

EAST LINK PROJECT

SUPPLEMENTAL DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

Comment Summary



CENTRAL PUGET SOUND
REGIONAL TRANSIT AUTHORITY



February 2011

East Link - Supplemental Draft EIS

Comment Summary

Sound Transit received 822 comments on the East Link Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement (SDEIS) during the 60-day public comment period. Comments were received from private individuals, homeowner associations, community organizations, business groups, businesses, and government agencies. Of these 822 comments, 749 were from private individuals, whose comments are summarized here by segment. Comments from government agencies, businesses, residential organizations and community interest groups are summarized following this general comment summary. The individuals' comments were primarily focused on Segments B and C, and most limited their comments to a specific alternative and were from individuals living, working, or with property interests in the project study area; comments were also received from those citizens with a general interest in the project. Most comments were generally supportive of East Link but expressed preferences for or issues about specific alternatives. A large number of submittals simply expressed support for the project and requested it not be delayed, still others requested a delay for more information development on a revised B7 alternative.

The following summary lists how many comments referenced each segment, describes which segment alternatives received the largest number of supportive comments, highlights which segment alternatives received the most endorsements from organizations and agencies and describes environmental issues raised in the comments. The most frequently mentioned environmental concerns centered on noise effects on residences, removal of park lands (either Mercer Slough Nature Park or Surrey Downs Park), effects on traffic along Bellevue Way and downtown Bellevue, and how these impacts might affect adjacent neighborhoods, such as Enatai, Surrey Downs or the condominiums adjacent to 118th Avenue SE.

Segment A, I-90: Most comments concerned the D2 Roadway's continued joint use with bus and light rail

transit, the loss of the center roadway for high-occupancy (HOV) vehicles and Mercer Island use, and the potential traffic impacts this might have.

Segment B, South Bellevue: Most individual commentors on this segment focused on either support for or opposition to *Preferred Alternative B2M* or Alternative B7. A total of 270 letters supported and 90 opposed *Preferred Alternative B2M*. An additional 4 letters supported any alternative on Bellevue Way SE and 119 additional letters opposed any alternative on Bellevue Way SE. A total of 165 letters listed supported Alternative B7, while 155 letters stated their opposition to B7. Those who support the *Preferred Alternative B2M* generally remarked that it has better access, is more cost-effective, and is more centrally located than Alternative B7. Those that stated preference for B7, expressed that *Preferred Alternative B2M* would have greater neighborhood impacts, including visual, traffic, noise, and residential relocations, as well as impacts on Mercer Slough and the Winters House. These commentors also remarked that Alternative B7 could be modified to be lower cost, could utilize the former BNSF Railway right-of-way, would better allow for future extensions east and south, and would have less neighborhood and ecosystem impacts. Those who stated their opposition to Alternative B7 asserted it would have greater ecosystem and noise impacts, lower ridership, a higher cost, and would be less accessible. Regardless of which alternative they preferred, many commentors expressed concern about impacts to Mercer Slough.

A number of commentors referenced the Alternative B7 study underway by the City of Bellevue, and requested that Sound Transit wait for the release of this report to issue the Final EIS or expressed support for the City's modified Alternative B7, known as B7-Revised or B7-R. A number of individual commentors referenced the study completed by the "Building a Better Bellevue" organization, which includes suggestions to lower the cost of Alternative B7. In addition to individuals, the

following lists specific organizations that also expressed preferences for B2M or B7 alternatives:

- *Preferred Alternative B2M* is supported by entities such as the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division, Bellevue Club, and Transportation Choices Coalition. A large percentage of the comments supporting the *Preferred Alternative* were from individual commentors.
- *Preferred Alternative B2M* and all Bellevue Way and 112th Avenue SE running alignments are not supported by entities such as Miles Construction NW and Building a Better Bellevue. *Preferred Alternative B2M* is also not supported by entities such as the City of Bellevue City Council, the Vision Line Coalition, and the Surrey Downs Historical Society.
- Alternative B7 is supported by entities such as the Bellevue City Council, Bellevue Lincoln Plaza, LLC, and the Washington Trust for Historic Preservation for its reduced impacts on the Winters House. A large percentage of the comments supporting Alternative B7 were from individual commentors, many whom live in the Enatai or Surrey Downs neighborhoods.
- Alternative B7 is not supported by entities such as the Transportation Choices Coalition, the Meydenbauer Center, the YMCA, and the Low Income Housing Institute.
- Several community organizations such as the Surrey Downs Historical Society, Building a Better Bellevue, and the Vision Line Coalition support a modified Alternative B7. The City of Bellevue City Council also supports Alternative B7 with modifications as summarized in the Public Agency Comments section below.

Segment C, Downtown Bellevue: A total of 62 letters supported *Preferred Alternative C11A* and 25 opposed it, while 220 letters supported *Preferred Alternative C9T* and 15 opposed it. Three letters mentioned Alternative C9A, all opposing it, and eight letters were received regarding Alternative C14E, two supporting and six opposing it. A large number of commentors expressed general support for providing access to downtown and putting stations “where people work and live.” Many commentors specifically stated they opposed

alternatives that traveled on the edge of downtown Bellevue.

Many comments were received from residents of the Belle Arts Condominiums, which stated a strong preference for a tunnel alternative rather than a surface street option. Residents were concerned that a surface street option would greatly increase the amount of noise impacts in the area due to train noise and the loss of sidewalk space in front of residences. They expressed that this loss would bring traffic and pedestrian noise closer to the buildings along the route. They were also concerned about safety, which they felt would deteriorate due to the increase in riders at the bus stop located at 108th Avenue NE and Main Street. The Belle Arts community was also concerned with noise associated with an increase in people waiting at the nearby bus stop.

Some individuals listed their concerns over alternatives that traveled up 112th Avenue SE due to impacts on Surrey Downs Park and the neighborhood that would be impacted by removal of a row of condominiums along 112th Avenue SE for connections to the *Preferred Alternatives C11A and C9T*.

Most comments expressed preference for a tunnel in order to not restrict future development aboveground and to minimize traffic impacts. Many comments were received that requested Sound Transit continue working with the City of Bellevue on funding for the tunnel. In addition to individuals, the following lists specific organizations that also listed preferences for C11A versus C9T alternatives:

- *Preferred Alternative C11A* is supported by entities such as the Muckleshoot Indian Fisheries Division, the Bellevue Branch of the King County Library, Meydenbauer Center, the YMCA, and the Low Income Housing Institute. The majority of the comments received, supporting this alternative, were from individual commentors.
- *Preferred Alternative C11A and C9T*, as they are currently designed, is not supported by entities such as the Bellevue City Council and Washington Trust for Historic Preservation. However, Bellevue City Council do support a C9T Alternative with a portal on 2nd Street rather than on Main Street. *Preferred Alternative C9T* is supported by entities such as the

Bellevue Branch of the King County Library, Meydenbauer Center, the Transportation Choices Coalition, King County Department of Transportation, the Red Lion Hotel, the Bellevue Downtown Association, the YMCA, and the Low Income Housing Institute.

- Alternative C9A is not supported by entities such as the City of Bellevue City Council.
- Alternative C14E is not supported by entities such as Transportation Choices Coalition.

Segment D, Bel-Red/Overlake: Nine out of ten of the submittals received for this segment supported *Preferred Alternative D2A*, with most commentors approving of the new *preferred* design along SR 520 and Overlake Village Station location. The majority of the commentors, including the Transportation Choices Coalition, were supportive of the *Preferred Alternative D2A* and stated that it would best serve the Bel-Red Corridor and Overlake areas of Redmond and provide the best ridership access. A small percentage of commentors were concerned about impacts on residences and businesses along the *Preferred Alternative D2A* and Alternative D2E guideways, but no letters specifically voiced opposition to any Segment D alternatives. However, the SDEIS did not address other Segment D alternatives. Two individuals submitted comments in support of Alternative D5. In addition to individuals, the following lists specific organizations and businesses that listed support for *D2A*:

- *Preferred Alternative D2A* is supported by entities such as Puget Sound Energy, Microsoft Corporation, the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Fisheries Division, the Transportation Choices Coalition, and the Greater Redmond Chamber of Commerce. A small number of comments received were from individual commentors, who also supported the *Preferred Alternative*.

Segment E, Downtown Redmond: One individual submitted comments in opposition to the Downtown Redmond Station and the *Preferred Alternative E2* due to concerns over costs and noise and safety impacts at their residence. The only other comments received regarding *Preferred Alternative E2* were from the City of Redmond and the Greater Redmond Chamber of Commerce. These

comments are discussed in the Public Agency Comments section below.

- *Preferred Alternative E2* is supported by the City of Redmond.

Public Agency Comments

Environmental Protection Agency

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) had no substantial environmental concerns regarding the alternatives analyzed in the SDEIS. In recognition of the difference of support for the *Preferred Alternative* in Segment B, EPA suggests explaining why ridership varies so greatly for Alternative B7, how land uses would be supported by the different alternatives, and describe the values and functions of the wetlands potentially impacted and whether the former BNSF Railway corridor can support the operation and also the construction logistics of light rail, freight, and a trail. EPA requested additional information in the EIS on the feasibility and engineering solution to the unplanned movement of peat and clay, and if Alternative B7 is selected, would like the reasons for selecting an alternative with higher impacts on wetlands clearly stated.

Muckleshoot Indian Tribe

The Muckleshoot Indian Tribe supports the *Preferred Alternatives B2M, C11A, and D2A* (including the *D2A* design options) because they find that these alternatives would have the least impact on streams and wetlands. However, they expressed concerns about information not present in the SDEIS regarding streams and the potential project impacts on fisheries, such as the impacts of lighting on water crossings, construction at stream crossings, lengthening culverts, and maintenance activities that can affect fish habitat and result in barriers for fish passage. They feel that more information is needed on the Sammamish River, Bear Creek, the Unnamed Tributary of Kelsey Creek, and Sturtevant Creek (east of I-405) to properly determine impacts on these streams. They also provided corrections regarding the timing of their fishing season.

Additionally, the letter requests that stormwater impacts are offset with improvements to the streams and cautions that impacts on salmonid resources may disproportionately affect the Muckleshoot Indian Tribe.

Port of Seattle

The Port of Seattle submits their comments to update the ownership and intentions of use within the former BNSF Railway corridor. In December 2009, the Port acquired the former BNSF Railway right-of-way in King and Snohomish counties. Following this action, the City of Redmond purchased the Redmond spur portion and Puget Sound Energy acquired an easement in this spur. This action included a signed Memorandum of Understanding between all parties (Port of Seattle, Sound Transit, King County, the City of Redmond, the Cascade Water Alliance, and Puget Sound Energy) that these will be available for public transportation uses, such as high-capacity transit or bus transportation. Port of Seattle acknowledges changes in designs that affect the former BNSF Railway corridor, such as the Downtown Redmond Station and the storage track.

King County Metro Transit

King County Metro Transit supports *Preferred Alternatives B2M to Preferred Alternative C9T*. They appreciate that the D2 Roadway would have continued joint use with bus and light rail transit. Their comments include concerns about how construction might disrupt existing transit facilities and services, especially at transit centers in the study area (South Bellevue Park-and-Ride Lot, Bellevue Transit Center, and Overlake Transit Center). They suggest holding a multijurisdictional meeting in order to resolve construction coordination issues. Metro would like to reach agreement on construction mitigation prior to the Record of Decision.

King County Library - Bellevue

The King County Library in Bellevue submitted a comment letter supporting the *Preferred Alternative B2M* to either *Preferred Alternative C11A* or *C9T* and support getting the project completed as soon as possible.

Puget Sound Regional Council

Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) feels that the current *preferred alternatives* analyzed in the SDEIS addresses previous impact concerns. Also, those alternatives that use the Hospital Station within the former BNSF Railway corridor offer good connectivity for future extensions northward. PSRC emphasizes that direct connectivity with regional transit centers are

important for encouraging strong ridership and realizing maximum benefit from existing investments in these facilities. PSRC recognizes that if the Downtown Redmond Station is the selected terminus, then this may be a situation where the transit center is relocated closer to the light rail station. Similarly, PSRC encourages prioritization of strong pedestrian and bicycle access to each station and specifically mentions improving pedestrian access across NE 8th Street for the Hospital Station.

City of Mercer Island

The City of Mercer Island is pleased that the I-90 facility within Mercer Island has been recognized for its eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places. Mercer Island is interested in preserving the historical use of the HOV lanes for Mercer Island single-occupancy vehicles in accordance with the 1976 Memorandum of Agreement. They also commend Sound Transit and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) for the continued partnership in resolving issues during this planning process.

City of Bellevue

Two letters were submitted from the City of Bellevue, one specifically from the City Council and the other from the Bellevue Staff. The main difference was that the City Council emphasized addressing their preference for alternatives in Bellevue and requested information on the alternatives they prefer and those they do not prefer, whereas the City Staff provided input on issues with the SDEIS document and the analyses. The Bellevue City Council opposes *Preferred Alternatives C11A* and *C9A* and requests that Sound Transit consider their forthcoming study of B7-R before the East Link Final EIS is released. This alternative would include a station at I-90 and Bellevue Way, and it would shift the tunnel portal of *Preferred Alternative C9T* to NE 2nd Street. This alternative was not evaluated in the Draft EIS or SDEIS. The City Council expressed that the SDEIS does not fully address construction impacts; phasing of construction; and mitigation for related impacts on roadways, historic, parks, wetlands, and other sensitive areas. Another concern of the City Council is the noise impacts during operation and construction of East Link. They request further analysis but acknowledge that Sound Transit will be conducting a best practices study in this area. Finally, by reference, they submitted eight reports conducted by

City of Bellevue. These reports include peer reviews of the Draft EIS, noise and ecosystems analyses, as well as Bellevue Light Rail Best Practices, Downtown Bellevue VISSIM Analysis, and the South Bellevue Station Alternative Location Analysis.

City of Bellevue prepared a staff review of the SDEIS and provided a detailed list of areas where they would either like additional analysis or suggested changes in the analysis. As an introduction, the City is requesting that the Downtown Bellevue Light Rail VISSIM Analysis be included in the Final EIS transportation analysis; that the slight changes in ridership do not fully reflect the anticipated changes in Bel-Red land use plans; the South Bellevue Park-and-Ride Lot Transportation Analysis warrants additional mitigation detail, and the noise impacts warrant further research of mitigation measures. Additionally, they are concerned that the noise impacts should address park impacts and that the noise analysis methodology may understate the project noise impacts. City of Bellevue also expressed a desire for numeric visual assessment rating evaluation and additional visual simulations to capture park impacts and change in the former BNSF Railway corridor.

Overall, City of Bellevue is expressing a desire for more detailed mitigation planning on visual impacts, parks, wetlands, and other sensitive areas, especially for construction phases. They are concerned about construction impacts on neighborhoods and businesses, the relocation of the Bellevue Transit Center, duration and number of lane closures, and the potential damage to the Winters House. They have requested additional information on mitigation, more cross sections in the design drawings, additional analysis of land use goals, and more detail about which parcels are partial versus full property acquisitions. Like the City Council, they too include through reference the multiple reports and peer reviews of the East Link Project developed by the City.

City of Redmond

The City of Redmond supports *Preferred Alternative E2*; however, they note several changes have occurred since the initial design of this alternative. Namely, Redmond has purchased portions of the former BNSF Railway corridor and adopted the Redmond Central Connector Master Plan Infrastructure Alignment Plan on October 19, 2010. This plan includes adding a large stormwater

trunk line inside the former BNSF Railway corridor and constrains available right-of-way to construct the light rail. They are requesting Sound Transit re-position the light rail alignment in a larger corridor that includes the former BNSF Railway and the adjacent NE 76th Street right-of-way.

Also they are requesting that Sound Transit locate support facilities and tail tracks in Southeast Redmond rather than in downtown and further design consideration in the area of State Route (SR) 520 and Bear Creek Trail to explore water-related issues. They are also requesting that a pedestrian bridge be considered at the Overlake Transit Center and expressed concern regarding the construction impacts and potential mitigation strategies at this facility. Redmond expresses concerns about noise-related impacts that may not be fully addressed in the Downtown Redmond and Overlake areas. Redmond questions some of the transportation and visual analyses along *Preferred Alternative D2A*. Due to the new connection for Bear Creek Parkway, Redmond is requesting additional transportation analyses at future intersections. Also, Redmond is requesting consideration of future planned access points and trail connections.

Businesses and Business Groups

Business Groups

Business Groups that submitted comments included:

- Bellevue Downtown Association
- Greater Redmond Chamber of Commerce

Individual Businesses

Individual businesses that submitted comments included:

- Meydenbauer Center
- Bellevue Lincoln Plaza, LLC
- Red Lion Hotels
- Microsoft Corporation
- Puget Sound Energy
- Eastside Oral Surgery Associates
- Express Construction
- Miles Construction NW
- Beacon Capital Partners, LLC
- The Evans Industrial Park
- The Bellevue Club
- The Pumphouse Bar and Grill
- RBJK Ventures, LLC
- Nickols Realty, LLC
- Rosen Properties

- Wright Runstad & Company
- Kemper Development Company
- Pine Forest Properties
- Property Development Centers
- Pine Forest Properties, Inc.

Business Summary

Businesses and business groups that submitted comments on the SDEIS varied from individual businesses with concerns about potential impacts on their property to business-sponsored organizations.

The Bellevue Downtown Association (BDA) expressed preference for *Preferred Alternative C9T* because of its speed, safety, reliability, access, proximity to the downtown core, compatibility with downtown land uses, and the ability to keep the Bellevue Transit Center open during construction. The BDA requested that the VISSIM Analysis conducted jointly by Sound Transit and the City of Bellevue and graphics of walking distance and visualizations developed during the downtown alternatives study be included in the Final EIS, along with analysis of an entrance to the Bellevue Transit Center Station that is directly adjacent to or within the Bellevue Transit Center. The BDA also requested considering additional video or noise simulations. The BDA would like to be involved with Sound Transit and the City of Bellevue regarding mitigation planning, and requests that this planning begin as soon as possible to address long-term noise, access, and other environmental impacts during construction.

The Greater Redmond Chamber of Commerce expressed continued support for the project and specifically *Preferred Alternative D2A*.

Most individual businesses supported the project but had specific concerns regarding impacts on their locations, primarily related to construction access, noise, and vibration, as well as operational traffic, access, and noise. In Segment C, Beacon Capital Partners expressed concern regarding access to office towers they own. Nickols Realty submitted comments on behalf of commercial tenants at several properties they manage within Segment D expressing concerns about future land uses, noise, vibration, access, and traffic impacts. Rosen Properties, which also manages a commercial property in Segment D, had similar concerns as Nickols Realty regarding parking, business displacements, and changes in transportation capacity on local roadways. Property

Development Centers, which owns the Safeway Beverage Plant on 124th Avenue NE, expressed concern regarding impacts to their facility from the 120th Station (both retained cut and at-grade) and access to their property.

Two business owners, the Pumphouse Bar and Grill and RBJK Ventures, adjacent to the Hospital Station were concerned with impacts to parking and maintaining access to their businesses during construction and operation. The Pumphouse Bar and Grill was also concerned with noise and vibration impacts and RBJK Ventures requested more detailed information about displacements.

Some commentors suggested changes to the *Preferred Alternative*, such as *Preferred Alternative B2M* crossing 112th Avenue SE at SE 15th Street instead of SE 6th Street, as suggested by the Bellevue Club, and a station on the west side of 112th Avenue SE near Main Street, suggested by the Red Lion Hotel. Both businesses supported *Preferred Alternative B2M*. Bellevue Lincoln Plaza supported Alternative B7 and expressed concerns regarding noise, traffic, soil conditions and topography related to *Preferred Alternative B2M*.

Kemper Development Company submitted comments regarding traffic in Segments A and B, land use, access, general operations, and the project purpose and need. Microsoft and Wright Runstad & Company supported the changes to *Preferred Alternative D2A* but also had concerns about utility conflicts on their properties. Puget Sound Energy identified utility conflicts for the alternatives analyzed in the SDEIS. Wright Runstad & Company also suggested deferring the 130th Station and requested the project be constructed at least to the 120th Station, and to keep the project on schedule. Two businesses, Evans Industrial Park and Pine Forest Properties, requested that *Preferred Alternative D2A* be designed to minimize impacts to their properties. Some businesses, including Wright Runstad & Company and Kemper Development Company, believed the ridership estimates in Segment D should be higher based on the planned changes in land use in that area.

The Meydenbauer Center expressed support for *Preferred Alternatives B2M, C9T* and *C11A*, with preference for *Preferred Alternative C9T*, and expressed concerns about Alternative B7. Two businesses, Eastside Oral Surgery Associates and Miles Construction NW, supported Alternative B7 and opposed the Bellevue Way

and 112th Avenue SE alternative, while Express Construction opposed the entire project.

Residential Groups

Residential Groups that submitted comments included:

- Holly Tree Lane Home Owners Association
- Mercer Park Condominium Association
- Brookshire Condominiums
- Belle Arts Board of Directors

Residential Group Summary

There were two predominant segments where residential groups collectively organized to voice their opinions on the SDEIS: Segments B and C. In Segment B, the residential groups were divided among those who opposed alternatives that used Bellevue Way SE and 112th Avenue, thus preferring Alternative B7, and those who opposed Alternative B7 and supported *Preferred Alternative B2M*. The listed concerns for both groups included a potential change in their quality of life, including property acquisition and/or loss of property value, noise, vibration, safety at stations located near neighborhoods, and visual intrusion. Both groups felt that traffic would worsen on the main arterials serving their neighborhood: Bellevue Way SE for residents in Enatai and Surrey Downs and 118th Avenue SE for residents living adjacent to the Alternative B7 route. Those living along the Alternative B7 (Mercer Park and Brookshire) route also expressed concern for potential visual impacts from the Alternative B7 crossing of Mercer Slough. Similarly, the residents near Bellevue Way SE (Holly Tree Lane) felt that the blueberry farm, valuable portions of Mercer Slough, and the greenbelt west of Bellevue Way SE would be compromised by the East Link Project.

In Segment C, residents of the Belle Arts Condominiums supported a tunnel alignment, which they felt would minimize traffic, noise and visual impacts in Downtown Bellevue. If *Preferred Alternative C11A* were to be chosen, they requested that the bus stop in front of their building be relocated because of potentially increased bus traffic and noise from reduced sidewalk width in front of their building.

Interest Groups

Interest Groups that submitted comments included:

- Transportation Choices Coalition
- Vision Line Coalition
- YMCA
- Low Income Housing Institute
- Eastside Heritage Center
- Bellevue Community College
- Building a Better Bellevue
- Surrey Downs Historical Society
- Washington Trust for Historic Preservation
- Coalition for Effective Transportation Alternatives (CETA)

Interest Group Summary

Eleven comments were received from community organizations or interest groups. The Coalition for Effective Transportation Alternatives (CETA) did not support adding light rail to the Eastside, maintaining that bus rapid transit would be a more viable alternative. The Transportation Choices Coalition strongly advocated light rail and urged Sound Transit to avoid delays in proceeding with the project. The Coalition also supported *Preferred Alternative B2M* rather than Alternative B7, citing the need for locating light rail and transit stations in locations that would serve the highest population areas, have lower environmental impacts than Alternative B7, and lower overall cost. Other supporters of the *preferred alternatives* include the YMCA and the Low Income Housing Institute.

The Vision Line Coalition commented that they feel there would be significant adverse environmental impacts that cannot be mitigated with the “B2 options” and that the analysis of Alternative B7 is flawed. Of greatest concern with the “B2 options” are impacts on wetlands, the Winters House, noise, light and glare, traffic, and local businesses and neighborhoods. They expressed support for a tunnel in downtown Bellevue and also feel that the potential for future expansion eastward should be discussed in the Final EIS. They also voiced support for the Building a Better Bellevue analysis, discussed below.

The Building a Better Bellevue organization submitted a study they prepared detailing concerns they have regarding the cost estimate for Alternative B7 and suggestions for lowering the cost. This organization also recommends a formal investigation be conducted into how the Alternative B7 cost-estimate was developed,

because they believe it was developed in a way to inflate the costs. Lastly, they also submitted a number of questions regarding the analysis of *Preferred Alternative B2M* and questioned the need for rail banking in the former BNSF Railway corridor.

Eastside Heritage Center, the historical organization on the Eastside and the tenant of the Winters House, expressed their concerns about how the *Preferred Alternative B2M* could impact Winters House, which is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and for being relocated during light rail construction. They were concerned about loss of access to the site, increased noise and visual impacts due to construction and operation, and loss of historical character. The Center asked that if they are required to relocate during construction, that similar access and facilities be made available for their use during this time. The Washington Trust for Historic Preservation also commented on similar potential impacts on the Winters House and on the Surrey Downs potential historic district. They feel that removal of homes adjacent to those contributing to the district could result in adverse effects on the district. The Surrey Downs Historical Society believes that the

Preferred Alternative B2M and Main Street Alignments would adversely impact both the Winters House and the Surrey Downs potential historic district. They were concerned with noise, construction, and vibration impacts to both historic resources and feel that construction and operation of *Preferred Alternative B2M* and the alignments along Main Street would change the character and context, and diminish the value of the Surrey Downs neighborhood. They recommended selection of Alternative B7, to avoid impacts to historic resources in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and of the Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act. The Surrey Downs Historical Society believes that Alternative B7 has not been sufficiently studied and requests that Sound Transit wait for the study being prepared by the City of Bellevue before an alignment is selected.

Representatives for Bellevue Community College submitted multiple comments requesting transit service be provided between the college and the South Bellevue Station, and noted the large number of students and employees that commute from Seattle who would be able to use the proposed project.