 and 2 add 14 transient slips and 10 to 13 PPV slips. Long-term moorage is reduced to 43 slips under Alternative 1 and 29 slips under Alternative 2. One goal expressed by the Comprehensive Plan is the provision of a significant waterfront destination. Long-term moorage slips are an important means of providing Bellevue residents access to the Park and to make the Park a waterfront destination. We believe that a reduction of long-term moorage slips harms that goal. How does the mix of type of slips, long-term moorage, transient moorage, PPV affect meeting this goal? How do they relate from a historical perspective? How do they affect park economics?

- **Alternatives** - Both alternatives have a significant reduction in the number of long-term moorage slips. The EIS should include and analyze an alternative that provides a similar number of long-term slips to the current Marina.

- **Aesthetics, Water Front Access, Historical Significance, Recreation and Use** - The EIS should analyze the impact of reducing the number of long-term moorage slips and adding transient and PPV slips on Comprehensive Plan goals. Impacts that should be analyzed include aesthetics; water front access; historical significance; impact of transient moorage on surrounding land use; impact on recreation; impact on park economics and how economics will be mitigated; impact on Bellevue residents and businesses.

- The EIS should analyze where vessels displaced by a reduction in number of slips will be relocated.

- **Safety and Security** - The EIS should analyze needs for safety and security of pedestrians and transient and long-term moorage vessels.

- **Construction** - The EIS should analyze impacts of dock construction or reconstruction on moorage and provide a plan for temporary relocation.

**Transportation** - Neither of the alternatives reflects a depth of analysis or planning for marina operations, particularly for vehicle access and parking. A marina requires public vehicle access to the head of the pier and parking for tenants, guests and transients. Neither alternative provides vehicle access to the head of the piers. The only access is via a waterfront promenade labeled for
pedestrian and emergency vehicle traffic. Alternatives 1 and 2 show an area with 4-6 short-term parking spaces and drop off at the head of Pier 1, but without a clear safe route to access the parking or drop off area. Both alternatives show a 90 car parking garage tucked into the hillside some distance from the Marina.

- **Public Vehicle Access to Marina** - The EIS should analyze and describe what public vehicle access is needed to the Marina.

- **Traffic Hazard** - The EIS should analyze and describe how public vehicles will safely move to the Marina and pedestrians and bikers will move on the waterfront promenade.

- **Parking** - The EIS should analyze and describe parking needs and locations for Marina users including transient boaters and long-term Marina tenants and guests. The analysis should cover short and longer term needs on weekdays, evenings and weekends.

- **Construction Traffic** - The EIS should analyze traffic during construction and describe how impacts will be mitigated.

In summary, PACCAR supports the planning process for the Meydenbauer Bay Park and we look forward to a thorough and complete analysis of the issues we have raised in the EIS.

Very truly yours,

Daniel N. Lewis

Director of Construction & Corporate Services
dan.lewis@paccar.com

DNL:

cc: M. Bergstrom, City of Bellevue Planning & Community Development  
R. Cole, City of Bellevue Parks and Community Services  
R.E. Bangert, II  
D.K. Williams  
File
I/we welcome the idea of having a Meydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park that all Bellevue residents and visitors can enjoy. We live nearby at Bayshore East Condominiums and enjoy walking in this area. This park could be a daily destination point for us, and even for our visitors. The vision that the City Council and Parks Department have in planning such a park is highly commendable. We are grateful that we can participate in the planning sessions of the City’s Steering Committee and that we can contribute our ideas and concerns since the nearby location of the park will impact our every day quality of life.

Our major concerns are:

- Transportation – Main St. is currently severely congested during commuter rush hours and when residents drive to their shopping or errand destinations. We would like to see a comprehensive transportation plan that would assess both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion along Main Street that would address current conditions and future conditions with the addition of the Park. Along with this idea, we oppose the closure of 100th/SE Bellevue Place.

- We do not support the loss of permanent moorage at Bellevue Marina. Going from 87 permanent moorage slips down to 18-58 slips will displace 29 to 69 boats. Safe boating in the Bay should be encouraged. Preserving space for the Meydenbauer Yacht Club’s program for young sailors each year is important. Transient boaters often create a disruptive, unsafe environment for families.

- We do not support commercial/retail development in the park or in the residential areas near the park. Because of our amphitheater-like location, these types of development could create noise that would be bounced around the Bay and destroy our tranquility.

- Parking – Parking spaces currently used by residents should be maintained and parking for park users should be created without increased traffic flow to the currently clogged Main St.

- We support a limited number of new low profile structures built in the Park.

- Water quality – The water quality of the Bay needs to be addressed. The build-up of silt has long been a problem. Noxious weeds such as milfoil, water lilies, purple loosestrife, and yellow iris need to be contained. Private money has been spent to treat these noxious weeds, whereas public funds should be used to treat the entire Bay. Meydenbauer Creek, which flows into the Bay from our shoreline, and many aged storm drains empty into the Bay causing pollution of the water. The current conceptual plans for the park address only a small number of the streams and drains that flow into the Bay and should address all of these in order to improve the water quality of the whole Bay.

- Pollution - During periods of heavy rain, water gushes through this creek looking like a mini-Snoqualmie Falls. During periods of no rainfall, the water along the shore becomes stagnant. Prevailing winds flow directly at our buildings so any garbage or diesel spills get trapped along our shoreline.

The new Waterfront Park should be designed to allow Bellevue residents and visitors to visit and escape the busy hustle and bustle of daily life and connect with nature. A low profile display of the historical value of Meydenbauer Bay would be enriching to everyone.

Signed: [Signature]

Address: 331-101 st #6

Bellevue, WA 98004
I welcome the idea of having a Meydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park that all Bellevue residents and visitors can enjoy. We live nearby at Bayshore East Condominiums and enjoy walking in this area. This park could be a daily destination point for us, and even for our visitors. The vision that the City Council and Parks Department have in planning such a park is highly commendable. We are grateful that we can participate in the planning sessions of the City’s Steering Committee and that we can contribute our ideas and concerns since the nearby location of the park will impact our everyday quality of life.

Our major concerns are:

- Transportation – Main St. is currently severely congested during commuter rush hours and when residents drive to their shopping or errand destinations. We would like to see a comprehensive transportation plan that would assess both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion along Main Street that would address current conditions and future conditions with the addition of the Park. Along with this idea, we oppose the closure of 100th/SE Bellevue Place.

- We do not support the loss of permanent moorage at Bellevue Marina. Going from 87 permanent moorage slips down to 18-58 slips will displace 29 to 69 boats. Safe boating in the Bay should be encouraged. Preserving space for the Meydenbauer Yacht Club’s program for young sailors each year is important. Transient boaters often create a disruptive, unsafe environment for families.

- We do not support commercial/retail development in the park or in the residential areas near the park. Because of our amphitheater-like location, these types of development could create noise that would be bounced around the Bay and destroy our tranquility.

- Parking – Parking spaces currently used by residents should be maintained and parking for park users should be created without increased traffic flow to the currently clogged Main St.

- We support a limited number of new low profile structures built in the Park.

- Water quality – The water quality of the Bay needs to be addressed. The build-up of silt has long been a problem. Noxious weeds such as milfoil, water lilies, purple loosestrife, and yellow iris need to be contained. Private money has been spent to treat these noxious weeds, whereas public funds should be used to treat the entire Bay. Meydenbauer Creek, which flows into the Bay from our shoreline, and many aged storm drains empty into the Bay causing pollution of the water. The current conceptual plans for the park address only a small number of the streams and drains that flow into the Bay and should address all of these in order to improve the water quality of the whole Bay.

- Pollution - During periods of heavy rain, water gushes through this creek looking like a mini-Snoqualmie Falls. During periods of no rainfall, the water along the shore becomes stagnant. Prevailing winds flow directly at our buildings so any garbage or diesel spills get trapped along our shoreline.

The new Waterfront Park should be designed to allow Bellevue residents and visitors to visit and escape the busy hustle and bustle of daily life and connect with nature. A low profile display of the historical value of Meydenbauer Bay would be enriching to everyone.

Signed: Louise Brewer 10/29/08

Address: 391 10 Ave SE

Bellevue, WA 98004
I/we welcome the idea of having a Meydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park that all Bellevue residents and visitors can enjoy. We live nearby at Bayshore East Condominiums and enjoy walking in this area. This park could be a daily destination point for us, and even for our visitors. The vision that the City Council and Parks Department have in planning such a park is highly commendable. We are grateful that we can participate in the planning sessions of the City’s Steering Committee and that we can contribute our ideas and concerns since the nearby location of the park will impact our every day quality of life.

Our major concerns are:

- Transportation – Main St. is currently severely congested during commuter rush hours and when residents drive to their shopping or errand destinations. We would like to see a comprehensive transportation plan that would assess both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion along Main Street that would address current conditions and future conditions with the addition of the Park. Along with this idea, we oppose the closure of 100th/SE Bellevue Place.

- We do not support the loss of permanent moorage at Bellevue Marina. Going from 87 permanent moorage slips down to 18-58 slips will displace 29 to 69 boats. Safe boating in the Bay should be encouraged. Preserving space for the Meydenbauer Yacht Club’s program for young sailors each year is important. Transient boaters often create a disruptive, unsafe environment for families.

- We do not support commercial/retail development in the park or in the residential areas near the park. Because of our amphitheater-like location, these types of development could create noise that would be bounced around the Bay and destroy our tranquility.

- Parking – Parking spaces currently used by residents should be maintained and parking for park users should be created without increased traffic flow to the currently clogged Main St.

- We support a limited number of new low profile structures built in the Park.

- Water quality – The water quality of the Bay needs to be addressed. The build-up of silt has long been a problem. Noxious weeds such as milfoil, water lilies, purple loosestrife, and yellow iris need to be contained. Private money has been spent to treat these noxious weeds, whereas public funds should be used to treat the entire Bay. Meydenbauer Creek, which flows into the Bay from our shoreline, and many aged storm drains empty into the Bay causing pollution of the water. The current conceptual plans for the park address only a small number of the streams and drains that flow into the Bay and should address all of these in order to improve the water quality of the whole Bay.

- Pollution - During periods of heavy rain, water gushes through this creek looking like a mini-Snoqualmie Falls. During periods of no rainfall, the water along the shore becomes stagnant. Prevailing winds flow directly at our buildings so any garbage or diesel spills get trapped along our shoreline.

The new Waterfront Park should be designed to allow Bellevue residents and visitors to visit and escape the busy hustle and bustle of daily life and connect with nature. A low profile display of the historical value of Meydenbauer Bay would be enriching to everyone.

Signed: John Oneil 10.2 x 0.8

Address: 371 101 st Ave SE
Bellevue Wash 98004- 2130
I/we welcome the idea of having a Meydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park that all Bellevue residents and visitors can enjoy. We live nearby at Bayshore East Condominiums and enjoy walking in this area. This park could be a daily destination point for us, and even for our visitors. The vision that the City Council and Parks Department have in planning such a park is highly commendable. We are grateful that we can participate in the planning sessions of the City’s Steering Committee and that we can contribute our ideas and concerns since the nearby location of the park will impact our every day quality of life.

Our major concerns are:

- Transportation – Main St. is currently severely congested during commuter rush hours and when residents drive to their shopping or errand destinations. We would like to see a comprehensive transportation plan that would assess both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion along Main Street that would address current conditions and future conditions with the addition of the Park. Along with this idea, we oppose the closure of 100th/SE Bellevue Place.

- We do not support the loss of permanent moorage at Bellevue Marina. Going from 87 permanent moorage slips down to 18-58 slips will displace 29 to 69 boats. Safe boating in the Bay should be encouraged. Preserving space for the Meydenbauer Yacht Club’s program for young sailors each year is important. Transient boaters often create a disruptive, unsafe environment for families.

- We do not support commercial/retail development in the park or in the residential areas near the park. Because of our amphitheater-like location, these types of development could create noise that would be bounced around the Bay and destroy our tranquility.

- Parking – Parking spaces currently used by residents should be maintained and parking for park users should be created without increased traffic flow to the currently clogged Main St.

- We support a limited number of new low profile structures built in the Park.

- Water quality – The water quality of the Bay needs to be addressed. The build-up of silt has long been a problem. Noxious weeds such as milfoil, water lilies, purple loosestrife, and yellow iris need to be contained. Private money has been spent to treat these noxious weeds, whereas public funds should be used to treat the entire Bay. Meydenbauer Creek, which flows into the Bay from our shoreline, and many aged storm drains empty into the Bay causing pollution of the water. The current conceptual plans for the park address only a small number of the streams and drains that flow into the Bay and should address all of these in order to improve the water quality of the whole Bay.

- Pollution - During periods of heavy rain, water gushes through this creek looking like a mini-Snoqualmie Falls. During periods of no rainfall, the water along the shore becomes stagnant. Prevailing winds flow directly at our buildings so any garbage or diesel spills get trapped along our shoreline.

The new Waterfront Park should be designed to allow Bellevue residents and visitors to visit and escape the busy hustle and bustle of daily life and connect with nature. A low profile display of the historical value of Meydenbauer Bay would be enriching to everyone.

Signed:  

Address: 377 101st Ave S.E.

Bellevue, Wash. 98004
We welcome the idea of having a Meydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park that all Bellevue residents and visitors can enjoy. We live nearby at Bayshore East Condominiums and enjoy walking in this area. This park could be a daily destination point for us, and even for our visitors. The vision that the City Council and Parks Department have in planning such a park is highly commendable. We are grateful that we can participate in the planning sessions of the City’s Steering Committee and that we can contribute our ideas and concerns since the nearby location of the park will impact our everyday quality of life.

Our major concerns are:

- Transportation – Main St. is currently severely congested during commuter rush hours and when residents drive to their shopping or errand destinations. We would like to see a comprehensive transportation plan that would assess both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion along Main Street that would address current conditions and future conditions with the addition of the Park. Along with this idea, we oppose the closure of 100th/SE Bellevue Place.
- We do not support the loss of permanent moorage at Bellevue Marina. Going from 87 permanent moorage slips down to 18-58 slips will displace 29 to 69 boats. Safe boating in the Bay should be encouraged. Preserving space for the Meydenbauer Yacht Club’s program for young sailors each year is important.Transient boaters often create a disruptive, unsafe environment for families.
- We do not support commercial/retail development in the park or in the residential areas near the park. Because of our amphitheater-like location, these types of development could create noise that would be bounced around the Bay and destroy our tranquility.
- Parking – Parking spaces currently used by residents should be maintained and parking for park users should be created without increased traffic flow to the currently clogged Main St.
- We support a limited number of new low profile structures built in the Park.
- Water quality – The water quality of the Bay needs to be addressed. The build-up of silt has long been a problem. Noxious weeds such as milfoil, water lilies, purple loosestrife, and yellow iris need to be contained. Private money has been spent to treat these noxious weeds, whereas public funds should be used to treat the entire Bay. Meydenbauer Creek, which flows into the Bay from our shoreline, and many aged storm drains empty into the Bay causing pollution of the water. The current conceptual plans for the park address only a small number of the streams and drains that flow into the Bay and should address all of these in order to improve the water quality of the whole Bay.
- Pollution - During periods of heavy rain, water gushes through this creek looking like a mini-Snoqualmie Falls. During periods of no rainfall, the water along the shore becomes stagnant. Prevailing winds flow directly at our buildings so any garbage or diesel spills get trapped along our shoreline.

The new Waterfront Park should be designed to allow Bellevue residents and visitors to visit and escape the busy hustle and bustle of daily life and connect with nature. A low profile display of the historical value of Meydenbauer Bay would be enriching to everyone.

Signed: Sue B. Wais Nov. 3 '08
Address: 393-101 Ave. SE
Bellevue, WA 98004

I have been out of town for the last 2 weeks so I looked here been at the Town Oct 29 meeting, but I did want you to know this.
We welcome the idea of having a Meydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park that all Bellevue residents and visitors can enjoy. We live nearby at Bayshore East Condominiums and enjoy walking in this area. This park could be a daily destination point for us, and even for our visitors. The vision that the City Council and Parks Department have in planning such a park is highly commendable. We are grateful that we can participate in the planning sessions of the City’s Steering Committee and that we can contribute our ideas and concerns since the nearby location of the park will impact our everyday quality of life.

Our major concerns are:

- Transportation – Main St. is currently severely congested during commuter rush hours and when residents drive to their shopping or errand destinations. We would like to see a comprehensive transportation plan that would assess both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion along Main Street that would address current conditions and future conditions with the addition of the Park. Along with this idea, we oppose the closure of 100th/SE Bellevue Place.

- We do not support the loss of permanent moorage at Bellevue Marina. Going from 87 permanent moorage slips down to 18-58 slips will displace 29 to 69 boats. Safe boating in the Bay should be encouraged. Preserving space for the Meydenbauer Yacht Club’s program for young sailors each year is important. Transient boaters often create a disruptive, unsafe environment for families.

- We do not support commercial/retail development in the park or in the residential areas near the park. Because of our amphitheater-like location, these types of development could create noise that would be bounced around the Bay and destroy our tranquility.

- Parking – Parking spaces currently used by residents should be maintained and parking for park users should be created without increased traffic flow to the currently clogged Main St.

- We support a limited number of new low profile structures built in the Park.

- Water quality – The water quality of the Bay needs to be addressed. The build-up of silt has been a problem. Noxious weeds such as milfoil, water lilies, purple loosestrife, and yellow iris need to be contained. Private money has been spent to treat these noxious weeds, whereas public funds should be used to treat the entire Bay. Meydenbauer Creek, which flows into the Bay from our shoreline, and many aged storm drains empty into the Bay causing pollution of the water. The current conceptual plans for the park address only a small number of the streams and drains that flow into the Bay and should address all of these in order to improve the water quality of the whole Bay.

- Pollution – During periods of heavy rain, water gushes through this creek looking like a mini-Snoqualmie Falls. During periods of no rainfall, the water along the shore becomes stagnant. Prevailing winds flow directly at our buildings so any garbage or diesel spills get trapped along our shoreline.

The new Waterfront Park should be designed to allow Bellevue residents and visitors to visit and escape the busy hustle and bustle of daily life and connect with nature. A low profile display of the historical value of Meydenbauer Bay would be enriching to everyone.

Signed: Betty Schwind

Address: 359 101st Ave NE
Bellevue WA 98004
October 29, 2008

To: Meydenbauer Project Workshop
Re: EIS Scoping Comments
From: Jim and Susan Powell
9903 Lake Wash Blvd NE
Bellevue WA 98004

We recognize that the proposed Meydenbauer Park plans represent what could be a great asset to our community. However, we, like so many others, have concerns that we hope will be seriously considered when the environmental impact of the park project is being studied. Our wish is that this project be totally non commercial and that it retain its peaceful, parkland nature.

As residents of Whalers Cove Condominiums, on the westerly end of the complex facing and adjacent to 99th, the proposals under consideration would have a significant adverse impact on our neighborhood, both with noise and physical activity. There are three particular areas of concern that we share:

1. Car traffic or access via 99th will create tremendous disturbance, affecting the peace and serenity that we value.

2. If a public boat landing is incorporated, the impact on our neighborhood would be very disruptive. Noise carries across the water like no other. This past summer, just one boat, filled with party-goers, was so noisy at 2AM we considered calling the police. We did not realize at the time, that the noise was coming from the lake; we never had that type of disruption on land.

3. Main Street traffic congestion is already untenable too much of the time. The impact of yet additional traffic needs to be studied; a solution to the present mess needs to be implemented before a destination that will create even further congestion is considered.

We value the opportunity for proving input and assume that it is meaningful.

Jim and Susan Powell
I favor the Meydenbauer Bay Neighbors Association MBNA Alternative to Alternative 1 Road Open Variant.

This would include three concerns:

1. Under Park Features #3 it should read Bayview/Chevron. Chevron availability is unknown at this time for use as an Environmental Education Center or a Grand Plaza. Any building should not exceed one story in height since it is directly west of the Astoria.

2. Advantage #5 Preserving the character and charm of Old Bellevue should be much stronger. If you have tried to find the Old Frontier Village in Scottsdale lately you know what I mean.

3. A general concern about public safety in the park. A good vegetation plan is essential.

Sincerely,

Bill Reams
a Main Street resident
October 30, 2008

Michael Paine  MPaine@bellevuewa.gov
SEPA Responsible Officer  Development Services Dept.

Dear Mr. Paine:

We attended the meeting last night of the EIS Scoping committee as well as the following public comment portion of the meeting. However, we would like to comment further on the proposal for the Maydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park, since we sense there are more impacts than currently being discussed as well as possible unintended consequences.

It seems in formulating park plans that some of the planning principles outlined by the Bellevue City Council have been ignored and others have been added that were not originally intended, specifically parts of items #9 and #10.

The current marina, particularly the newer section, is a premier marina on Lake Washington and most parts are relatively new. It would be the height of folly & unnecessary expense to eliminate covered docks or move parts of it, particularly the newer docks. If anything, the plan should include rebuilding the older dock to enhance its appearance & improve safety. There are few marinas on Lake Washington as it is and to contemplate removing docks when there are waiting lists for moorage space is not consistent with either items #9 or #10 noted above.

If marina roofs are not aesthetically pleasing to some people, it is possible to disguise or otherwise camouflage them with some types of realistic artwork or green plants, or some combination of the two, to make them look like a roof-top garden or other more atheistically pleasing sight. Most people come to watch the boats & activity on the bay & hardly notice the roofs of the docks, if they are aware of them at all.

Even with the revised proposals, the elimination of parking at the marina site overlooks the fact that boat owners often move items to and from their boats, that service vehicles need access to the boats often for several hours at a time, that boat owners may be gone anywhere from hours to days at a time & need long-term parking, that handicapped boat
owners need accessible parking and emergency vehicles need access. The current parking lot serves the needs of the marina tenants & will be needed at its current site even if some park improvements are ultimately made to the area. Lack of long-term parking & covered docks for marina tenants will devalue the marina & rents.

The current area around the bay is residential & boating oriented and there is need for both to be continued into the future. The Planning Principles incorporate the wording "minimizing impacts on residential areas." The proposal to increase zoning from R-30 to R-60 & add retail in certain areas would be a major impact on the residential areas, as it would increase auto, truck & pedestrian traffic & cause noise & other impacts as well as increase congestion on Main Street. Increased density & more retail is not compatible with the residential character of the area.

If the marina is used by more transient boaters, rather than long-term moorage tenants, there will be more demand for sewage pump out stations, restroom facilities, as well as more wake damage, marine debris, boating accidents & water contaminates from portable fuel tanks, spills, etc. In addition, more employees could well be required to manage transient boaters & activity, increasing the costs to the city compared to the current status.

The proposed street changes to make the area more pedestrian friendly & to connect the dispersed park properties do not seem to take into account the fact that the yacht club has several social functions on a more or less continuing basis that cause multitudes of car traffic, plus there are organizations or groups that rent or use the yacht club space that also have large numbers of attendees that would have to use narrower streets, have less parking available and impact the intersections on Main Street, particularly at 101st, if the intersection at Main & 100th was closed. Groups going to a social function at the yacht club are unlikely to use a parking garage several blocks away.

Several of the proposals for the park have merit & there is no doubt that it would be an attractive area that would invite people, but it would be wrong to ignore the current uses and users who have a vested interest in the marina & a tranquil atmosphere around the bay. It would make more sense to offer more passive types of viewing & activities that don’t require so much upheaval and change or destruction of current facilities.

Respectfully submitted by Jan & John Roehr

Cc: Mayor G. Degginger, Michael Brennan, Michael Bergstrom, M.B Peterson
Anita Skoog Neil  
Madelaine Georgette  
Bellevue, WA  
RE: Meydenbauer Bay Park Plan  

Please excuse the tardiness of these inputs to the EIS. I would like to add some comments to the EIS about the proposed parking lot and transit stop on Lake Washington Blvd. NE across from our house at 9804 Lake Washington Blvd. NE.  

As your team has written the EIS perhaps you could add language to the letter that would address these issues. These sections may be the place to address the proposed parking lot and the proposed transit stop envisioned on Lake Washington Blvd NE but I will leave that up to you.  

We don't want the added noise, traffic, parking, congestion, light and glare, and pollution from this proposed parking lot and proposed transit stop in the two park plans. How would the proposed parking lot and transit stop fit into the proposed peaceful green space where people can relax and enjoy the peace and quiet with the starting and stopping of cars and busses?  

The proposed parking lot on Lake Washington Blvd NE would be an impediment to the traffic on an arterial road like Lake Washington Blvd NE. This arterial handles the overflow traffic from Bellevue Way and is vital to moving traffic through Bellevue, especially at rush hour. Commuters are trying to get to the 520 bridge or the Mercer Island Bridge to get home. Increased traffic from the proposed parking lot would increase traffic accidents. The transit stop would impede the traffic flow and would contribute to congestion and noise. Lake Washington Blvd NE provides an avenue for residents to exercise themselves and their pets. Increased traffic would compete with the recreation of downtown dwellers.  

The proposed parking lot on Lake Washington Blvd NE would precipitate turning cars into the proposed parking lot impeding the flow of Lake Washington Blvd NE traffic. There is no room on Lake Washington Blvd. NE for a turn lane because of the Meydenbauer Bridge. The Meydenbauer Bridge was rebuilt and there is no room for any more lanes. The City of Bellevue will have to learn to live with the limitations of the existing structures and terrain in this small neighborhood.  

The proposed parking lot and the proposed transit stop on Lake Washington Blvd. NE would precipitate increased starting and stopping of cars, more noise from traffic, more light and glare from cars in the parking lot, more pollution in the air, and increased polluted water runoff into Lake Washington. The proposed parking lot and proposed
transit stop will precipitate the degradation of the neighborhood and Lake Washington. The lighting and glare from the parking lot will shine into our houses and the houses across the Bay. It will affect the quality of life for the existing residents and neighborhood.

The headlights and glare from the cars will beam across the Lake to the living rooms on the other side of the Meydenbauer Bay and up into our houses. The view from the parking lot will be into the living rooms of the houses across Meydenbauer Bay. Has the company EDAW actually gone down to the street of Lake Washington Blvd NE, and looked in person to see the actual view across the Bay? The parking lot view will be of residents cooking dinner, taking out the garbage, sweeping their sidewalks, and cutting their lawns. The sounds of the increased traffic starting and stopping will reverberate in the Bay and the sounds will bounce around the Bay.

A better way to access Meydenbauer Bay Park would to combine with an entrance close to the marina, providing access to the two different sections of the Park. In this manner, you would be providing the visitor an easier way to enjoy park.

Meydenbauer Bay should be cleaned up before launching into a large, extensive, and encompassing project.

I think that we should ask for a transportation study from Perteet Company for Lake Washington Blvd. NE; the same type of transportation and traffic flow that they did for 100th Avenue SE. This traffic study would show that there is no room for increased capacity, that it interferes with the function of the arterial flow, and increases pollution of all kinds to the neighborhood.

H. Water
   - Increased water runoff of pollution from the proposed parking lot into the Lake
   - Increased water runoff of pollution from the proposed transit stop into the Lake
   - Increased noise pollution from the proposed transit stop and proposed parking lot
   - What would be the limitation of the schedule of the proposed transit stop?
   - What would be the limitations of the transit vehicles used at the proposed transit stop?

L. Transportation
   - Please address the added noise, traffic, congestion, light and glare, and pollution from the proposed parking lot on Lake Washington Blvd NE
   - Please address the added noise, traffic, congestion, light and glare, and pollution from the proposed transit stop on Lake Washington Blvd. NE
M. Parking

- Please address the added noise, traffic, congestion, light and glare, and pollution from the proposed parking lot on Lake Washington Blvd NE
- Please address the added noise, traffic, congestion, light and glare, and pollution from the proposed transit stop on Lake Washington Blvd. NE

Please let me know if this is sufficient or needs work. Please feel free to rewrite, add or change this information. Thank you for your time and help.

What will be the plan for the existing million dollar houses on Lake Washington Blvd? and the existing landscaping and trees? The two remaining plans from EDAW show that all the existing landscaping has been torn out and replaced with sterile modern buildings with a few paltry trees?

We had said that we wanted a green open space, and yet the two remaining plans from EDAW show sterile modern buildings. The pier that juts out into the Meydenbauer Bay will be looking into the living rooms of the houses across the Bay. There is no view into Lake Washington or not much.
Thursday November 6, 2008

All parties concerned:
Here are some inputs about the proposed Meydenbauer Park Plan from a resident living at 9804 Lake Washington Blvd NE since 1966. We are not happy about the proposed parking lot and proposed transit stop across from our house. It is disruptive to the neighborhood and traffic flow.

Robin J. Savage
Editor/Researcher
Rsavage@appraisalgroupnw.com
Fax No. 425-455-9740
Honorable Mayor Grant Degginger  
City of Bellevue  
City Hall  
450 110th Avenue NE  
PO Box 90012  
Bellevue, WA  98009-9012  

RR: Meydenbauer Bay Park Plan  

Dear Mayor Degginger:  

This letter is written to address issues that are of concern to us regarding the proposed Meydenbauer Bay Park plan. We see some relevant issues that show shortsightedness in this project, and I will bring them to your attention. I have lived at 9804 Lake Washington Blvd. NE since 1966, attended Bellevue High School. You could say that I am familiar with the area, and have been involved with the growth of the City of Bellevue as a concerned citizen and resident.  

Meydenbauer Bay should be cleaned up before launching into a large, extensive, and encompassing project. I don’t see much thought, will, or plans to clean up Meydenbauer Bay before launching into a massive, extensive remodel of our neighborhood. The City of Bellevue and the City Council don’t seem to be moving toward any action on cleaning up the Bay. There seem to be only more grandiose plans to add volume and degradation to an already overburdened infrastructure. You have a vision; we live in the already overburdened infrastructure and we are asking our government, elected and hired, to respond to our requests.  

Why did the Mayor appoint people to the Committee who do not live in the area in question? What was the selection process the Mayor used to appoint the Committee members to the Meydenbauer Bay Park Committee? How was the pool of people decided and established to populate the Meydenbauer Bay Park Committee? Why were there no residents from the Meydenbauer Bay area are included in the pool of people considered by the Mayor to be appointed to the Committee? The residents of this area would be able to contribute their knowledge of the area to the work on the Park Plan. I find the representation lopsided.  

The proposed parking lot and transit stop on Lake Washington Blvd NE across from our house at 9804 Lake Washington Blvd NE shows shortsightedness and a lack of regard for the environment. The proposed parking lot on Lake Washington Blvd NE would be an impediment to the traffic on Lake Washington Blvd NE, an arterial road. This arterial handles the overflow traffic from Bellevue Way and is vital to moving traffic through Bellevue, especially at rush hour. Commuters are trying to get to the 520 bridge or the Mercer Island Bridge to get home after work. Increased traffic from the proposed parking lot would increase traffic accidents,
starts and stops, and increase travel time on Lake Washington Blvd NE. Buses at the proposed transit stop starting and stopping on Lake Washington Blvd NE will impede traffic flow.

The proposed parking lot on Lake Washington Blvd NE would precipitate turning cars into the parking lot which would impede the flow of Lake Washington Blvd NE traffic. Lake Washington Blvd NE provides an avenue for residents to exercise themselves and their pets, and provides a recreational outlet for the downtown dwellers. Turning cars into the proposed parking lot would compete with the recreation of downtown dwellers. There is no room on Lake Washington Blvd. NE for a turn lane because of the Meydenbauer Bridge. The Meydenbauer Bridge was rebuilt and there is no width for any more lanes. The City of Bellevue will have to learn to live with the limitations of the existing structures and terrain in this small neighborhood.

The proposed parking lot and proposed transit stop on Lake Washington Blvd. NE would precipitate increased starting and stopping of cars, more noise from traffic, more light and glare from cars in the parking lot, more pollution in the air, and increased polluted water runoff into Lake Washington. The proposed parking lot and transit stop will precipitate the degradation of the neighborhood and Lake Washington, and will also affect the quality of life for the existing residents and neighborhood. What kind of restrictions on the schedule of the transit vehicles will be implemented? What restrictions on the size of the transit vehicles would be established so that we would not be getting the double-car buses in our small neighborhood streets? I think that we should initiate a transportation/traffic study for Lake Washington Blvd. NE, and the neighborhood it runs through to get an idea of the limitations that should be implemented for this arterial.

The headlights and glare from cars in the proposed parking lot will beam across the Lake to the living rooms on the other side of the Meydenbauer Bay as well as houses on Lake Washington Blvd. NE. The view from the parking lot will be into the living rooms of the houses across Meydenbauer Bay. Has the company EDAW actually gone down to the street of Lake Washington Blvd NE, and looked in person to see the actual view across the Bay? The view will be of residents cooking dinner, taking out the garbage, sweeping their sidewalks, and cutting their lawns. The sounds of the increased traffic starting and stopping will reverberate in the Bay and the sounds will bounce around the Bay. The pier that juts out into the Bay will be looking into the living rooms of the houses across the Bay on Pickle Point. The pier is very intrusive to such an enclosed area as the Bay.

A better way to access Meydenbauer Bay Park would to combine an entrance at 99th Avenue close to the marina, providing access to the two different sections of the Park: to the right the beach park, and to the left, the marina park. In this manner, you would be providing visitors an easier way to enjoy park. And why not have two beaches in the Park? There is waterfront but not much width to the parcels and there is a slope. 100th Avenue SE is the logical entrance to the other side of the Park at the marina.

We stated that we wanted a green open space for people to be in the nature; yet the plans from EDAW show sterile modern buildings in the park with a few trees here and there. We stated no café; one plan has a café in it. Alternative #1, which was widely liked, has disappeared into 2 plans which both have buildings in the Park. Meydenbauer Park doesn’t have that much depth;
where are the buildings going to go? And what about the existing landscaping and buildings? What will be done with this portion of the neighborhood?

The Meydenbauer Bay has existing activities/features like the sailing school and permanent moorage which should be grandfathered in; why throw the baby out with the bathwater? The Lagen red building should be used for a whaling museum and it would have future use for the Eastside Heritage Group. In the same vein, the marina and moorage should retain permanent moorage. Look to Kirkland to see all the problems they have with transient moorage: drinking, selling drugs from the boats, more pollution, more noise, more traffic. The Bay is an enclosed area; it is very different from the open vista that Kirkland has onto Lake Washington. The pollution from more transient boat traffic will quickly degrade the Bay and promote the growth of milfoil and algae.

Main Street was never meant to be used as a thoroughfare; it is a restaurant/condo/neighborhood street. NE 1st was meant to take some of the through traffic from Main Street. NE 1st accesses the Downtown Park and winds its way into the downtown area via 2nd Street. The City of Bellevue is not making NE 1st Street happen. We had hoped to have Main Street be a walking/shopping/eating street as they have in Europe but that hasn’t happened in Bellevue. Car is King in Bellevue.

We have enough hotels in downtown Bellevue; it seems every part of the downtown area has hotels or motels; even by the Bellevue Club there is a motel. We don’t need any more hotels, especially one on Meydenbauer Bay which is a residential neighborhood.

It would seem that this process is on the fast track for a slap dash finish, rather than taking the time to really figure out what the existing terrain has to offer, and to enhance what currently exists in these areas. Shouldn’t we take the time to really discuss everything, rather than worrying about the clock and the calendar?

As per Agenda Item #2.b, I don’t see that the 2 remaining EDAW plans are responding to the picture painted in this Agenda Item #2.b. We had Alternative #1 which was a green open space as the most popular Alternative; that has been merged into 2 plans, both having sterile modern buildings, intrusive piers, an elevator, superfluous and gratuitous concrete slabs with a few paltry trees here and there...not very green, relaxing or responsive. I don’t find modern sterile buildings matching very well in a passive green open space.

There doesn’t seem to be much interest by the Committee in keeping the Lagen’s red boathouse; the residents of the neighborhood are very interested in keeping the boathouse as a whaling museum, keeping historical Bellevue information herein. The Committee doesn’t seem to have much interest or respect for the existing sailing club; the sailing school is valued by the residents and the people using the sailing school. There is enthusiasm by the Committee for transient motorized moorage in the EDAW plans but not much support for the existing boat owners in the Bellevue Marina, and in the Bay. The existing boat owners could be grandfathered into this Park plan. I think the sailing club, red boathouse, and existing boat moorage should be grandfathered into the Park plan.
I don’t see the parking question being addressed very adequately. Where is the discussion about putting underground parking into the Downtown Park? Finishing the remaining ¼ of the Downtown Park has been on the books for awhile; the Parks bond has been passed so I assume that will be completed. Use your imagination and put underground parking there. People can walk from the Downtown Park to Main Street and down to Meydenbauer Park; people will find their way to the Park.

I don’t see much interest by the Committee, City of Bellevue, or the City Council in a passive green space for people to relax and enjoy the nature. I see intrusive piers jutting out into the Bay, imposing on house dwellers across the Bay, and modern sterile buildings. Having glass elevators jetting up and down is not contributing to a passive green space. People in the Northwest don’t need a lot of props to enjoy nature; we just need an open space and we are easily amused. The powers that be seem to be pushing the motto “Bellevue, a Waterfront City”, but we were under the impression that we were opening the discussion for a green open space where people could relax in the nature. Over time, I have seen the City of Bellevue evolve into tall towers, with no pre-planning for traffic and cars, just more traffic lights. Even New York City has Central Park which is an open green space for city dwellers to relax in the nature. This is turning out to be an expensive mistake at the taxpayers’ expense and I am not amused.

All the best,

Robin J. Savage
Meydenbauer Bay Park Program

(Revised per July 31, 2008 comments)

Meydenbauer Bay Park offers the citizens of Bellevue an opportunity to reconnect their community to Meydenbauer Bay and Lake Washington. Located just blocks from downtown Bellevue, Old Bellevue, and Downtown Park, Meydenbauer Bay Park offers a respite from urban intensity at the same time it represents the community’s most important access to a remarkable and memorable shoreline experience.

The park’s design should fundamentally be grounded in environmental stewardship. Our first question should be, “how does the site function ecologically?” The park’s development should improve and enhance natural drainage and the bay’s water quality, at the same time it offers a visual amenity to surrounding properties and downtown Bellevue. Specific restorative actions, such as day-lighting the creek at the west end of the site, improving natural filtration, improving water quality in the bay, and native vegetation should be high priorities. The park should enhance the bay, both visually and ecologically.

While grounded in our environmental vision, we also see Meydenbauer Bay Park as a remarkable shoreline experience for all of Bellevue’s citizens. A successful design solution for the park will balance environmental stewardship with enhanced access for everybody in Bellevue. We see lots of people using the park in summer and in winter, but not in ways that disrupt degrade natural systems, interfere with native species, or annoy the park’s neighbors. We envision the park as a place that downtown Bellevue users can walk to for a break from the pressure of an intense urban environment – to contemplate a quiet stream; to stick their toes in the lake; to stroll and reflect; to watch or participate in boating activities.

Specifically, we see a variety of activities in the park, including a beach, swimming, picnicking, trails and paths, children’s play, ecological and historical interpretation, and a water’s-edge promenade. The park will continue to host a marina for moorage, as well as new uses such as rowing, canoeing, and kayaking. The whaling building also offers opportunities for programming of activities featuring water-related trades such as boat restoration.

The park should be inclusive of all age groups, pedestrian accessible, and easily reached by water. We should welcome non-motorized marine craft. While the park might be home to a vendor or two, it shouldn’t try to replicate the active, intense, and major events use of Downtown Park.

The park should be inspired by the area’s history, both ecologically and culturally, but the interpretation of this history should not be in the form of a museum.

Perhaps in summary, Bellevue’s Meydenbauer Bay Park should be “a waterfront oasis for all citizens of a burgeoning 21st century city.”

Agenda Item #2.b
Meydenbauer Bay Steering Committee Meeting
September 18, 2008
Please see the comments from Ms. Stoll regarding the project.

I live on SE Shoreland Dr. and like most of my neighbors, welcome the park concept but have some concerns that you have not addressed.

I am concerned about the environment and see you are now going to an EIS. The issues I feel need to be addressed are:

Traffic - with the increased pollution that will occur and with traffic circulation especially if 100th is closed off. What is the plan if there is an evacuation order? Do we have one and how will this be impacted with this closure. We are currently held hostage when the city allows a marathon to run through our neighborhood. Is this what we could expect when there was a real emergency?

Parking.
Noise especially if the plan allows for "events" at the park. Remember noise carries easier across waters. It is great to hear children learning to sail but band concerts, souvenir hawkers or drunk and disorderly transient boaters is not acceptable.

Water quality of the bay. There is silt built up now and we do not have a plan to clean it up on a regular bases. Salmon habitat. Noxious weeds removal?

Safety. We do not even have street lights on our street. We would be using the police much more if we felt our families safety was at risk.

Moorage - Why should residents do without moorage so transient boaters can use new ones?

History- Meydenbauer Bay has a charm because there is such diversity of people and homes. It would be ruined.

Environment- We have come to the understanding that we must manage our resources-- we have to become stewards of the planet. We need to really look at what we are doing and make sure if we do put a shovel in the dirt or remove a tree we know the consequences. The same goes for more steel and cement buildings. Do we really need all this?
Sharen Stoll

9417 SE Shoreland Dr.
Attached is a suggested 3rd alternate to be considered in the EIS. This alternate increases the size of the park by including the Chevron station and the photographer property across from the Chevron into the plan replacing the commercial building south of Main on the Chevron and city property below it with added park and a relocated two lane 100th avenue. This plan allows 100th to be used for access as the area residents desire while providing a walkway from the bay park to Wildwood without crossing 100th. It also integrates the park with Main street far more than the existing alternates 1 & 2 and provides a more attractive connection along 100th to the downtown park.

Ed Sweo

I am a resident of Whaler’s Cove on 99th and Lake Washington Blvd, a member of Meydenbauer Bay Yacht Club and a contributing member of the Meydenbauer Bay Neighbors Association. My wife and I regularly walk in the neighborhood and at the downtown park.

I believe Bellevue will miss a wonderful opportunity to tie the waterfront park to Main Street and the downtown park if all the several hundred feet distance on Main Street between the Astoria condo and the Vue condo is not made an unobstructed view of the water in the park plan. All the alternatives to date have had buildings, raised covered walkways or other obstructions to what would be a beautiful park and water view from this heavily travelled street. There is no better way to make the waterfront a part of the city than by making it visible to the greatest degree possible to all the walkers and drivers on Main Street. Take a stroll along this area of Main to see what I mean!

Ed Sweo

10/31/2008
Submission by Whaler’s Cove Homeowners Association

Meydenbauer Park

Whaler’s Cove Visit

November 4, 2008

Background

24 resident families,


Issues of Concern to Whaler’s Cove

1. Overall Character of the Park Should be Peaceful –
   a. sounds
   b. Intensity of Intended Uses (Retreat Structure, Alternate #2 item #4), Commercial Buildings

2. Preserve Whaler’s Cove Views –
   a. Screening plantings which blocks the view
   b. current landscaping problem with park property
   c. proposed bathroom (Alternate 1 item #12)

6. Parking –
   a. Current problems – Christmas Boats and Blue Angels
   b. should be “invisible” to those using the Park. Current proposals (Alt 1 # 16 and Alt 2 #4)
      i. noise,
      ii. traffic hazard at 99th and Lk Wash Blvd intersection,
      iii. after hours concerns.
   c. 99th Ave. should provide only (Whaler’s Cove visitor parking)
      i. limited parking as it does now.
      ii. drop off zones reserved solely for Marina users.
d. Service –
   i. restricted in size of vehicle and time of day
   ii. Noise The same is true regarding leaf and trash blowers and other gas powered gardening equipment
7. Retain Access for Emergency Vehicles to Whaler’s Cove – Continued access must be included in the plans.
8. stairs and recycle garbage
9. Avoid Commercial Uses
10. Maintain the marina – limited amount of transient moorage.
PARK SUGGESTIONS

Nov 4, 2008

Ed Sweo, 9905 Lake Washington Blvd NE, Bellevue, WA 98004

1. Prefer Alternate 1 for Whalers Cove

   No vendors nearby condo

   Peaceful waterfront park between condo & lake

   Retains both high quality docks

   Keeps transient boats outside inner bay

   Avoids ugly high viewing pier of Alternate 2

2. Suggested Improvements

   Change location of road to marina per sketch, this increases buffering of condo from park and garage entry while also providing direct access to marina short term parking without driving down pathway.

   Move bathroom to west of this road to increase isolation from condo.
Bergstrom, Michael

From: Ed Sweo [edsweo@comcast.net]
Sent: Thursday, November 06, 2008 1:11 PM
To: ‘Ed Sweo’; Degginger, Grant; Brennan, Mike; Paine, Michael; Bergstrom, Michael; Balducci, Claudia; Chelminiak, John; Noble, Phil; Davidson, Don; Lee, Conrad; Bonincontri, Patsy; Terry, Matthew; Foran, Patrick
Cc: Rich Wagner; Ray Waldmann; 'Kevin Austin'; Bob Buckley; Anita Skoog
Subject: RE: Meydenbauer Bay Park
Attachments: Suggested Park Alternate 110108.docx; Suggested Park Alternate 103108.docx

Attached is Alternate 4, an underground variation on the 3rd alternate submitted October 31. Both of these suggested re-routings of 100th Ave provide access from the neighborhoods south of Main to 100th Ave north of main and Lake Washington Blvd west of 100th without increasing congestion on Main Street. Both use the photographer property on the NE corner of Main and 100th for a re-routed 100th that connects to a two lane 100th south of Main. The suggested Alternate 4 undergrounds 100th south of main by combining it with the parking garage entries under the proposed new building adjacent to the Astoria on Main. The suggested Alternate 3 previously submitted routes 100th south of main on the surface in place of this new building.

Ed Sweo

From: Ed Sweo [mailto:edsweo@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, October 31, 2008 10:29 AM
To: ‘Ed Sweo’; ‘gdegginger@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘MBrennan@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘MPaine@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘MBergstrom@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘Cbalducci@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘IChelminiak@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘PBonincontri@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘DDavidson@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘CLee@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘PForan@belleuwewa.gov’
Cc: Rich Wagner (rich@wagnermanagement.com); Ray Waldmann (rwaldmann1@mac.com); 'Kevin Austin'
Subject: RE: Meydenbauer Bay Park

Attached is a suggested 3rd alternate to be considered in the EIS. This alternate increases the size of the park by including the Chevron station and the photographer property across from the Chevron into the plan replacing the commercial building south of Main on the Chevron and city property below it with added park and a relocated two lane 100th avenue. This plan allows 100th to be used for access as the area residents desire while providing a walkway from the bay park to Wildwood without crossing 100th. It also integrates the park with Main street far more than the existing alternates 1 & 2 and provides a more attractive connection along 100th to the downtown park.

Ed Sweo

From: Ed Sweo [mailto:edsweo@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, October 24, 2008 12:03 PM
To: ‘gdegginger@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘MBrennan@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘MPaine@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘MBergstrom@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘Cbalducci@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘IChelminiak@belleuwewa.gov’; ‘PForan@belleuwewa.gov’

11/6/2008
I am a resident of Whaler's Cove on 99th and Lake Washington Blvd, a member of Meydenbauer Bay Yacht Club and a contributing member of the Meydenbauer Bay Neighbors Association. My wife and I regularly walk in the neighborhood and at the downtown park.

I believe Bellevue will miss a wonderful opportunity to tie the waterfront park to Main Street and the downtown park if all the several hundred feet distance on Main Street between the Astoria condo and the Vue condo is not made an unobstructed view of the water in the park plan. All the alternatives to date have had buildings, raised covered walkways or other obstructions to what would be a beautiful park and water view from this heavily travelled street. There is no better way to make the waterfront a part of the city than by making it visible to the greatest degree possible to all the walkers and drivers on Main Street. Take a stroll along this area of Main to see what I mean!

Ed Sweo

11/6/2008
SUGGESTED ALT. 4

Added Park

Relocated 100th - 3 Lanes

Relocated 100th - 2 Lanes Under New Building & Plaza Also Serves as Garage Entry

Garage & 100th Entries & Exits

Scale: 1" = 100' - 0"

M EYDENBAUER BAY PARK & LAND US
Bergstrom, Michael

From: Jim Voelker [Jim.Voelker@infospace.com]
Sent: Monday, October 27, 2008 2:44 PM
To: Degginger, Grant; Balducci, Claudia; Chelminiak, John; Noble, Phil; Davidson, Don; Lee, Conrad; Bonincontri, Patsy; Sarkozy, Steve; Terry, Matthew; Foran, Patrick; Bergstrom, Michael; Cole, Robin; Brennan, Mike; Paine, Michael; Doug Leigh; Iris Tocher
Cc: voelkerfam@yahoo.com
Subject: Meydenbauer Bay

All:

We are writing to express our concerns pertaining to the proposed park development at Meydenbauer Bay. Our home is located on Lake Washington approximately one quarter mile south of the bay. We have owned the property for ten years.

Certainly expansion of the public park in Meydenbauer is desirable. The acquisition of the land adjacent to the park demonstrates solid long term planning and should serve as an excellent method to connect “Old Bellevue” to the lake. However in our opinion, the expansion of commercial activity past its current boundary should be examined very carefully and the introduction of commercial development on the lake should be rejected.

The upside of a few more restaurants and a few more tax dollars does not outweigh the potential for the long term negative environmental impact, the devaluing of the property and lifestyle for those residents near the park and the added congestion and associated problems in the bay. And as currently proposed, the plan to close 100th would significantly diminish traffic flow in an area that is already fairly congested. The expansion of the park along existing lines would allow more people to enjoy the area, without diminishing the enjoyment of current residents. This seems like a reasonable use of the land.

Initially, we were favorable to the idea of a more “lively” public area; yet on further reflection have determined that the City’s proposals are too aggressive and would likely do irreparable harm.

Regards,

Jim and Patty Voelker
415 Shoreland Dr SE
Bellevue, WA. 98004

Jim Voelker | Chairman and Chief Executive Officer

1

InfoSpace, Inc. | 601 108th Ave NE, Ste 1200 | Bellevue, WA 98004 USA
Office +1 425.201.8989 | Mobile +1 206.601.8901 | Fax +1 425.201.6165
jimv@infospace.com | www.infospaceinc.com

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential information that is legally privileged. The information is solely for the use of the intended recipient(s); any disclosure, copying, distribution, or other use of this information is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by return e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.

10/28/2008
Bergstrom, Michael

From: Jennifer Wilkins [jenw1@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2008 10:37 PM
To: Claudia Balducci; Lee, Conrad; Davidson, Don; Doug Leigh; Degginger, Grant; Iris Tocher; Chelminjak, John; Terry, Matthew; Bergstrom, Michael; Brennan, Mike; Paine, Michael; Foran, Patrick; Bonincontri, Patsy; Noble, Phil; Sarkozy, Steve; Cole, Robin

Subject: Bellevue City Park environment

Dear Honorable Mayor Grant Degginger and City Officials,

During the next couple weeks you will be making important decisions regarding the new city park located on Meydenbauer Bay.

As you are aware, Meydenbauer Bay is a narrow, quiet residential bay nestled in the heart of the city. This new bay park could become a natural retreat from the commercial buildings, Bellevue Mall, and all the condominium high-rises that are being developed all over the city. Our citizens need a peaceful bay park to unwind with families and friends. The Bellevue Downtown Park has been a spectacular success with it's elegant, natural beauty and during the warm months it attracts thousands of people who love it.

I hope that you will continue to keep the natural beauty of Bellevue parks so they will attract our residents instead of the high-speed boat crowd from other areas. Meydenbauer Bay is very vulnerable to any change in its environment. Any loud noise from boats or loud people will reverberate all through this quiet, natural reserve/residential area. A commercial park with many transient boaters could be very disruptive to all people who live around the bay. Our other residents: the osprey, eagles, blue heron, red-winged blackbirds, beaver, otter, turtles, and fish would be negatively affected as well.

Please do everything possible to respect this precious bay and all of its Bellevue residents.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Wilkins

363 101st Ave. S.E.
Bellevue, Wa. 98004
425 453-9229

11/12/2008
I/we welcome the idea of having a Meydenbauer Bay Waterfront Park that all Bellevue residents and visitors can enjoy. We live nearby at Bayshore East Condominiums and enjoy walking in this area. This park could be a daily destination point for us, and even for our visitors. The vision that the City Council and Parks Department have in planning such a park is highly commendable. We are grateful that we can participate in the planning sessions of the City’s Steering Committee and that we can contribute our ideas and concerns since the nearby location of the park will impact our every day quality of life.

Our major concerns are:

- Transportation – Main St. is currently severely congested during commuter rush hours and when residents drive to their shopping or errand destinations. We would like to see a comprehensive transportation plan that would assess both vehicular and pedestrian traffic congestion along Main Street that would address current conditions and future conditions with the addition of the Park. Along with this idea, we oppose the closure of 100th/SE Bellevue Place.

- We do not support the loss of permanent moorage at Bellevue Marina. Going from 87 permanent moorage slips down to 18-58 slips will displace 29 to 69 boats. Safe boating in the Bay should be encouraged. Preserving space for the Meydenbauer Yacht Club’s program for young sailors each year is important. Transient boaters often create a disruptive, unsafe environment for families.

- We do not support commercial/retail development in the park or in the residential areas near the park. Because of our amphitheater-like location, these types of development could create noise that would be bounced around the Bay and destroy our tranquility.

- Parking – Parking spaces currently used by residents should be maintained and parking for park users should be created without increased traffic flow to the currently clogged Main St.

- We support a limited number of new low profile structures built in the Park.

- Water quality – The water quality of the Bay needs to be addressed. The build-up of silt has long been a problem. Noxious weeds such as milfoil, water lilies, purple loosestrife, and yellow iris need to be contained. Private money has been spent to treat these noxious weeds, whereas public funds should be used to treat the entire Bay. Meydenbauer Creek, which flows into the Bay from our shoreline, and many aged storm drains empty into the Bay causing pollution of the water. The current conceptual plans for the park address only a small number of the streams and drains that flow into the Bay and should address all of these in order to improve the water quality of the whole Bay.

- Pollution - During periods of heavy rain, water gushes through this creek looking like a mini-Snoqualmie Falls. During periods of no rainfall, the water along the shore becomes stagnant. Prevailing winds flow directly at our buildings so any garbage or diesel spills get trapped along our shoreline.

The new Waterfront Park should be designed to allow Bellevue residents and visitors to visit and escape the busy hustle and bustle of daily life and connect with nature. A low profile display of the historical value of Meydenbauer Bay would be enriching to everyone.

Signed: (Signature)

Address: 363 101st Ave SE

BELL WA 98004
MEYDENBAUER BAY - PARK & LAND USE PLAN - STEERING COMMITTEE 10-30-08

> Alternatives show developments that we can't control.

> Consider roundabout 101st + Main

Lower Pier 1 More Level
L.T. moorage "pay by" 14 RPD = 14 Grant Bond issued = 15, lease paid off
Sailing School should not be a design
Transit could connect to Winter Moore
Keep 1, 2 Beaches?
Transit moorage to West
City must be educated for moorage
Moorage buildings + office commercial
Use another TID support?

Christmas Ships - New Tradition

Need L.T. moorage
Need transient moorage
Good to show co-op open
Consider 1 Way-Narrower-ADA
How does ADA fit? kite parcel?
Need for C1F C2? Need?
Use of lighthouse? Marsden, creation, comment
Life cascading water??
Value of opening upper stream?

Keep Natural. flare.
Expo changing access to docks
Understand new use concept + access
Program, Park - all ages
Lace Bags
Neighborhood concerned about noise in park
(10pm)
Expo - fireworks, eyes, re-planting
Ocean view with more than 350 park - more.

- 2 Beaches
- Walkway out water.
Close co-op, rentals, entry
Close 100th - "memorable museum"
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PUBLIC HEARING

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

MEYDENBAUER BAY PARK AND LAND USE PLAN

October 29, 2008
5:09 p.m.
450 110th Avenue Northeast
Bellevue, Washington

TAKEN AT THE INSTANCE OF THE CITY OF BELLEVUE
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EVA P. JANKOVITS, CCR NO. 1915
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BE IT REMEMBERED that on Wednesday, October 29, 2008, at 5:09 p.m., at 450 110th Avenue Northeast, Bellevue, Washington, the following proceedings were taken before Eva P. Jankovits, a Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public:

PROCEDINGS

MR. SCOTT: Welcome to the Halloween edition of the Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan. We're glad you're all here. My name is Brian Scott. I'm with EDAW. I've been the facilitator of the last few steering committee meetings and public meetings. And we're glad to have you all here tonight. And I see a lot of familiar faces. I'm glad you're here.

There's been one kind of twist in the road since the last steering committee meeting. And that is that the City, based on the input they've been getting from the community, decided that they were going to do a full environmental impact statement for this project. And that is basically to allow the community, all of you, more opportunity for input into the project.

What that does is have an impact on the schedule, however, but it means we're going to have more community meetings and more analysis of the project than in the original plan that we gave you.
So tonight the meeting has two purposes. The first purpose, which I'm going to turn over in just a second, is the formal, official scoping meeting for the City's environmental impact statement. And Michael Paine with the City of Bellevue is going to lead that.

The second half of the meeting is really a separate meeting, but we told you we were going to have a public meeting on the alternatives tonight, so we're doing it. And so for the next hour and a half or so, Michael's going to lead us in the formal scoping meeting for the EIS, and then in the second half of the meeting, starting at about 6:30, we're going to move into a further discussion of the alternatives for the Meydenbauer Bay Park and Land Use Plan. And we'll have a presentation of those and then break out at various tables to talk about various aspects of that and get your input. So it's kind of two meetings tonight. And the first half is the formal scoping meeting for the EIS, so I'm going to turn it over to Michael Paine to lead that.

MR. PAINE: Good evening. My name's Michael Paine. I work for the Department of Health and Services, and I am the environmental coordinator which simply means that in this case, I'm responsible for
the integrity and the process by which the EIS is put
together, so eventually it will be my name on the
bottom line when the EIS goes out for the City of
Bellevue.

So we're going to start off a little bit just
talking briefly about what this process is about, what
SEPA is, and another little bit about what we can
expect to talk about tonight with respect to the
scope, the precise scope of the EIS.

So, first, what's SEPA? Well, SEPA is the State
Environmental Policy Act. That was an act for the
state of Washington that was passed after a citizen
initiative in the '70s. And it effectively obligates
state and local government to policies of
environmental concern and protection. It sets up
elaborate procedural frameworks for considering
environmental consequences in actions that cities or
agencies take. They're typically permitting agencies.

In this case, we're looking at a master program
or a master plan for a -- for park and land use
changes, and we're looking at it with what's called a
programatic standpoint which simply means we're
looking at it in a very general way and not a specific
way as we might if we were looking at a specific
project for which permits will be issued.
And what SEPA does is it gives authority to the local government to make decisions on the basis of environmental quality and values. And there's an elaborate mechanism by which that happens. We don't need to talk about that. But, nevertheless, the overall impact is that decision-makers, your council, for example, must consider environmental issues before they make a decision.

So when is an EIS required and what is it? An EIS is a comprehensive analysis of environmental impacts of a range of alternatives, including a no action alternative, which means everything sort of stays the same. So the idea is you pick a series of alternatives and you compare them against the baseline of no action.

An EIS is required when there's a likelihood of more than a moderate adverse impact or when a city chooses to review the issues in more depth. And we've chosen to do that because of the latter case.

It typically identifies the impacts of each alternative on various elements of the environment, always going back to the no action alternative as a grounding. You know, that's the baseline. We typically issue the draft EIS first. There's a comment period after the draft EIS. And then we issue
an FEI, so a final EIS.

Now, we may choose to hold a public hearing like this. It's a little more formal. This is a scoping meeting, but a little more formal public hearing to go over comments and to take testimony about the adequacy and the impacts and the issues addressed in the draft EIS.

The draft EIS takes quite a while to do, so I think the project team can tell you that the consultants will go away, work on this for quite a while, come back, the City will review it in depth, will finally issue it, and then at some previous -- at some point, then we may hold an additional meeting.

Okay. The process of -- what is scoping? So scoping is a process by which we try to narrow the range of issues that we've discussed in the EIS. And, you know, when you -- when you're doing an environmental impact statement, there is an infinite number of issues that you could address. The environment is a very complex concept, and there's an enormous number of interactions that one can spend time on. Our whole purpose here in the scoping is to try to narrow the analysis to the most important issues, the issues for which we're most concerned about.
So I guess I'll skip the second bullet, but generally, comments should be confined, and in this purpose -- you know, in this circumstance, comments should be confined to the range of alternatives, the environmental elements identified for study, the need for additional meetings, and the likely mitigation measures.

So, for example, tonight, if you're not satisfied with the range of alternatives that are addressed, in other words, you'd like to see a different alternative, you can get up and make an argument for that. What we don't want to hear is, Gee, I don't like any of them. That's just not very useful in this process. It might be useful in another process, but it's not useful in this process.

We need to hear specific precise information. We think this alternative is fine. This alternative really doesn't address the range of impacts appropriately. We'd like to see you put in another alternative, that sort of thing. You might also say, Gee, I know something that you don't. There's all kinds of problems here that you have not addressed to date in the planning process, and we think the EIS ought to address that.

And now I'm going to pass it back to Michael
Bergstrom, and he will talk about the proposed action.

MR. BERGSTROM: If I can avoid that beep.

Electronics.

So I'm Mike Bergstrom. I'm one of the project managers for this proposal. And we came up with -- I'm going to call this a nutshell description even though it looks pretty wordy of what this project is about. Basically, this is a project which is based on many years of comprehensive plan language that the City has adopted through the various processes since the 1980s. But it's to develop a long-range master plan for, A) a public park along the waterfront of Meydenbauer Bay and, B) to study land uses on nearby upland properties in order to improve visual and physical access from downtown and adjacent areas to that waterfront park but in a manner -- and this is the last -- kind of last half of that paragraph -- in a manner that is consistent with the City of Bellevue comprehensive plan policies, policies contained in our park and open space system plan, as well as the planning principles that are approved by the city council for this project.

The planning principles are referenced in our determination of significance and scoping notice. They're just kind of headlined in there in a long
paragraph. Copies of that notice are on the table if you don't have one. The 12 planning principles are also on a separate sheet in their full text on that table if you'd like to review those.

Next slide.

This is a map showing city owned properties. Outlined in white, you can see Downtown Park pretty much in the center of the slide. And then the properties kind of down toward the right edge of this drawing is Wildwood Park, an existing park that I think you're all familiar with. And then the properties that the City owns along the waterfront and leading up to past 100th Southeast up toward Main Street. And it's those properties in the white outline south of Main Street primarily to South Lake Washington Boulevard where we're focusing most of our attention, but not all.

The land use plan that I referred to with the last slide addresses the intervening properties between that waterfront area and Downtown Park generally. And we -- over time, we came to review a couple subsets of that area as the upper block and the area south of Main. This is giving me all sorts of things.

So upper block is generally in this area. North
Lake Washington Boulevard, south of Northeast 99th --
or Northeast First Street, and between 99th Avenue
Northeast and 100th Avenue Northeast. The area that
we called south of Main, generally, in that area, kind
of the reference point would be the Chevron station,
and there's property that's around that primarily to
the south.

What we are doing in looking at those two
areas -- next slide -- is we wanted to get to look at
the land use patterns and see if those might be
modified through zoning incentives to help them create
certain public aspects that would support and interact
with the new waterfront park.

So, again, that might be view corridors. It
might be pedestrian corridors that are midblock. It
might be other types of public amenities that kind of
tell you or convey a message that there's a waterfront
park nearby and makes you want to go down there and
kind of communicate that interaction.

So early on we looked at a variety of what
those -- variety of possible incentives, but in the
upper block what -- where we've ended up at least
temporarily, there's no recommendation or decision
yet, but where we are in that upper block is to look
at increasing density to the extent that it might tip
the balance to make somebody want to redevelop an older property. A lot of the old -- a lot of the properties in that block contain older buildings built in the 1950s and 1960s. They're not very attractive, so maybe there's some way of enticing them to build new.

And the -- what's reflected in the alternatives which shows an -- a possible increase in density, the zoning in that -- in the majority of that block currently allows 30 dwelling units per acre, so it's mostly a multifamily zone. There's a portion of it that's some office. But allowing 30 units per acre, a lot of the properties are developed to a higher density than that. In fact, there's one that's developed to 60 units per acre already. And some are, like, around 40 and then some down to the 30 area. So what could be offered to get those properties to tear down and build something new and improve the street state, the pedestrian experience walking around the block.

So the alternative in that area -- next slide -- the -- again, the existing zoning is mostly R30. There's a portion adjacent to 100th Northeast which is "O," which means "office," but the potential reflected by the alternatives would establish a new zone or an
overlay zone or a similar mechanism to allow them to
develop up to approximately 60 units per acre on that
R30 portion.

However, they could not increase the allowable
height, so that the current height limitations in that
lot would remain, which are about 40 feet is how you
could -- the height you can build to now. And, also,
no changes to the range of uses that could be -- that
can occur within that block. So it's strictly a
density thing. There would likely be corresponding
changes to setbacks or lot coverage to allow that
extra density to fit within existing height limits.

The area south of Main, this is kind of a
combination, again, looking at increasing the density
on some of the parcels in that block, allowing some
retail expansion but no change to, again, allowable
building height, so whatever rules are in place now,
parcel by parcel, will remain in place.

But in exchange for some features such as shared
underground parking, pedestrian connections to
Wildwood Park over to the new waterfront park,
provisions for public places whether they're overlooks
or plazas, similar features, art and water features,
and activation of the pedestrian environment. As
people walk down to the park, are they going by
something interesting that makes that journey pleasant?

Next slide.

So, again, this block is divided into two zoning districts currently. The parcels that front Main Street, the Chevron, the Astoria, are in a downtown zone. And it's a subzone of downtown called Old Bellevue. And there's a variety of subzones through the downtown. And that zone allows a wide range of uses: Retail, office, hotel, residential. And then the remainder is R30, similar to the bulk of the upper block that I described.

So the potential reflected on the alternatives is as follows: The zoning on Chevron would stay as is, but a new zone or overlay zone would extend down across two other ownerships. The -- one of the City owned parcels, which is the Eastern Bayview Village Apartment site, which is directly south of Chevron, and then an ownership south of that, which is Meydenbauer Apartments.

And what the zoning envisions here is that on that Bayview parcel, around both parcels, the -- the density would be increased to roughly 60 units per acre. And why I say roughly or approximately is because we may address this through a different
mechanism such as floor area ratio, FAR, which
measures things -- measures development potential
differently than a strict number of units per acre.
It has more to do with kind of matching the volume of
built space under the site where it sits, but we're
aiming for about that target, 60 units per acre, and
then again on the Bayview Village piece but not on the
Meydenbauer Apartment piece, allowing some retail on
that property to help activate the pedestrian
experience. And, again, no change of heights, and
other than the Bayview piece, no change in the
allowable uses.

I'll turn this over to David.

MR. BLAU: Hello. I'm Dave Blau,
representing the planning design consultant team. We
have a number of members here in the audience.

There were a number of questions before folks
sat down about what's the difference between tonight
and tomorrow night, the steering committee meeting,
and let me just try to clarify that a bit.

Part 1 tonight is formal scoping. And that
takes input on both the upland land use area that
Michael just described, as well as the park
alternatives. In the second hour and a half tonight,
we will go into more depth in how those park
alternatives have be refined, and we will also show you the pros and cons of keeping 100th Avenue open or closed as part of the park plan. We will also get into a very light overview of the traffic analysis work that our team has done. Tomorrow night, where the steering committee will be all focused on the park at 100th Avenue and the traffic and park study with a little more depth tomorrow night, but essentially we'll give you a preview tonight of the materials that -- it will be the same materials that we'll use for tomorrow night.

So as far as the EIS goes, we have upland use action, we have the park master plan as an action, two interrelated actions. So here again there will be a no action that would be analyzed, as well as several alternatives. And if you have attended past workshops, the first alternative puts a heavy emphasis on education. It daylights the entire ravine and creek, creates a new wetlands area at the mouth of the creek. There's adjustments in a new pier. There is stormwater daylighting at both ends of the park. And it's used in these terraces and as one progresses down to the water.

So this scheme will be analyzed, Brian, as well as a second alternative which put more of an emphasis
on the civic and urban edge theme. We do a partial
daylighting here, a different configuration and study
of the mooring, a very different approach to coming
down and out over the water, scaled down from our last
drawings at our last set of workshops.

And then we will also examine the pros and cons
of 100th Avenue, open or closed, inside of these two
alternatives. So we will show that in the second half
of tonight's workshop.

MR. PAINE: Well, I wanted to say a little
bit about how we should proceed tonight. And one of
the things to remember is that you don't -- if you
want to make a verbal comment, that's wonderful, and
you can do so. We'll have the microphone set up here,
and we'll have you come up and make a comment. You
also have comment sheets over here you can fill out.

If you've already sent a letter, don't repeat
what you've already said in the letter. That doesn't
really make any difference. Sometimes numbers means a
lot in different forums. They don't mean anything in
this forum. What we're really interested in here is
specific pieces of information about the alternative.
So keep your comments specific and to the point.

And as I mentioned before, you want to talk
about the range of reasonable alternatives, so, you
know, if you're going to talk about alternatives, one
of the most important things to say is have we --
whoa.

MR. SCOTT: Too much?

MR. PAINE: Too much.

Have we got the range in there that you think's
appropriate. And by "range," I mean sort of the
bookends. So, you know, something at one end and
something more at the other end. So low development,
high development, just as an example.

And then are there environmental impacts that
were on the initial description of the project that we
announced the scoping meeting on with -- are there
some that weren't there and that you think should be
considered, so raise that issue. Raise the issue
about a methodology and, by that, simply, you know, do
you have some clear picture about how we ought to go
about looking at certain types of impacts and
alternatives. And is there other information that
you'd like to provide us that you think would make the
document better?

And then, of course, are there some mitigation
measures? If you've already identified in your mind
certain impacts, do you have some ideas about how they
might be mitigated?
So if you want to comment on the scope, I'm going to have you come up to the microphone. You need to begin by identifying yourself because we want -- we're keeping a record which will show up in a scoping report in the EIS, so you will actually see your initial scope and your name, perhaps anyway. Spell your name. Give your address. If you represent an organized group, say so. Limit your comments to the three minutes. And we may -- we may be more flexible depending on how many of you really want to speak. And remember, it's a scoping meeting, so focus on the issues that are appropriate tonight.

Now, how many people think they want to give a verbal comment tonight?

Well, I think what we'll do is just start over here and go from there, okay? Remember to identify yourself.

MR. SCHWEET: Okay. My name is Rick Schweet.

MR. PAINE: Hold the mic up to your...

MR. SCHWEET: Rick Schweet, S-c-h-w-e-e-t.

Closer? Okay. Could we leave the lights down, please? It just helps it.

I'm supposed to identify where I live. I live right there. I own a unit at The View at Meydenbauer
Bay. That's probably as close to this project as anybody. And first of all, I want to say that it's a great opportunity for the city. I appreciate the effort that the paid and unpaid professionals that put into that whole project. It's a great opportunity, and I'm certainly behind it 100 percent.

My only concern is -- you know, the reason I purchased here -- or the residents of this little community here enjoy a serenity and tranquility that is, you know, really the benefits of living on the bay. And I invite anybody to come and sit in my unit 24 hours a day. It's a very tranquil, serene setting.

And one of these alternatives to me is -- maintains that better than the other, and I just want to bring up that concern that whatever you do, if possible, it would be nice for us that the people that have purchased units here and paid considerable sums to have this serene environment, that you consider maintaining that environment for us.

And, specifically, I just -- I know that Alternative 1, you know, takes away the pier here, which is a terrific idea, it's a little bit ugly, but this is really a serene area because boating, by definition, is finished by, you know, dark, and, you know, it's quiet all the time.
So my opinion is Alternative 1 for me is more interesting just from the fact Alternative 2 has this additional pier and public-use docking --

MR. BERGSTROM: One minute.

MR. SCHWEET: Okay. Thank you. -- that, you know, without safeguards on when people can use this, would people be allowed to use this pier at midnight or one in the morning regardless, you know, I just -- my personal opinion is Alternative 1 maintains the serene and tranquil environment for the residents of these units here.

So thank you very much.

MR. BERGSTROM: Thanks.

MS. GEORGETTE: Good evening. My name is Madelaine -- want me to spell that?

M-a-d-e-l-a-i-n-e, Georgette, G-e-o-r-g-e-t-t-e. I live at 10,000 Meydenbauer Way, Unit 6, Bellevue, 98004.

I'm speaking as an individual as well as on behalf of the Meydenbauer Neighborhood Association. And my first comment is regarding process.

In my former career, I was involved in environmental consulting and worked as a public involvement facilitator. And while I know that the City of Bellevue is well within the law, the
requirements of SEPA with regard to notification and
everything, I'm deeply disappointed and upset, and I'd
like other people to, if they agree with me, to please
stand up that you're only allowing 24 hours for
comment from the scoping meeting.

I personally have held scoping meetings for
projects in the Greater Puget Sound area for small
cities on the Eastside, as well as King County, and
you're following the process -- the SEPA process by
law. You are conforming with the law, but you're not
conforming to the spirit of the law, which is to
maximize opportunities for public input.

Basically, most people will not track this
project online. And so they're here tonight to get
the information, and you're giving them 24 hours to
provide comment. I really don't think that that is
fair. And I'm very disappointed. And I'd like to
know if there's anyone in this room who agrees with
me, and would they please stand up.

Thank you.

Twenty-four hours isn't enough. This is a
complex project.

My second point, if I may quickly, is, I would
like to see an alternative because, putting the park
aside, the upland zoning, you're proposing going from
R30 to R60. I would like to see a compromise alternative that might go to R45. You're providing us with the two -- two good alternatives for the park that show a variety of development, but you're not giving us any alternative on the master plan. And I feel that's very unfortunate and would like to request that one be provided. Thank you.

MR. BLAU: How much time would you think you'd need for -- as opposed to 24 hours?

MS. GEORGETTE: I think the public's entitled to at least a week, personally. I think that would be fair, gives the people an opportunity to study these.

Now, I personally went online. I printed all of the alternatives and I couldn't see -- I couldn't read them. They were unreadable as printed off -- off of the screen. So you'd have to go down to Kinko's, blow them up.

I also know that the scoping meetings that I held on behalf of King County Solid Waste Department with regard to the siting of an incinerator, which fortunately was never developed, and it led to the great recycling program that King County now provides, that we gave people two weeks input after a scoping meeting.
Because these are complex projects, we also provided people with handouts of the alternatives and such information in paper form. And I think that the public's entitled to that. Thank you.

MR. PAINE: If you need two weeks, you have two weeks.

MS. GEORGETTE: Thank you. Much appreciated.

MR. EVANS: My name is John Evans, and I live in Whaler's Cove, which is a condominium just above the marina, so I have a pretty good feel for that area.

The first thing I'd like to talk about is the demand --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Would you hold that to your mouth a little bit?

MR. EVANS: -- the demand for access to this particular area of the lake. Twice a year we notice people coming to our area for a matter of about four hours each time. One time is when the Blue Angels fly over, the people drive down 99th, and they park at the bottom and they watch the Blue Angels fly over, and then they hop in their automobiles and they depart as soon as the Blue Angels depart.

The other time that we see a lot of activity is
when the Christmas ship comes around. And the
Christmas ship comes to the head of Meydenbauer Bay,
and they stop and they sing. And I don't know how
many of you have heard this, but it's really quite
remarkable, because singing over water doesn't work
very well. So you get this kind of a low murmur and
rumble and so on. And then after they have satisfied
themselves -- I assume that it sounds quite good if
you're on the ship, but they sing to each other and
then they take their ship and they go away, and we
know that we're going to be without musical excitement
for a whole year.

The point that I'm going to make is that this
has to be one of the silliest things I have ever
looked at. There is no demand for anything on
Meydenbauer Bay. There is plenty of -- there are
plenty of moorages, and most of the time most of them
are empty.

MR. BERGSTROM: One minute.

MR. EVANS: What?

MR. BERGSTROM: One minute remaining.

MR. EVANS: Okay. Well, suffice it to say,
I don't think I have ever seen anything that is as
amusing in concept and performance as this little
development that we're looking at here. Foolish is
not the word for it.

MR. NADEN: I was just told to stand up. I think I speak better if I'm sitting down, but I will try to be as brief as possible.

My name is Tom Naden. I live at 101 Meydenbauer. It's a very secret place just south of the Meydenbauer Bay Yacht Club. And you can't get there from the street. You have to turn down the alley. We're right on the end of Meydenbauer Bay.

I'm concerned about Meydenbauer Bay filling in and becoming a nonbay. The things that do that, of course, are siltation and washing of materials down the various waterways. I think it would be very important in your -- in your study to address siltation -- silt -- yeah, siltation of the bay.

I oppose transient boats coming in because I think it should be a park for Bellevue people and not for the boating public from the other part of Lake Washington. There are plenty of places for them to go. And this is a residential area.

I feel that you should study the effect of transient boats, garbage, noise, fumes, and so forth. I think that you should be very careful as to how you use fertilizer on all of the grass you're going to put in there because it does wash down into the bay. That
should be a primary concern. And I'm sure there are ways of taking care of that.

On the lower block, adding additional retail I feel results in additional pollution from noise, garbage, fumes, and so forth. And I would like to have a very close study on the effect of retail outlets down in that area. I think there are plenty of them up on Main Street, where they ought to be.

The last thing that really disturbs me is traffic. I go up to the intersection of Main Street and 101st Southeast every day, day in and day out, and that's a horrible intersection. And I am sure that with the present building that we have, plus changing the density in the upper block from 30 to 60 is going to make Main Street a zoo of cars, probably as bad as Northeast 8th, if not worse.

And I must tell you, the only way to navigate around this part of the area that I live in down there is to stay on foot. And then you look at all those traffic jams and you feel good about taking care of your health and keeping away from the traffic. Thank you.

MR. PAINE: Is there anybody else that wants to speak?

There are more of you suddenly wanting to speak
than you said.

MR. HANNAH: Yeah. Scott Hannah,
Meydenbauer Bay Yacht Club.

THE COURT REPORTER: Can you spell your
name?

MR. HANNAH: Meydenbauer Way, of course. I
won't mention a couple of things --

MR. SCOTT: Sir, can you spell your name,
please?

MR. HANNAH: Okay. If it's already been
discussed. Of course, 100th, the closure would be a
great imposition on the yacht club as we only have two
ways to get in and out of the yacht club now, and so
you'd be eliminating 50 percent.

The other one, of course, is moorage. We have
members that have boats over in the moorage. And we
just plain love boats. I think everybody else does.
It's just that simple.

The two items that are probably touched on a
little lightly is that we like the alternative that
gets the daily visitors away from our yacht club, and
that's our Pier 3, which is adjacent to the city
marina. The reason is that our youth sailing team is
a club that is at the end of that pier. And you've
got kids in eight-foot plywood sailboats with lessons
tipping over in the water all around that area. And if you use the east end of the city marina for daily, you know, moorage, you'd have speedboats and little kids in sailboats into each other, and that'd be a mess.

Another thing that's touched on, the last man just mentioned, and it's goes under the idea of care of the bay. And besides dredging, it's also weed control. Weed control is Parks Department, dredging is Utilities Department. We've received written word that the City does not want to touch dredging. We don't want to go there, don't want to talk about it.

We have one agreement with the City that they dredge on our property just outside on the water, of course, where there's an outfall. We gave them an easement through the property for an outfall. And when the level of the dirt, the silt gets up to a certain level, then they come and dredge it. And they recently hauled out somewhere between 15 and 18 truckloads of silt and stuff, so there is runoff. And there's several more outfalls that are on City property. These need to be addressed.

As far as this care of the bay, I would like to see some comprehensive --

MR. BERGSTROM: One minute.
MR. HANNAH: -- program or agreement that would be done between, you know, the yacht club, the residents, and the City. I mean, the residents -- the shoreline owners and the City. It's kind of a coalition of people.

Or just to back up a minute, I've had several people, architects and city people say, What does this have to do with the park? And, simply, what it has to do with the park is that we're going to be looking at a swamp if we don't take care of this bay. So I think it's an integral part of the whole program. Thank you.


MR. ROEHR: John Roehr, R-o-e-h-r. I live in Medina, 2233 77th Avenue Northeast, for 45 years. I do have a boat in Bellevue Marina. I'm concerned about two things, and already one has been mentioned, and that is access.

The streets are relatively narrow. Obviously more accoutrements and plants are going to be making it more pleasant, but fire trucks, emergency medical vehicles are two things that occasionally use the street. And with higher density, there will be more turnaround space. Over in our area there are
clear-cut specifications for turnarounds for fire
trucks.

The other thing that bothers me is the
devaluation of an asset by limiting access. And of
course, that would affect the -- the yacht club. More
important, the Bellevue Marina will have no value if
it has no parking. If you limit it to a few minutes,
there's no way boats could be loaded, unloaded, cars
can be left for day runs over at the fuel dock, et
cetera, et cetera. So access and ability to get
through there.

It appears that the road is an extension from
the -- in front of the yacht club through the marina.
Well, that'd be one way. How would it be utilized for
people who use the marina? Thank you.

MR. PAINE: This gentleman first.

MR. PETERSON: Good evening. My name is
Marvin Peterson. I'm the president of the Meydenbauer
Bay Neighbors Association. I live at 9840 Southeast
Shoreline Drive in Bellevue.

First I want to thank this whole group here
because we, as a group, as an association, we really
respect what you folks are doing, and we are for a
park. I want to say that again: We are for a park.
And sometimes the messages out there seems to think
that we're in conflict with you, but we're not.

And we last week had a meeting at the Overlake
Golf and Country Club. We mailed 1,300 mailers out.
We had well over a hundred people show up for this
meeting. And it was very, very informative. And we
hit on four subjects, and the four subjects are bullet
points that we feel we would like to be working
practically with you to resolve these issues so each
will benefit.

The first one happens to be, as many people
discussed, the closure of 100th. As we all know,
we're very concerned about the future traffic problems
on Main Street, a two-lane road that allows us to be
restricted and traffic I can see in the future. I
believe you have plans. It'll be a one-way, perhaps
eastbound, and then Northeast Second might be one way
the other way. I don't know.

But closing 100th restricts you from using any
arterial going from south to north using a light at
102nd, and it's 20 feet wide, and there's no way to
expand on that. It's a big issue, and we certainly
love the idea that you've added the option with the
alternative one-on-two package.

The second issue again is retail and
commercialization of the park. And, you know, the
last steering meeting we had, it was, again, very
unanimous in the audience that people did not want to
have retail in the park. And tonight, and as we go
forward, gentlemen, if you'd show to us the building
and facilities that you have in these designs what you
really plan there. That has concern for us, and I'm
sure we can get that resolved.

Moorage: Well, you know what; I have a boat
out. I live on a lake. I'm not over at the marina,
but I can tell you that what we need to worry about is
you can't replace moorage.

MR. BERGSTROM: One minute.

MR. PETERSON: Thank you. Thanks, Mike.

And we need to do the moorage. And we need to
keep it as much as possible. I don't know what the
answer is there. I would love to see Pier 3 stay. We
would love to have everybody that rents that space
stay. It adds to the bay. Looking at the lines in
the scape is something really nice to look at.

The other issue is the quality of water. Scott
talked about that. That's a big issue. The other one
is, again, rezoning. And we need to be very careful
about the rezone issues and understanding where we're
going with that. Once we have clarification on that,
we'll be with you I'm sure and you'll be with us.
And I'd like to thank you. We have a scoping clause we sent to the City, and I have copies of it. If anybody wants it, it's very helpful for you to understand what kind of questions we ask. It's to the benefit of the city and the residents, and we thank you again for all your hard work.

MR. PAINE: I think this gentleman was first.

MR. SWEO: My name is Ed Sweo. I live at Whaler's Cove along Meydenbauer Yacht Club. I'm involved in youth sailing, and the particular detail of Plan 1 that shows the land extended at the bottom of what's now 100th cuts off our ability to put those floats in the little indent which you can see on the plan. I can go over that with somebody, but, essentially, you stretch the land out and cut off our access, which I'll go over in detail with anybody that wants to do that.

I like the park so well, I'd like to see it go further and extend it over where the Chevron station is, perhaps across the street where the photographer is. And if you wanted to, you can even push 100th over a couple hundred feet and you can have an even bigger park with lots of views from the street which isn't real -- isn't much in the present plans.
And I'd like to -- and I'd like to then see us eliminate all commercial activity within the park.

Thank you.

MR. PAINE: Remember, if you're going to propose a new alternative, call it out so we know you're serious.

MS. NEIL: I'm Anita Skoog Neil, 9302 Southeast Shoreline Drive, Bellevue, Washington.

I just wanted to briefly highlight because Marv mentioned that we had done a pretty extensive letter to the City -- I'm in the way -- but anyway, I wanted to tell you because a lot of us -- most of us have never been through this kind of process before, so the kind of items in this letter, and there's several questions.

There's land use that's addressed, and this thing is 13 pages long. Aesthetics; lighting; historical and cultural preservation; earth; air; noise; water; flora; animals, which includes, of course, mammals; fish, and birds; public services; funding; transportation; and parking.

And like Marv said, we did bring some extra copies, and if we don't have enough, you can mail us your e-mail address and we can e-mail it to you.

I think, for those of you that have never been
involved in this, to see what we wrote up will give you a pretty good idea of if there are items missing that are really of importance to you. So we think we did a, you know, pretty complete job, but we probably missed some things, so anyway. So Marv and I are back here, and that's what I wanted to add.

MR. PAINE: Anybody else?

MS. STOLL: I'm Sharon Stoll, 9417 Southeast Shoreline Drive in Bellevue, Washington.

The one thing I've not heard is anything about safety. I don't have a boat. I just like driving my car. What I have found, though, is that noise carries quite -- well, if you're on land, it carries across the water. And I've heard that in one thing that there was going to be a band concert at the park, so I think what I would ask is your definition of a park, what you see as happening at this park from all of the things.

The other thing is safety. We have no street lights. We don't have any street lights on Shoreline Drive. And I do believe that with the increased boat traffic coming in from transients, we can see more challenges to the property. And the police would be used greatly. I think they need to know that this could be a potential problem for them, too. Thank
you.

MR. PAINE: Okay. We've got a few more
maybe and then we'll close this part of the meeting --
scoping meeting and let the meeting continue in a more
informal way.

MR. REEVES: I am Bill Reeves, 10047 Main
Street.

I am wondering what will determine whether
there's another meeting like this after the draft EIS.
You said there may be another meeting. How will we
know if there is going to be one, and what will
determine if there's going to be one?

MR. PAINE: Is that a question you want me
to answer?

MR. REEVES: Yes.

MR. PAINE: Oh, okay.

MR. REEVES: Whoever wants to answer it. I
just think we --

MR. PAINE: Right.

MR. REEVES: -- we need to know that for
ground rules.

MR. PAINE: Okay. The City's rules allow a
meeting, in other words, they say a meeting may be
held. It's not mandatory. With a project of this
size and scope and complexity and controversy, it will
probably be held.

MR. REEVES: How are we going to find out if it will be held and will there be some kind of notice?

MR. PAINE: I see. So when the draft is published, okay, when the draft is published, there's a 30-day comment period. And you will get notice of that, and it will, in that 30-day comment period somewhere, we will schedule a meeting, a public hearing to talk about the EIS.

MR. REEVES: Okay. So there will be one.

MR. PAINE: That's -- I think it would be impossible for us to say there wouldn't, but, yes, absolutely.

MR. REEVES: I don't -- you know, I don't understand what you're saying to me.

MR. PAINE: Yes.

MR. REEVES: Is there going to be --

MR. PAINE: We will --

MR. REEVES: -- a meeting or isn't there?

MR. PAINE: We will have a meeting.

MR. REEVES: Okay. Fair enough.

MR. PAINE: And I think there's one other thing to mention that if people ask -- if people request in writing that that comment period be extended, that also can happen. And that's one of
the -- one of the requirements that -- or one of the
options that we have, when enough people make it clear
they can't get sufficient comments in on the draft
that -- sometimes drafts are difficult to review, I
readily admit it. They're big documents. So you can
also do that, but you need to request that in writing.

So is that clear on the process?

MR. REEVES: Not really.

MS. GEOGRETTE: Could you please address
another problem question? You said that this is a
programatic EIS.

MR. PAINE: Yes.

MS. GEOGRETTE: Could you explain what
happens between the final problematic EIS and the time
in which you would develop specific alternatives for
parks development. And would that then have an EIS as
well?

MR. PAINE: This will probably be the only
EIS for this project, but we can't know that until we
know what the Parks Department wants to do in the
future. In other words, they -- they've got
alternatives that they're analyzing in the documents.
They may, ten years from now, finally have the funding
to do it. SEPA still will apply and will have to go
through a process of looking at whether or not it's
appropriate to do an EIS or not on whatever it is that
they actually end up building.

MS. GEORGETTE: So at this point in time,
there's no identifiable time frame between the final
programatic EIS and park development.

MR. PAINE: I think you need to address that
question to the -- to the Parks Department and to Mike
Bergstrom, the project manager. But I would assume
it's very much dependent on funding.

MR. BERGSTROM: There's no definite time
frame at this point.

MS. GEORGETTE: Thank you very much.

MR. PAINE: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Question on
notification. We just started watching the permit
notices and noticed when the -- when the notice came
out about the EIS. Are we going to get better
notification about the meeting on the draft EIS?

MR. PAINE: That is the notification that
the City provides. So --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It comes out in the
permit notices?

MR. PAINE: The permit notice. What you --
what you ought to do as well is watch the project Web
site where most of this information will be
regurgitated and you'll -- you'll actually get notices there about changes.

For example, since you have been rather adamant about extending the scoping period until the 12th, that will come out on the Web site. Mike will probably post that so that -- that you are reminded that you have until the 12th.

Yes.

MS. GEORGETTE: Would it be possible to send a notice to all people who've made scoping comments in the scoping process that the draft EIS is available?

MR. PAINE: That is -- whoever makes comments on the draft EIS gets that specific notice.

That's correct.

MS. GEORGETTE: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, just -- but in addition to that, since the Parks Department does have a whole lot of our e-mail addresses, wouldn't it be pretty easy to e-mail us and let us know?

MR. PAINE: That's something can -- they're welcome do.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

MR. PAINE: You just need to -- but as far as our legal requirements, that's not how we do the notice.
Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is there funding for this in this proposition for -- that's coming up that we vote for on Tuesday?

MR. BERGSTROM: No. No.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It isn't.

MR. SCOTT: The question was, is funding for this in the current parks levy. The answer was no.

MR. PAINE: Last question.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it appropriate to have in the scoping pedestrian access amenities? I walk down there all the time, and that's a concern of mine.

MR. PAINE: Is it appropriate to have pedestrian amenities in the scoping process to raise that question? Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She said scope -- she said access and amenities.

MR. PAINE: Access and amenities. So would you like that recorded?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Mm-hm (answers affirmatively).

MR. PAINE: So why don't you make that comment and then we'll -- give your name.

MS. WORTHEN: My name is Jean Worthen,
W-o-r-t-h-e-n. I live at 10011 Northeast First. And my question was, is pedestrian access and pedestrian amenities, is it appropriate to include those in the scoping process. And you indicated that it was, and I think that is an important aspect.

MR. PAINE: All right. I'd like to formally close the scoping process, but before I do, or the scoping meeting, but before I do, I just want to announce again that we will extend the scoping period till November 12th at 5 p.m., and after that we're not going to extend it again.

Fair enough?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What will be the type -- how will we put our comments in until November?

MR. PAINE: You can e-mail me, the environmental coordinator. You can e-mail Mike Bergstrom. But they should probably -- whatever you do, however you communicate, by letter or by e-mail, my name, Michael Paine, Development Services Department, should be on that so that -- that I make sure that I see it as well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And what's your e-mail address?

MR. PAINE: It's mpaine@bellevewa.gov. And
I'm quite certain it's on the -- on the Web site because I'm getting a lot of your e-mails, so somebody knows.

MS. COLE: Michael, there's also comment forms, scoping comment forms that you can take with you and return prior to November 12th. They're on the table by the door.

MR. PAINE: They're on the table as you go out. So just remember the issues -- this is -- this is a process that's best suited to focusing on the issues that we've talked about, you know, alternatives, impacts, mitigation, missing information, that sort of thing.

Okay. I'd like to formally close the scoping meeting.

(THE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED AT 6:06 P.M.)
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Appendix B
Noise – Background and Analysis Basics
Appendix B – Noise Basics

Noise is generally defined as sound that is loud, disagreeable, unexpected, or unwanted. Sound, as described in more detail below, is mechanical energy transmitted in the form of a wave by a disturbance or vibration that causes pressure variation in air that the human ear can detect. Throughout this analysis, the terms “sound” and “noise” are analogous.

Sound Properties

A sound wave is introduced into a medium (air) by a vibrating object. The vibrating object (e.g., the string of a guitar) is the source of the disturbance that moves through the medium (Figure 1). Regardless of the type of source creating the sound wave, the particles of the medium through which the sound moves are vibrating in a back-and-forth motion at a given rate (frequency). The frequency of a wave refers to how often the particles vibrate when a wave passes through the medium. The frequency of a wave is measured as the number of complete back-and-forth vibrations of a particle per unit of time. One complete back-and-forth vibration is called a cycle. If a particle of air undergoes 1,000 cycles in 2 seconds, then the frequency of the wave would be 500 cycles per second or Hertz (Hz).

Figure 1: Sound Wave Properties.

Each particle vibrates as a result of the motion of its nearest neighbor. For example, the first particle of the medium begins vibrating at 500 Hz and sets the second particle of the medium into motion at the same frequency (500 Hz). The process continues throughout the medium; hence, each particle vibrates at the same frequency, which is the frequency of the original source.

A wave is a phenomenon that transports energy along a medium. The amount of energy carried by a wave is related to the amplitude (loudness) of the wave. A high-energy wave is characterized by a large amplitude; a low-energy wave is characterized by a small amplitude. The amplitude of a wave refers to the maximum amount of displacement of a particle from its rest position.
Sound and the Human Ear

Because of the ability of the human ear to detect a wide range of sound-pressure fluctuations, sound-pressure levels are expressed in logarithmic units called decibels (dB) to avoid a large and awkward range in numbers. The sound-pressure level in decibels is calculated by taking the log of the ratio between the actual sound pressure and the reference sound pressure and then multiplying by 20. The reference sound pressure is considered the absolute hearing threshold (Caltrans 1998). Figure 2 presents typical indoor and outdoor noise levels.

Because the human ear is not equally sensitive to all audible frequencies, a frequency-dependent rating scale was devised to relate noise to human sensitivity. An A-weighted dB (dBA) scale performs this compensation by favoring frequencies that humans are more sensitive to. This dBA scale has been chosen by most authorities for regulating environmental noise.

With respect to how humans perceive and react to changes in noise levels, a 1-dBA increase is imperceptible, a 3-dBA increase is barely perceptible, a 6-dBA increase is clearly noticeable, and a 10-dBA increase is subjectively perceived as approximately twice as loud (Egan 1988), as presented in Table 1. Table 1 was developed on the basis of test subjects’ reactions to changes in the levels of steady-state pure tones or broadband noise and to changes in levels of a given noise source. It is probably most applicable to noise levels in the range of 50–70 dBA because this is the usual range of voice and interior noise levels. For these reasons, a noise level increase of 3 dBA or more is typically considered a substantial degradation of the existing noise environment.

Table 1. Subjective Reaction to Changes in Noise Levels of Similar Sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in Level (dBA)</th>
<th>Subjective Reaction</th>
<th>Factor Change in Acoustical Energy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Imperceptible (Except for Tones)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Just Barely Perceptible</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clearly Noticeable</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>About Twice (or Half) as Loud</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: dBA = A-weighted decibels
**Figure 2: Typical Noise Levels.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
<th>DECIBELS (dB)*</th>
<th>SUBJECTIVE EVALUATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Near jet engine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold of pain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock band</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerating motorcycle a few feet away</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noisy urban street/heavy city traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas lawn mower at 3 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage disposal at 3 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacuum cleaner at 3 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busy restaurant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near freeway auto traffic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window air conditioner at 3 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft whisper at 5 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet urban nighttime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet rural nighttime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human breathing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshold of audibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* dB are “average” values as measured on the A-scale of a sound-level meter.

Source: Developed by EDAW.
Sound Propagation and Attenuation

As sound (noise) propagates from the source to the receptor, the attenuation, or manner of noise reduction in relation to distance, depends on surface characteristics, atmospheric conditions, and the presence of physical barriers. The inverse-square law describes the attenuation caused by the pattern in which sound travels from the source to the receptor. Sound travels uniformly outward from a point source in a spherical pattern with an attenuation rate of 6 dBA per doubling of distance (dBA/DD). However, from a line source (e.g., a road), sound travels uniformly outward in a cylindrical pattern with an attenuation rate of 3 dBA/DD.

Noise Descriptors

The noise descriptors most often used when dealing with traffic, community, and environmental noise are defined below in Table 2.

Table 2. Common Noise Descriptors and their Definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( L_{\text{max}} ) (maximum noise level)</td>
<td>The maximum instantaneous noise level during a specific period of time. The ( L_{\text{max}} ) may also be referred to as the “peak (noise) level.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_{\text{min}} ) (minimum noise level)</td>
<td>The minimum instantaneous noise level during a specific period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_{\text{eq}} ) (equivalent noise level)</td>
<td>The energy mean (average) noise level. The instantaneous noise levels during a specific period of time in dBA are converted to relative energy values. From the sum of the relative energy values, an average energy value is calculated, which is then converted back to dBA to determine the ( L_{\text{eq}} ). In noise environments determined by major noise events, such as aircraft overflights, the ( L_{\text{eq}} ) value is heavily influenced by the magnitude and number of single events that produce the high noise levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( L_{dn} ) (day-night noise level)</td>
<td>The 24-hour ( L_{\text{eq}} ) with a 10-dBA “penalty” for noise events that occur during the noise-sensitive hours between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. In other words, 10 dBA is “added” to noise events that occur in the nighttime hours, and this generates a higher reported noise level when determining compliance with noise standards. The ( L_{dn} ) attempts to account for the fact that noise during this specific period of time is a potential source of disturbance with respect to normal sleeping hours.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Caltrans 1998; Lipscomb and Taylor 1978.

Community noise is commonly described in terms of the ambient noise level, the all-encompassing noise level associated with a given noise environment. A common statistical tool to measure the ambient noise level is the average (equivalent) sound level, \( L_{\text{eq}} \), which corresponds to a steady-state sound level that contains the same total energy as a time-varying signal over a given time period (usually 1 hour). The \( L_{\text{eq}} \) is the foundation of the composite noise descriptors such as \( L_{dn} \), as defined above, and shows a positive correlation with community response to noise.

Negative Effects of Noise on Humans

Negative effects of noise exposure include physical damage to the human auditory system, interference, and disease. Physical damage to the auditory system can lead to gradual or traumatic hearing loss, leading to permanent hearing damage. In addition, noise may interfere with or interrupt sleep, relaxation, recreation, and communication. Although most interference may be classified as annoying, the inability to hear a warning signal is considered dangerous.
Noise may also contribute to diseases associated with stress, such as hypertension, anxiety, and heart disease. The degree to which noise contributes to such diseases depends on the frequency, bandwidth, noise level, and duration of exposure (Caltrans 1998).

**Vibration**

Vibration is the periodic oscillation of a medium or object. The rumbling sound caused by the vibration of room surfaces is called structure-borne noise. Both natural phenomena (e.g., earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, sea waves, landslides) and human-made causes (e.g., explosions, machinery, traffic, trains, construction equipment) can result in ground-borne vibration. As is the case with airborne sound, ground-borne vibration may be described by amplitude and frequency.

Vibration amplitude is typically expressed in peak particle velocity (PPV) or root mean square (RMS), as in RMS vibration velocity. The PPV and RMS velocity are normally described in inches per second (in/sec). PPV is defined as the maximum instantaneous positive or negative peak of a vibration signal. PPV is the metric often used to describe blasting vibration and other vibration sources that result in structural stresses in buildings (FTA 2006; Caltrans 2002).

Although PPV is appropriate for evaluating the potential for building damage, it is not always suitable for evaluating human response. It takes some time for the human body to respond to vibration signals. In a sense, the human body responds to average vibration amplitude. The RMS of a signal is the average of the squared amplitude of the signal, typically calculated over a period of 1 second. As with airborne sound, the RMS velocity is often expressed in decibel notation as velocity decibels (VdB), which serves to compress the range of numbers required to describe vibration (FTA 2006). This velocity decibel scale is based on a reference value of 1 microinch per second (μin/sec).

The background vibration-velocity level typical of residential areas is approximately 50 VdB. Ground-borne vibration is normally perceptible to humans at approximately 65 VdB. For most people, a vibration-velocity level of 75 VdB is the approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible levels (FTA 2006).

Typical outdoor sources of perceptible ground-borne vibration are construction equipment, steel-wheeled trains, and traffic on rough roads. If a roadway is smooth, the ground-borne vibration is rarely perceptible. The range of human perception of vibration is from approximately 50 VdB (the typical background vibration-velocity level) to 100 VdB (the general threshold where minor damage can occur in fragile buildings). Construction activities can generate ground-borne vibrations, which can pose a risk to nearby structures. Constant or transient vibration can weaken structures, crack facades, and disturb occupants (FTA 2006).

Construction-generated vibration can be transient, random, or continuous. Transient construction vibration is generated by blasting, impact pile driving, and wrecking balls. Random vibration can result from jackhammers, pavement breakers, and heavy construction equipment. Continuous vibration results from vibratory pile drivers, large pumps, horizontal directional drilling, and compressors. Table 3 summarizes the general human response to different levels of ground-borne vibration.
Table 3. Human Response to Different Levels of Ground-borne Vibration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vibration-Velocity Level</th>
<th>Human Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 VdB</td>
<td>Approximate threshold of perception.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 VdB</td>
<td>Approximate dividing line between barely perceptible and distinctly perceptible. Many people find that transportation-related vibration at this level is unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 VdB</td>
<td>Vibration acceptable only if there is an infrequent number of events per day.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: VdB = velocity decibels referenced to 1 μinch/sec and based on the root mean square vibration velocity.
Source: FTA 2006.

Underwater Noise

Noise behaves in much the same way in air and in water (WSDOT 2009). Water currents bend noise waves upward when propagated into the current and downward downstream when observed over long distances. Noise waves bend toward colder denser water. Bottom topography and underwater structures can block or refract noise waves.

Several descriptors are used to describe underwater noise (WSDOT 2009). Two common descriptors are the instantaneous peak sound pressure level (dBpeak) and the Root Mean Square (dBRMS) pressure level during the impulse, sometimes referred to as the peak and RMS level, respectively. The peak pressure is the instantaneous maximum overpressure or underpressure observed during each pulse and can be presented in Pascals (Pa) or sound pressure level (SPL) in decibels (dB) referenced to a pressure of 1 micropascal (dB re: 1 μPa). The RMS level is the square root of the energy divided by the impulse duration. This level is the mean square pressure level of the pulse. It has been used by NMFS to describe disturbance-related effects (i.e., harassment) to marine mammals from underwater impulse-type noises. When evaluating potential injury impacts on fish, peak sound pressure (dBpeak) is often used. Underwater noise that may affect fish is analyzed in Section 3.3 (Plants and Animals).
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