

Appendix D: Email Comments

All comments in this section represent comments received by email between October 12 and December 14, 2009. The comments were transcribed and reviewed by staff, with a second reviewer to double-check the accuracy of transcriptions. The name of each commenter is provided, as available, in relation to the comment. Original copies are stored in the project records.

South Bellevue Workshop – Email Comments

From: Russell Clark

Sent: Friday, October 16, 2009 3:11 PM

To: Kuciemba, Katie

Subject: Proposals to change the downtown to tunnel options crossing 405

Katie,

Thank you for taking the time to talk at the meeting on the 15th. As you have mentioned the city council and Kevin Wallace are pushing to change the preferred alternative thru downtown I would like to request an on-site meeting with you and any other parties that are involved

in this decision making process. As I'm sure your hearing from everyone regardless of where you go you will greatly impact someone. The original decision and choices for the preferred alternative was free of political pressure and influence by prestigious people in the community. I would again like to refocus the decision back to the best thing for the community and the reasons why the preferred alternative was chosen after considerable research was done.

I will not be available to attend the meeting on Nov 18th but I will have my attorney present. Your prompt attention to this matter is appreciated and look forward to meeting soon.

Russell Clark

P.S. I would also appreciate being put on the e-mail advisory list of ongoing decisions being made on this project.

From: Duane Goehner

Sent: Monday, October 12, 2009 3:22 PM

To: Kuciemba, Katie

Subject: Light Rail viewpoint

Unfortunately we are not able to come to community meetings on this, but we do want to give our perspective. Dependability is critical for a commuter system. Having lived in Moscow, Russia in the 90s, I know how amazing a system can be, and I used it exclusively. The key factor: The trains were not hindered by traffic. Unfortunately the system that has already been built here, as the news reports indicate, has been delayed and hampered because it is at ground level. I am completely opposed to a ground level system that is interfacing with traffic, roads, peds. For me, you may as well NOT have it, because it adds too many problems. For instance, if I want to get to the airport, I do not want to wonder if a train is going to be delayed due to traffic issues, or having hit some person along the tracks, etc. The problem variables increase too much for dependability to me. IF a system is not hindered and intersecting with traffic, etc. I will use the system all the time (if the price is reasonable, and not at luxury liner costs!). But no doubt, if the train system is slow and delayed, the reputation will not only make it a system unused, but a system that will not recoup money from ridership.

One critical place of concern for me is downtown Bellevue. Your system is DOO

ED if you have at grad transport there. It has to be below grad, or you have a system that is not realistic. No doubt, cost cutting is a concern, but if you cut this cost for dig and cover, you have put the final nail in the coffin for me to use this system. As someone who heads to the Microsoft area, the mess and delay

for the train system going through a town like Bellevue is something I will completely avoid! And you will have an incredible gridlock in Bellevue with the cars. Already without the train factor, there are huge traffic delays there. I could only imagine if you would put through a train line!

I hope you are heeding the concerns of folks when they express the concerns about at grad Bellevue lines, and other areas. They are valid. And if your committee ignores them, they need to be held accountable with their personal assets! Because such poor decisions that go against good counsel should have consequences for those who make those decisions.

Duane Goehner

From: Paul Sweum

Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 10:30 AM

To: Kuciemba, Katie

Subject: Good event last night

Hello Katie...thanks for helping to put on a great workshop last night!

I've always found the SoundTransit staff to be really friendly and approachable...and I believe when you're a transit authority that can go a long way when you're considering effects on communities, whether they're perceived as good or bad. Communication and reaching out to the public is important on many levels, including minimizing headaches for you and your colleagues before they spin too far out of control.

Case in point; the lady last night at the end of your presentation who claimed that residences were going to be condemned, when in fact they aren't.

Obviously you wouldn't be doing your job and in a community outreach role unless you had a passion for it. As a planner I sympathize with the challenges you have to go through — especially the night meetings and how that takes you away from your personal life.

If you haven't read this lately, I highly recommend it...it's about how NOT to behave if you're a transit authority...it contrasts (in a very bad way) with the approach that's taken with your agency today. Chances are your upper management have heard of Bob Moses, the old head of the Triborough Authority out of New York City, and the chaos that he caused from the 1940s–70s (especially after he got into housing projects following LaGuardia's departure – OMG). This should give you some history on many things related to transit and community outreach, and lots of other tidbits, such as how the interstate freeway system came to be – [The Power Broker](#). Ric Burns' documentary on New York City has other things on Moses, if you're a documentary type...totally fascinating stuff.

If there's a reference library at your HQ, the book might be there...and if not, I'd get a copy for the staff to read. It's the sort of thing I wish I'd been exposed to in graduate school. Here's some other interesting reads by Howard Kunstler: [The Geography of Nowhere](#) & [Home from Nowhere](#)...if your views are left-leaning, much of it will make sense...if you're right-leaning, you'll think he's a deconstructionist nut job. Much of it goes back to New Urbanism, which of course ties into transit.

Anyway, long message here...thanks again. I'll be in touch about maybe organizing some sort of outreach event through that social marketing group Biznik. I'll send you an invite...it's totally professional and not akin to the sort of personal-leaning shenanigans you find on Facebook, so you're safe in terms of representing yourself as a SoundTransit employee. I like to think of it as a more interactive version of

LinkedIn. It's also free. If you join I could partner with you, and we could brainstorm on forming an informational event for folks to meet at, probably more on the informal side.

Talk to you soon...good luck tonight with the Bel-Red segment.

Tip o' the topper,

Paul R. Sweum,

From: W Clark Powell

Sent: Friday, October 16, 2009 11:40 AM

To: eastlink- mailbox shared,

Subject: Comments from this week's workshop, October 14, 2009

General Comments:

Mercer Island will suffer heavily from this project. Negative impacts are

1.) Construction disruptions

2.) Loss of express lanes

3.) Restriping of I-90 will remove shoulder lane and every stall car will cause a traffic jam, a situation that hasn't been seen on the floating bridge for decades.

4.) Light rail noise which was either overlooked by Sound Transit or hush up. Only now with the first functioning section do we find that these things make a lot of noise and the noise is distinct such that freeway noise will not mask it.

5.) The light rail project is basically a "parking lot" project with the bulk of riders coming from park and rides. This project will not reduce traffic on Mercer Island but will increase it as people from all over Mercer Island and mostly from the Eastside drive to the Mercer Island park and ride to use the light rail.

6.) Destruction of the Mercer Island business district by creation of new park and ride lot(s) where the Walgreens Drugstore is located.

Positive features of the project for Mercer Island are:

1.) A fancy electric train to replace the 550 bus route. This line might be several minutes faster but the increased speed will not compensate for the traffic delays in getting to the park and ride. My point here is that if Sound Transit wants to improve transit for Mercer Island then it will have to improve the present light rail plan. Two improvements that I have identified are:

1.) To reduce the increased traffic caused by light rail, two more light rail stops should be added to the eastlink on East and West Mercer Way. East Mercer Way has at least three high density buildings including Covenant Shores Retirement home, the Jewish Community Center, and the Mercer Island City Hall. Both additional stops will take traffic from the Mercer Island Park and Ride and will allow Island residents to use transit WITHOUT STARTING THEIR CARS. More stops on Mercer Island will make it much easier for Island residents to walk, bike, or catch a ride to the light rail. Without this improvement quality of life on Mercer Island will drop as a result of problems 1 to 6.

2.) Traffic Abatement: Since real public transit is really based on getting people to work WITHOUT STARTING THEIR CARS, the present south end of Mercer Island to Seattle bus routes, 202 and 205, should be increased by 30 runs per day. Along with the increased service, funding for direct marketing of this service should be started. For too long Sound Transit and Metro have taken the story book approach

of "if you build it, they will come." This is not the way to get riders in affluent neighborhoods. Sound transit needs to develop a way to match bus routes with riders who live and work on the same bus route and then needs to figure out how to point out to riders that they could walk out their door, walk a block, get on a bus, and while being free to read, talk or sleep, they can end up at their place of work. In affluent neighborhoods people don't ride buses because they can't afford to drive, they ride buses because it is comfortable and convenient and direct marketing is the way to point this out to them. If this traffic abatement was executed effectively, it would remove 2,000 to 3,000 cars from Mercer Island streets at rush hour.

Please consider doing something for Mercer Island to compensate for the damage the eastlink project is doing to Mercer Island. If Mercer Islanders find out how much their home is being trashed by this project in its present form you will encounter some serious, well financed opposition in the future. I would say that at this point no one on Mercer Island has paid that much attention to it so they don't know now how much damage it will do. They will find out some day and the results may not be desirable for Sound Transit.

W Clark Powell

From: Carl Stork
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 2:44 PM
To: Kuciemba, Katie; eastlink- mailbox shared,
Subject: Eastlink comments

Dear Ms. Kuciemba,

I've been observing the Eastlink process for some time and I attended the Bellevue High workshop last night. I was not aware of its limited scope, and I would like to offer broader input on the design and construction impacts of Eastlink.

I am a proponent of transit generally and light rail in particular, so I generally support what Sound Transit is doing. I very much wish more could be built, quicker and cheaper, and I am concerned that Link is overbuilt, resulting in less total transit for the dollars spent. We certainly spend more dollars and time per mile than virtually any other system anywhere. I do think Link is critical for our region, given that there will be a long-term decline in fossil fuels and concern about global warming. In addition to providing a fossil-fuel free method of transportation, Link should help encourage development and land use that is less energy intensive.

In particular, I think it is extremely important to build Link more quickly – I can't begin to understand why it will take 12 years – until 2021 for Eastlink to be operating. Construction should be compressed so that it takes at most 2-3 years to build, after the design phase is done. That reduces construction impact on people and gets the benefits sooner.

It seems that there are some hidden rules that were followed in picking the alignment: no residential houses torn down and no lanes of traffic lost. I don't think we can get an optimum design with those restrictions, and I think we should accept some compromises here to get a transit system that can serve more dense areas or be built more quickly and cheaply.

The downtown Bellevue area is by far the largest jobs center, retail destination and likely also the largest concentration of residents that could live within walking distance of a light rail station. I think it is critical that Eastlink serves the downtown Bellevue area effectively. The most recent proposal to locate the only station within downtown Bellevue at NE 4th & 110th NE seems to significantly reduce Eastlink's utility and impact on downtown Bellevue. It's really pretty far off in the corner of town, and the streets to both the

east and west are hilly. I realize that it is a result of the routing through the 112th corridor to keep the line in business/industrial areas.

However, a route that stays on Bellevue Way until roughly NE 4th St, and then curves and follows NE 6th St under/beside the BTC would allow for a station in the southwest of downtown area (e.g. Bellevue Way/Main/NE2nd) and complement a second station near BTC. These two stations would much more effectively serve downtown Bellevue and even the High School with a bit of a walk. This alignment would allow a 405 crossing near NE6th St, and a station on the east of 405 near autorow, serving both the hospital area and whatever gets redeveloped at autorow. I believe such an alignment could be a combination of elevated and at grade until entering a portal somewhere either near Bellevue Way/NE 4th St, or perhaps the Bartell/old Safeway parking lot, and still be a fairly short tunnel (roughly 6 "blocks" from 104th to 110th.)

Given that such an alignment serves Bellevue so much better than the snaking alignment east of 112th, I really think this should be reconsidered.

Sincerely Yours,

Carl Stork

From: Amy Sirr

Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 5:04 PM

To: eastlink- mailbox shared,

Subject: South Bellevue workshop comments

I live in the Enatai neighborhood and attended the workshop this past Wednesday at the Bellevue High cafeteria. I received a lot of useful information and appreciate Sound Transit's efforts to keep the community informed. I use public transportation and am supportive of the B3S route. I wasn't able to turn in my participant workbook so I thought I'd just email my comments...

I liked the alternative that has been created for the S. Bellevue park-n-ride where the station is on the east side of the parking lot. This option would perhaps help a bit with noise and track height concerns for people living across the street from Bellevue Way. However, I was sad to see it would mean taking out the Bill Pace fruit stand. I was told that options are being looked at to replace it. I know the Winter's house has to be moved and have heard that it will probably be relocated near where it is now. If you do take out the fruit stand, I wonder if part of the Winter's house could be used in that capacity (probably too tricky since it's a historical landmark but thought it might be an idea to save money and perhaps draw more people into the Winter's house (does anyone ever go in there?))

As much as I would like to see my neighbors' concerns with the station mitigated, I do think that Sound Transit's primary goal should be making the light rail as efficient as possible so that when it is built and running people will actually see it as a viable transportation option. The slower the route becomes the fewer people will ride it. Therefore, if this option means a slowdown in travel time that is significant then I would prefer to see the original west facing station chosen. I also think in the long run it makes more sense to run the track straight down 112th rather than curving behind the Bellevue club. People moan and groan, and for good reason, but ultimately we need the light rail to be functional (fast). If the travel times and costs are not too great of a trade off then these options (behind Bellevue club and east of parking lot station at S. Bellevue Park-n-Ride) are great ways to help decrease objections to the B3 route.

Ultimately, I'm happy to leave these decisions to the engineers at Sound Transit and the city of Bellevue as I'm sure they are completely capable of making the right recommendations.

Thank you and please keep me on the mailing list for future updates.

From: Scott Lampe
Sent: Thursday, October 15, 2009 6:20 AM
To: eastlink- mailbox shared,
Subject: Comments on South Bellevue Open House

Attached are my comments related to the open house last night at Bellevue High School.

Scott Lampe

Sound Transit wants to know how light rail can best serve **OUR** community.

Please share these facts with them...

Sound Transit, a taxpayer supported agency, is obligated to give equal weight, thorough study, analysis and engineering to the B7/Burlington Northern route.

It is a viable, economically sound solution to a regional transit problem.

SOUND TRANSIT --- WHEN WILL THE AGENCY FACE THE FACTS ???

Public Comment	Over 75% of those who commented on the East Link DEIS support the B7 alignment.
Cost Savings	B7 costs no more than B3. With B7, you get a direct link to future connections east to Issaquah and south to Renton. Paying the \$125 million (\$125,000,000) now to cross over the Mercer Slough makes a future eastward expansion less expensive. Why not build this bridge for future connections now and save money?
Gaining Ridership	Utilizing B7 in today's dollars reduces future expansion costs east to Eastgate and Issaquah and more easily adding 11,000 riders daily to the light rail system.
Ridership Numbers	Per Sound Transit's own analysis, there are negligible ridership differences between B7 and B3.
Congestion	Using B7 and the BNSF right of way removes construction impacts from Bellevue Way, thereby decreasing gridlock and drivers finding alternate routes through adjacent neighborhoods.
Noise	B7 is has only one curve, resulting in faster travel times and less "wheel squeal". Curves cost more money. B3 has three curves.

Safety	Grade separation increases speed and safety. B7 is grade separated. By Sound Transit's own analysis, B7 will have no or minimal impacts with regard to accidents. B3 is not grade separated
City Policy	Bellevue's Light Rail Best Practices and Comprehensive Plan Policies support the B7 route over all other Bellevue alignments proposed by Sound Transit. The Best Practices study took 1 ½ years and cost over \$400,000.00. The facts from this study should be applied to any East Link proposal.
Access	A SE8th/I-405 area station will serve Bellevue neighborhoods equally as well as the proposed South Bellevue Park and Ride by utilizing drop-off areas, linked bus service and multi-modal access. It will eliminate the need for both the East Main Station and the South Bellevue Park and Ride Station.
Visual Blight	The proposed station at the South Bellevue Park and Ride will reach a height of 75 feet. Rails will be 30 feet tall, electrical transmission lines will be 15 feet above that, and elevator access will be 30 feet above that!
Wetland Impacts	The South Bellevue Park and Ride is built on in-fill in a wetland, and could not be built today with current environmental regulations. The Bellefield Office Park is also built on in-fill in a wetland. The buildings continue to sink each year, and must utilize pumps for flooding. What will be the extent of impacts from a light rail train station in the Mercer Slough?
Historical Impacts	Choosing B7 leaves the Historical Winters House untouched. It is Bellevue's only public building on the National Register of Historic Places.

For Further Information Contact The Surrey Downs East Link Committee: scottlampe@msn.com

Increased Housing House Bill 1490, defeated by a single vote in the 2008 Washington State Legislature, would have mandated a 50 unit-per-acre density (housing units) within a half-mile from ALL transit stations.

Downtown Bellevue – Email Comments

From: Terry
To: Katie Kucimba
Subject: 10812 NE 12th Place Bellevue Home on Tunnel Route

Katie,

Who has the legal final say in which route will go through downtown Bellevue? Sound Transit or City of Bellevue? I'm not clear on who has the final say. Am I at the mercy of Sound Transit? Of the City of Bellevue? Or both? I am Terry Barr and I live at 10812 NE 12th Place, Bellevue WA.

From: H, Landig
To: Kuciemba, Katie
Subject: Bellevue presentation

Might utilization of the space above the Bellevue NE 8th/ I-405 interchange lower cost of property acquisition and slightly shorten the route? At the same time it would straighten the route, thus reducing operational cost. Please see attached sketch. (I am by no means an engineer or construction person, so there are probably all kinds of reasons for this not to work...)



From: Carl Stork
Sent: Friday, November 27, 2009 9:45 AM
To: eastlink- mailbox shared,
Subject: Downtown Bellevue comments

Of all of the downtown Bellevue alignments, I prefer C11A which permits the Link station to be at the current Bellevue Transit Center and closer to the center of downtown Bellevue than any of the other alternatives, and allows for a well-suited station for the Hospital and potential development near 116th & NE 8th St. Carl Stork

From: Lesley Stuart
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 6:17 PM
To: eastlink- mailbox shared,
Subject: Comment on So. Bellevue/Downtown Light Rail Project

Greetings,

Thank you for soliciting community input on this project. I was not able to attend the workshop last week due to illness, but would like to convey some concerns. I have heard that there may be political pressure put on new Bellevue City Councilpersons to alter the I-405 crossing from where it is currently in the plans to somewhere south of there. This would allow use of the existing BNSF railway line. I would NOT support this.

Please keep the light rail on the west side of I-405 until it crosses north of NE 8th. I live very close to where that old rail line crosses SE 5th and the rail traffic would be horrible. I know this, as it was bad enough when the Dinner Train and Boeing trains used the track until last year.

Thanks very much.

Sincerely,

Lesley Stuart

From: Mitchell Nudelman
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2009 7:31 AM
To: Kuciemba, Katie
Subject: Downtown Bellevue alternatives

I was unable to make the meeting on the 18th. I was wondering if there is any cost information out on the new alternatives C9-A and C11- A to compare to the chart showing the comparison of the current alternatives costs.

Thanks,

Mitch Nudelman
Bellegrove Ob/Gyn

From: James P. Bridges
Sent: Saturday, November 21, 2009 8:05 AM
To: eastlink- mailbox shared,
Subject: Downtown Bellevue Presentation 11-18-2009

Hi, Just wanted to pass on that all looks good from a rider prospective. All though after looking at the Potential New At-Grade Alternatives. I found At-grade alternative C11A more appealing. Maybe a possibility less in construction cost. With the trains pulling in to the Bellevue TC it will be more convenient for making train/bus connections.

Thank you,
James

From: Michael Stanek
Sent: Thursday, November 19, 2009 8:23 PM
To: Kuciemba, Katie
Subject: Eastlink Light Rail

Katie, I attended the public meeting at the City of Bellevue today and got a lot of information about the light rail coming to Bellevue. I live in downtown Bellevue currently and work downtown as well actually right next to the bus transit center on 108th. I am a civil engineer with experience in land development and currently work on airports. I am very interested in the light rail coming to the Eastside. I think rail is a much better way to travel than bus and the light rail will bring much needed relief to vehicle traffic to the city here. After attending the meeting today and having several of my questions answered I have several comments:

1) The best option for the light rail is one of the tunnel options. It is so much better to have a train system underground and out of the public's way like New York has. The only signs of the subway there are stairs every once in a while leading to the subway. I used to live next to an elevated train system in New Jersey that was pretty nice. That place had a huge parking lot for commuters like a park 'n ride so may not be as applicable to a downtown setting. Places like San Francisco with a street car like system are not as efficient. The rail on Martin Luther King works well because the road is so wide. Typically street cars impact vehicle traffic, pedestrian traffic, can create unsafe conditions and are annoying to hear. Elevated trains are a better alternative to street cars. Don't believe that street cars will enhance the downtown area at all. Look at the trolley near Lake Union. It is a terrible nuisance to drivers at an already confusing intersection.

2) 110th Street should not be used as an optional route. The road is too narrow to accommodate cars and the light rail. Even if it becomes a one-way road, it will still adversely affect traffic through that area. It will impact traffic flow to the Bravern which is Bellevue's newest and most invested developments. There are still a lot of empty spaces there that will need to attract tenants. I think that it is a good idea to have the light rail nearby, but not in front of the Bravern.

3) While the tunnel is the best option, unless it can be properly financed, then something else should be done. Please don't try some crazy taxing or financing scheme and borrow too much. If we don't have funds, then we don't have funds. Be financially responsible.

4) There has been an alternative route proposed by one of the council members at the City of Bellevue called the Vision Line. The Vision Line is a proposal for the train to use the old BNSF track that runs along I-405. I think that is probably the best option available and should be researched more. Since surface street rail is such a pain and will not enhance Bellevue's downtown at all, and the tunnel looks like it won't happen, then this option should be explored. The downside of it is that it is somewhat farther away from businesses, shopping, etc. But there could be a bus stop there just for the purpose of shuttling people between the train station and the bus center on 108th. It will keep impacts out of the immediate downtown, and would be cheaper to build. Thanks for your time.

Michael Stanek

From: Wilson Geegh
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 12:52 PM
To: eastlink- mailbox shared,
Subject: Nov 18 Workshop Comments

Dear Sound Transit,

I attended the Nov 18 workshop and strongly support the preferred C4A surface route through Bellevue. It will be more convenient for riders than a tunnel, and a recent Sound Transit video demonstrated minimal traffic interference. I do wonder about using the south side of Main rather than the north side. I hope you are able to negotiate the roadblocks put up by NIMBY's as well as "tunnel vision" politicians and business people.

Wilson Geegh

From: Reiner Decher
Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 5:33 PM
To: Kuciemba, Katie
Subject: more comments

Dear Ms Kuciemba,

I stopped by to talk to you at the Bellevue mtg and mentioned the platform design issues at the ID station to allow for easy transfers from the Eastlink to the airport, perhaps burdened with luggage. I want to add the notion that events at the stadium station will similarly involved large crowds during games and it would be really appropriate to allow such crowds to proceed across the platform from the East to the stadium rather than up and over the tracks via stairs, escalators, or elevators.

One of these days I will make a trip to the ID station to see whether a central platform is feasible. In Munich Germany I have seen platform on both sides of the train with sign and audible suggestion to exit on the L to do one thing (a connection or street exit) and on the R to do another. That seemed to work quite well.

I agree with the ST determination that the one-seat trip is better from the East to the North, downtown and the U rather than going South. Fewer people are like to make that trip.

I am very interested in seeing whether the people objecting to the Blv Way, 112th route will accept and capitulate or whether this will remain a contentious issue. I am also following these ST2 happenings with an eye on Blv City Council whose membership has leaned toward a plurality of members in the pocket of the archenemy of light rail, Kemper Freeman.

Reiner Decher
Prof. Emeritus
U of Washington

From: Maury Miller
Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 9:03 AM
To: Kuciemba, Katie
Subject: East Link

Ms. Kuciemba:

I have been following the East Link project with interest. The most important aspect of the project is the route. The recent C9T is the best combination of cost and ridership. It goes close to the downtown core of Bellevue. This is key. Kevin Wallace's Vision Line is a mistake. It is a unfortunate product of NIMBYism. The line will require a people mover so there is access to the downtown core of Bellevue. If you add in the cost of the people mover to the Vision Line proposal, it will have the same cost as the C9T alternative. Bellevue needs a first class transit system and C9T will provide this.

Maury Miller

From: Men Lim

Sent: Wednesday, November 25, 2009 12:06 AM

To: Kuciemba, Katie

Subject: east link light rail meeting

Hi Katie,

I wasn't able to attend the eastlink light rail meeting on Nov 18th. I was wondering if you have meeting notes that you can share with me?

In Colorado, they just got done w/ their light rail project a few of years ago and I'm not sure if anyone from the Abella condo spoke to you/the representatives, but I have a couple of concerns about the light rail track being built on the 110th ave ne. My main concern is the noise from the construction and the train will make once it becomes operational.

- Was there any consideration of having the train run both north and south on 108th st?

- What time will construction be taking place on 110th ave ne? During the 405 highway construction near NE 4th st a couple of months back, there were a LOT of noise and the thin windows in these condos doesn't help.

- Will the light rail be running 24/7? if 24/7, how much noise is it going to make? In Colorado, every time a light rail train comes to a stop light, they always fire off the train's horn. Will the train drivers be doing the same thing here?

Thanks, Men

From: STEVE S OMOTO

Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 8:33 PM

To: eastlink- mailbox shared,

Subject: East Link light rail: Downtown Bellevue Workshop

As a pedestrian and frequent user of Metro Bus Service at the Bellevue Transit Center, I'd just like to voice my support for the C9A at-grade alternative. I heard that this alternative is being considered because it avoids busy NE 8th St. For me, it avoids the NE 6th St (pedestrian walkway by the Galleria) which I use along with a lot of other Metro bus riders who approach the Bellevue Transit Center from the

west Bellevue side. In any event, I do hope consideration is given to provide an access to the Transit Center without having to cross the rail line.

I'd also like to add that I think cost is important and the tunnel alternative sounds nice, but, if I were to vote for a tax to fund the \$300 mil tunnel option, I would vote no.

Thank you for allowing these comments, Steve Omoto

From: Dwight Schrag

Sent: Tuesday, November 24, 2009 8:53 PM

To: Kuciemba, Katie

Subject: Re: Enhanced C9T concept

Hi Katie, We had good/open discussions with Surrey Downs leaders today; and they are meeting as a group tonight. They are searching for a good solution to rally around. We'd like to help get to some consensus for support so downtown interests can go home happy and relax.

As ST has discovered by now, it's time to select maybe two good options for downtown; and then go to 30% engineering. Hopefully the Workshop provided some clarity of public input. **Politics should now get out of the way and let ST get to work.**

#1) I plan to suggest one potential approach to bring down costs of C9T ("enhanced C9T"). It needs some engineering reviews to see if it's even a viable possibility. Similar to one of the original elevated alternatives along 112th to 110th, but using a shortened tunnel instead, to get to the bus terminal area along 6th St. Sue Comis will recognize it. If technically feasible, it could avoid much cost; and provides great benefits to ST & downtown (my opinion). I'd guess BDA would probably be supportive + Surrey Downs, too.

#2) A further cost-reduction concept is very similar, staying elevated along 112th, accomplishing the same result with far lower costs; and even more great benefits. Engineers are needed again to assess. If this were my city to run for 100 years, I'd use this particular approach. My tag-name is "modified Vision" for sentimental benefit of Surrey Downs/South Bellevue folks. Initial reactions seemed positivewe'll see? Not sure how BDA would respond? We'll see.

#3) If neither approach has any ST traction, my engineering idea-machine will be shut down. Mary and I can then rest easy knowing we did our very best to help bring common sense for challenging downtown planning issues. We will be quiet and take a long deserved vacation.

I'd suggest your best outreach efforts might focus on BDA and Surrey Downs. Betina Finley still seems fully engaged on North End. She's skilled with group dynamics. So is Cathy Jeffris. We're happy to discuss the situation with you anytime. We're much committed to helping reach a viable/cost-efficient consensus.

Fill us in what you learned from the Workshop inputs. Dwight & Mary Schrag

From: Dwight Schrag

Sent: Friday, November 20, 2009 9:11 AM

To: Van de Kamp, Bernard
Subject: Enhanced C9T concept

Hi Bernard,

We didn't get opportunity with you at Wed's. ST workshop to discuss conceptual approach to reduce tunnel length for current C9T alternative by about 50%; and place downtown transit center station partially at-grade along NE 6th St. for ease of access to the Bus TC.

Large number of new downtown route concepts being floated out by ST at the workshop was interesting, plus vision-line idea, too.

As Bellevue works your December 10th timeline with ST for potential value of additional tunnel funding sources, we should discuss one more idea to see if it might be technically feasible to accomplish. If it is, the added costs for C9T additions (+\$300 million) might be cut by say 60% range.

It would be helpful to look at your concept/detailed C9T route drawings; elevations; and tunnel radius requirements for the downtown tunnel route. Can we pick a time with you to do that in coming days? I don't want to suggest another new concept to add to your pile of options unless it is feasible to build.

Thanks, Dwight Schrag

From: Dennis Neuzil

Subject: Comments for Sound Transit Nov. 18, 2009 open-house for Downtown Bellevue East

Link LRT route alternatives

Comments regarding the Nov. 18, 2009 ST East Link open house at Bellevue city hall addressing the downtown Bellevue segment route alternative concepts:

It is my opinion that all surface alternative routings are totally inappropriate for the subject route segment:

- Reliability, capacity, and safety for LRT movements would greatly suffer.
- Roadway traffic operations, capacity, safety, access and circulation for both motorized and nonmotorized travel modes would be extremely and unacceptably adversely impacted.

Accordingly, the following alternatives should be given further detailed development and evaluation:

- **C9T -- cut-&-cover tunnel via 110th Ave NE and NE 6th St.:** This alt.'s station near the hospital vicinity NE 8th St is beneficially and therefore superior access-wise to C3T for hospital-bound passengers. A fully grade-separated covered walkway/trail should be provided to accommodate both pedestrians and bicycles (supplemented with an airport-terminal-style pedestrian-beltway) to link this station to the west side of 116th Ave at the Group Health/Overlake main buildings complex.
- **C9T-modified (Dennis Neuzil):** Same as above except replace the 110th Ave NE alignment segment with one in tunnel or cut/cover along 108th Ave NE.

- **Vision Line Coalition concept:** This alignment concept, recently proposed by the Vision Line Coalition to the City of Bellevue and Sound Transit, should be studied in-depth by both the city and Sound Transit. Its utilization of a part of the BNSF RR right-of-way and elevated alignment along 114th Ave NE downtown may offer substantially reduced construction cost and less cost-escalation risk versus the above alternatives -- while still providing acceptable-quality access to the office core via a grade separated covered walkway/pedestrian speed-ramp from its NE 6th St station. It is absolutely vital, however, that this alternative be able to accommodate a potential commuter rail train operation and the pending regional-class bicycle-pedestrian trail on the BNSF segment, as well as a major ped-bike trail on the 114th Ave segment (the Lake Washington Loop Trail).. This alternative's "hospital station" should also have the pedestrian/bicycle link to Overlake Hospital/Group Health as recommended above for the two C9T alternative variants.

Dennis Neuzil, Dr.Eng., P.E

From: Sue Olsen
To: letters@bellevuereporter.com
Date: Thu, 19 Nov 2009 16:24:47 -0800
Subject: Light Rail

Regarding the "New Light Rail Plan Avoids Downtown Core" I find Wallace's dubbed 'Vision Rail' a misnomer if ever there was one. It presents an inefficient plan that is not only lacking vision but irresponsible. Rapid transit has many purposes including serving the community, reducing traffic congestion and in the long term perhaps even improving the environment. This proposal with its "sort of near Bellevue" rail stop does none of these. Light rail should indeed and quite frankly especially serve the downtown core including the many residents, visitors, businesses and their employees and maybe even shoppers! Again this proposal does none of these and should it become the chosen route I can hear the nay-sayers now "no one uses light rail". Well that likely would be true since the proposed route would be essentially without a useful community purpose. I am old enough to remember the Forward Thrust projects voted on in the late 1960's. Thanks to a serious vendetta by Kemper Freeman Sr. one was defeated and that was light rail. Had it passed then we would now have an efficient transportation system/service in place and I might add at a far lower price. Please Sound Transit administrators do not accept this latest proposal.

Sue Olsen
 Bellevue

From: Craig Dalby [mailto:craigdalby@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, December 10, 2009 8:51 PM
To: Kuciemba, Katie
Subject: Comments on East Link Workshops

In July 2008 a Sound Transit document titled "Sound Transit 2: A Mass Transit Guide" stated that, "Because it runs on its own tracks separated from traffic, light rail is quick and reliable." A majority of Puget Sound residents agreed with that assessment and voted to expand our light rail system. But now, with some proposed alternatives for East Link, our regional light rail system is in jeopardy of becoming a long streetcar line, which would not be separated from traffic and would not be especially quick. To ensure that we get what we voted for, Link must be designed and constructed as a rapid transit system.

Local considerations drive a large part of Link's configuration. Many of the "slower" design options in the Link system are developed at the request of municipal officials and planners, who are concerned that elevated lines would be unsightly and faster moving trains would be noisier. But these issues can be addressed without diminishing the value our regional rail system. Sound Transit must work with local

governments to design routes and stations that address community needs, while still serving the regional purpose for which light rail was intended: to link communities together with fast transit.

Rather than lowering speed limits on freeways, sound walls are used to reduce noise impacts to adjacent residences. This same approach can be taken with East Link, and has been done already along much of the existing Central Link route. Sound walls should be considered for Link segments in south Bellevue, and through the planned neighborhoods in the Bel-Red corridor, including sections running in street medians. Vegetative screening on the outside of the walls could improve the aesthetics.

In-street routes and at-grade road- and pedestrian-crossings that slow the trains well below their potential speeds need to be avoided entirely. If elevated routes for Link aren't preferred for a particular area, street overpasses or underpasses could be built for the roads that will cross the line. With proper forethought these can be nicely designed structures that will enhance, rather than detract from, the appearance of the neighborhood.

The East Link segment through downtown Bellevue is especially problematic. A tunnel or elevated route is a must here, as all the proposed at-grade routes are hopelessly flawed. Sound Transit should continue to study this option, and work to find funding for it. However, if an underground route is unaffordable, Sound Transit must reconsider elevated alternatives.

Another area of concern is around Overlake, where current plans would have Link drop to street grade along NE 24th Street just before crossing an entrance to a shopping center located north of the street. This makes little sense. The Link route should continue on an elevated structure to near the Overlake station (or perhaps including the station itself), then drop to street level with no at-grade crossings. This would allow unfettered vehicle access to the shopping plaza and no speed reduction for the trains.

Of course, the best solution for each particular area will depend on the specifics of the site. But the overriding principle in designing Link should be keeping it separate from all other transportation routes.

In 2007 Joni Earl said that, "Every day Sound Transit and its partners work together to offer fast, reliable and convenient options to get out of traffic." We must work to ensure that East Link is fast and reliable by not placing it right in the middle of the traffic it's supposed to avoid.