



Eastgate/I-90

Land Use & Transportation Project

CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, September 29, 2011
5:30 P.M. – Room 1E-108
Bellevue City Hall – 450 110th Avenue NE

1. Call to order (5:30)
2. Approval of September 8, 2011 meeting minutes (5:30-5:35) *
3. Discussion of Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report (5:35-6:15) *
(continued from September 8, 2011)
4. Initiate discussion of preferred alternative (6:15-7:00) *
5. Public comment (7:00-7:15)
6. Further Committee discussion (7:15-7:30)
7. Adjourn (7:30)

* = related materials included in packet

Upcoming Meetings: Thursday, October 6, 2011, 5:30 PM
Thursday, November 3, 2011, 5:30 PM

Visit our website: www.bellevuewa.gov/eastgate-corridor.htm



Eastgate/I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project

TO: Eastgate/I-90 Citizen Advisory Committee

FROM: Mike Bergstrom, Planning & Community Development
Franz Loewenherz, Transportation Department

SUBJECT: September 29, 2011 CAC Meeting – **Agenda Item No. 4 – Initiate Discussion of Preferred Alternative**

DATE: September 23, 2011

Introduction

On September 29, following further discussion of the Evaluation Report at Agenda Item 3, the CAC will have the opportunity to start laying the foundation for a preferred alternative at Agenda Item 4. While the real effort on a preferred alternative will take place one week later (on October 6), having an initial discussion on September 29 will help ensure a productive session the following week.

Preferred alternative development schedule

Development of the preferred alternative is expected to occur over three meetings – October, November, and December, followed by a project wrap-up meeting January. Meeting dates and primary tasks are:

- October 6 – Work session to develop a preliminary preferred alternative. The outcome will be a graphic similar in style and level of detail as the draft alternatives.
- November 3 – Refinement of the preferred alternative. More detail and definition will be added; urban form and corridor character will be more fully developed.
- December 1 – Finalize the preferred alternative.
- January 5 – Approve the final report/recommendation for transmittal to Council.

As part of this work, we will share the preliminary preferred alternative that results from the October 6 meeting with the public at an open house on October 18 (4:30-6:30 PM at the Robinswood Cabana). Input received at that event will be given to the CAC to help inform alternative refinement that will occur on November 3. Of course, CAC members are welcome and encouraged to attend the open house.

CAC homework request

We ask that you give some thought to the considerations listed below in advance of the September 29 meeting. While there may not be sufficient time that evening to fully discuss and resolve each of the above items on September 29, the extent to which consensus can be reached or progress made on some of them will make the October 6 work session that much more efficient.

Considerations

Development of a preliminary preferred alternative needs to consider many things, including the type of starting point to use. If there is consensus among CAC members that one of the draft alternatives fundamentally represents a desirable vision, you might want to use that as a base and modify it as you deem appropriate (including using elements from other alternatives). Or, the CAC could start with the No Action scenario or even a blank map and then create something very different from the draft alternatives.

Regardless of approach, there are some broad issues and considerations to bear in mind, including:

- The preferred alternative will represent a long-range vision. Although some elements could happen in the near future, others will occur over a long period of time. How would you like the corridor to look and function 20 years in the future?
- What should be the long-term character of the corridor? How can future economic development in the study area help retrofit the corridor to achieve or contribute to that character?
- Different approaches to development density and building heights will have different implications for urban form and corridor character. Generally speaking, what are appropriate densities and heights for the study area?
- Land use and transportation elements need to be addressed together and support one another. What mix of land uses and transportation improvements best achieves this?
- What makes this employment area different from other areas (e.g., downtown, Bel-Red, Issaquah, etc), in terms of businesses it attracts, where it fits in the city's overall economic picture, and its relationship to surrounding neighborhoods?
- When thinking about individual geographic subareas in the corridor, what is the primary objective we are trying to achieve and how is that best accomplished?
- The CAC should refer to the evaluation criteria you developed in February & March to help guide the development of the preferred alternative.
- The CAC might be able to reach consensus at this meeting on certain elements of the draft alternatives that should either be definitely included in or excluded from the preferred alternative. Identifying such elements on September 29 would help make the October 6 work session more efficient.

Attached materials

Attached to this memo is an excerpt of the minutes from the July 5, 2011 City Council meeting. At that meeting, CAC co-chairs Hamlin and Larrivee and staff provided Council with a project update, and Council had several questions and insights to offer. You might find these helpful as you start to think about a preferred alternative.

Attachment: July 5, 2011 Council minutes excerpt



Eastgate/I-90 Land Use & Transportation Project

TO: Eastgate/I-90 Citizen Advisory Committee

FROM: Mike Bergstrom, Planning & Community Development
Franz Loewenherz, Transportation Department

SUBJECT: September 29, 2011 CAC Meeting – **Agenda Item No. 3 – Discussion of Draft Alternatives Report** (continued from September 8, 2011)

DATE: September 23, 2011

Introduction

At your September 8, 2011 meeting, the CAC was presented with an overview of the Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report that was produced by staff and consultants over the summer months. Because the CAC did not have the opportunity to review the report prior to that meeting, it was agreed that a followup meeting would be useful to give the CAC adequate time to review the report in more depth. Therefore, a meeting was added for September 29 to further discuss the report and start laying the groundwork for the development of a preferred alternative.

This meeting will serve as a bridge between the evaluation of the draft alternatives and the development of a preferred alternative. The discussion at Agenda Item 3 will lead into Agenda Item 4, at which point the CAC will be asked to initiate discussion on a preferred alternative. These two agenda items, combined, will help ensure a productive meeting one week later on October 6. The goal of that meeting will be to develop a preliminary preferred alternative that will be refined in November and December.

CAC homework request

Staff would like to hear from individual CAC members on how well you think each alternative responds to the CAC evaluation criteria. Therefore, in advance of the September 29 meeting, we ask that CAC members give some thought to this topic and be prepared to spend two-three minutes at the meeting to share your individual insights. Hearing different individual perspectives will be valuable to the CAC as a whole, as well as to staff, and will help advance the discussion to occur at Agenda Item 4 and the eventual development of a preferred alternative.

Followup questions

In addition to providing your own observations about the alternatives and their relationship to the evaluation criteria, the CAC will be able to ask followup questions of staff and one of our project consultants, Jim Ellison. Mr. Ellison is a professional engineer who prepared the technical memorandum contained in Appendix E of the Evaluation of Draft Alternatives Report. That memorandum analyzes the potential impacts of the No Action and three Action alternatives on the roadway network.

Additional evaluation materials

The Evaluation Report given to the CAC at your September 8 meeting did not include Appendix B – Redevelopment Analysis (Heartland). We hope to have that available on September 29 to review with you that evening. That analysis is evaluating different potential development scenarios on selected sites within the study area to determine their financial feasibility. The analysis will help staff and the CAC better gauge the types of development or redevelopment that might make financial sense in the corridor.

We look forward to this discussion Thursday evening.

Agenda Item No. 2
September 29, 2011
Eastgate/I-90 CAC Meeting

CITY OF BELLEVUE
EASTGATE/I-90
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

September 8, 2011
5:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-108

MEMBERS PRESENT: Carrie Courter Blanton, Tom Bohman, Lindy Bruce, Dave Elliott, Jay Hamlin, Francois Larrivee, Mark Ludtka, Tom Perea, Rob Pucher, Rachel Solemsaas, John Stokes, Cynthia Welti

MEMBERS ABSENT: Jeffrey Hummer, Jim Stanton

OTHERS PRESENT: Councilmember Jennifer Robertson

STAFF PRESENT: Franz Loewenherz, Transportation; Mike Bergstrom, Planning & Community Development

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. Call to Order

Co-Chair Hamlin called the meeting to order at 5:36 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

A. June 16, 2011

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Mr. Bohman. Second was by Mr. Ludtka and the motion carried unanimously.

3. Evaluation of Draft Alternatives

Before turning to a review of the draft alternatives, Co-Chair Hamlin granted a request to allow for a presentation regarding the Lincoln Executive Center property.

Mr. Pat Callahan with the Urban Renaissance Group said following the Committee's last meeting the questions and comments asked and made by Committee members and staff regarding the Lincoln Executive Center site were compiled and answered in clear detail. He said in general terms the desire is to create an environment that is very different from the one that currently exists on the site, but one that is consistent with the plans that have previously been discussed. He allowed that a change in the zoning would be needed to make the project feasible. The shared objective is to increase retail amenities in the neighborhood, make the development look far better than it does currently, and to create jobs. He shared with the Committee revised plans for the site that included tearing down a building in the back, constructing a parking garage and two new office buildings. The Bank of America branch would need to be purchased as part of the redevelopment; the branch and much of the existing surface parking would be replaced with a water feature, retention pond, and green space. He indicated for the Committee how 40,000 square feet

Agenda Item No. 2
September 29, 2011
Eastgate/I-90 CAC Meeting

of retail could be added to the complex by putting it at grade as the most visible and most easily accessed component. A pleasant pedestrian environment connecting everything would be created covering the quarter mile between the site and the park and ride lot. From an economics standpoint, the towers will need to have 150-foot height limits. Two scenarios have been tested: a six-story building, and a twelve-story building. In the tests, only the twelve-story building was shown to make economic sense. In addition, peak rents will need to be charged, but the height and resulting views will make higher rents possible.

Senior Planner Mike Bergstrom briefly reviewed the contents of the draft alternatives report. He also outlined the study schedule, noting that a meeting had been added on September 29 and that the group would return to meeting the first Thursday of each month beginning in October. The staff will provide updates to the Planning Commission and the Transportation Commission in October, and will update the Council on November 14. An open house will be held before finalizing the alternative.

Mr. Bergstrom noted that the evaluation of alternatives is structured around the nine topical areas addressed by the evaluation criteria. The Council principles did not have specific titles but were fed into each of the topical areas. The CAC was reminded that the No Action alternative was predicated on what is likely to happen in the corridor over the next 20 years if no changes are made to policies and development regulations. The three action alternatives each emphasize a different theme: a jobs/housing balance in Alternative 1; building on the historic success of office and jobs in the corridor in Alternative 2; and a more modest approach of focusing only on the corridor concerns mentioned most often by the community in Alternative 3. He allowed that the CAC was free to pick and choose elements from among the alternatives in developing a final alternative.

Mr. Bergstrom said the analysis did not turn up any fatal flaws in any of the action alternatives. The transportation network will function under any of the alternatives, though there are existing chokepoints that will continue to be evident.

Mr. Ludtka asked if the lack of a transportation fatal flaw in any of the action alternatives could be interpreted to mean none of the alternatives pushed the envelope far enough. Senior transportation planner Franz Loewenherz said the alternatives were framed based largely on market feasibility and what might reasonably be expected to occur, which kept the envelope from being pushed too far.

There are minor differences among the alternatives in terms of environmental consequences. However, it is largely necessary to ramp up the power of the microscope to see them, primarily because the corridor is already highly developed and therefore impacted. There could be some beneficial impacts associated with redevelopment given the current storm water management standards which are much stricter than those in place when much of the corridor was developed; even so, the environmental benefits would be relatively small.

All of the action alternatives include some potentially significant capital expenses. All of the action alternatives also necessitate and provide opportunities for partnerships with other agencies and institutions.

Mr. Bergstrom said the market feasibility study completed prior to the CAC taking up its work predicted market demand out over 20 years, though it did not consider all land use sectors in terms of quantifying them. The focus was primarily on office, residential and

Agenda Item No. 2
September 29, 2011
Eastgate/I-90 CAC Meeting

hotel rooms. He noted that while the No Action alternative is technically feasible from a market standpoint, it captures little of the identified demand and does not provide for the services and amenities desired by those who live and work in the area. Alternative 1 overall most closely approximates the identified demand. Alternative 2 provides the greatest opportunity for redevelopment in terms of new space square footage; the amount of office it includes exceeds the market demand identified in the Spinaker report. Alternative 3 has the greatest retail growth, but since the market demand for retail was not quantified in the market analysis, it cannot be said how supportable the demand is. Alternative 3 falls below the market demand for other identified land use sectors.

The residential development shown in the Richards Valley area in Alternative 1 is unlikely to occur, primarily because of what stands in the way, namely a Puget Sound Energy substation and some properties with very high improvement-to-land ratios. Large-format retail as shown in Alternative 3 could be successful, but it would have to displace other retail uses.

The alternatives reflect a range of projected job growth. Alternative 2 with its focus on office is projected to add 6800 jobs over the 2008 figures. Alternative 1 would add about half that many jobs, while Alternative 3 would bring online even fewer new jobs. The No Action would have some growth, but not as much as any of the action alternatives, and it does not improve the competitive position. All of the alternatives, including No Action, retain or provide for a broad range of economic uses, including industrial, institutional, retail, office and service. The alternatives all preserve the industrial area, though under No Action some growth is shown, under Alternative 1 there is some reduction, under Alternative 2 the overall amount remains static though there is a transformation to more high-tech, and under Alternative 3 nothing changes.

The alternatives all capitalize on the characteristics of the corridor but in different ways and to different degrees. Alternative 2 specifically promotes the Bellevue College/Richards Valley partnership for economic development; the alternative also shows office development at Sunset Village, which is where two auto dealers are located, though the net economic benefit would be questionable.

The various alternatives all continue to provide neighborhood-serving retail at some level and in some form. The No Action alternative could see the displacement or loss of neighborhood-serving businesses at Sunset Village due to continued growth of the auto dealers, and the Albertsons in Eastgate Plaza could be lost. All of the action alternatives reinforce and expand retail/service opportunities in different degrees and different ways. The residential element that appears in Alternatives 1 and 3 but not 2 helps support the retail uses. Large-format retail could serve neighborhood needs, but might displace existing neighborhood-serving needs. The alternatives all tend to keep most of the new development away from the residential edges, but to the extent that they abut edges or are visible from neighborhood areas, there should probably be some site design guidelines to help control the transitions. Alternative 2 is likely to require greater design control because it ramps up building heights and the like.

Mr. Bergstrom reiterated that none of the alternatives have much consequence either for better or worse on environmental quality and character. Redevelopment under any alternative could improve the surface and groundwater quality. The No Action alternative results in the fewest temporary impacts because there would be very little new construction undertaken. Increased traffic volumes under all of the alternatives will increase the total aggregate CO₂ emissions. Alternative 1 will reduce the peak hour

vehicle emissions on a per-capita basis owing to other efficiencies and increasing fuel efficiencies.

Mr. Loewenherz pointed out that under Alternative 1 adding residential influences a number of categories. The jobs/housing balance will have the most pronounced effect on reducing emissions on a per-capita basis.

Mr. Ludtka commented that with higher density, more land can be made available for open space, which will add more flora and fauna back into the system and help offset the CO₂ emissions. The current layout of the corridor essentially has everything paved. Mr. Loewenherz said the point is well taken. He said some of the enhancement characteristics are not unique to any one of the alternatives and could be mixed and matched in the preferred alternative.

Mr. Bergstrom said all the action alternatives improve the public health and promote sustainability to some extent through improved connections and walkability. Alternative 1 ranks the highest in that category, however, because of its jobs/housing balance.

Mr. Bergstrom allowed that corridor character is a concept that is not easily defined. He noted that the Mountains-to-Sound trail will go through the corridor along some alignment under any of the alternatives, including No Action. The trail will contribute to the character of the corridor and will be something that can be capitalized on. Generally, however, the No Action will bring about no noticeable change to the character or urban form of the corridor. Alternatives 1 and 2 present the most opportunity to improve the character of the area due to the amount of redevelopment they propose. The housing in Alternative 1 contributes to a variety of scale and architectural detailing that is not obtained otherwise; it also increases the evening and weekend vitality by emphasizing the mixed use character. From a gateway feature standpoint, the transit hub focus of Alternative 1 is the strongest feature, though it is an expensive item. The office in Alternative 2 offers a good opportunity to incorporate the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway character and green building standards, which would produce a large integrated campus character, primarily along the north edge of the freeway. Alternative 3 would add more retail than the others and might emphasize the corridor as a retail center; how much that really would do to the character of the corridor is somewhat limited. The interchange landscaping envisioned by Alternatives 2 and 3 creates a visual gateway, though not one that as is strong as the one envisioned by Alternative 1. Any of the alternatives could improve the character of the corridor through improved landscaping of both private properties and streetscapes.

With regard to parks, open space and recreation, Mr. Bergstrom said certain things will happen even under the No Action alternative. The Bellevue Airfield Park will be developed given that it is close to master plan adoption. The Mountains-to-Sound Trail alignment is not yet determined, but the presumption is it will be developed in the corridor. All of the alternatives will improve sidewalk and bicycle facilities, though the least improvement would occur under the No Action alternative. In the outreach done concerning the Mountains-to-Sound Trail alignment, the No Action alignment completely along the south edge of I-90 was the most preferred by riders. Alternative 1 does more than the others to call attention to small parks and green spaces; it looks at the conversion of storm detention ponds to the west of 139th to a park-like setting for public enjoyment. Each of the alternatives, however, are somewhat weak with regard to parks, open space and recreation, and development of the preferred alternative may want to take that into account. Alternatives 2 and 3 do not propose any new parks, but Alternative 3 does

Agenda Item No. 2
September 29, 2011
Eastgate/I-90 CAC Meeting

propose a partnership with Bellevue College for a community recreational or service facility that would be mutually beneficial. Overall, alternative 1 proposes the most desirable package of features.

Turning to the land use/transportation linkages, Mr. Loewenherz said the traffic engineers who worked on the alternatives benefited from the city's in-house modeling platform. In all, a total of 54 key intersections were assessed for levels of service and the amount of delay. The model was able to compare the impacts of the various alternatives and to determine the delta between the various improvements, both on the interstate and the arterial network. There was concern expressed by some CAC members about the concepts in looking at the applicability of roundabouts and the extent to which they would be feasible in the corridor; working with the state, benefit was gained from tapping into their expertise in generating some microsimulations illustrating how vehicles at future volume levels would operate through the roundabouts. Projected turning movement volumes at each of the intersections were also calculated to assess the changes.

Mr. Loewenherz said the trail assessments were made by a retinue of 42 cyclists, including Ms. Welti and Ms. Bruce. The group biked a number of different alignments considered for the corridor. That was followed up with an online questionnaire that generated more than 60 responses. A specialist in trails and bike facility design with national expertise went out into the field to determine what it would take to build each route. Time was spent supporting their analysis by giving them information about where collisions occur, existing roadway geometries, and so forth.

Connectivity within the corridor was one of the Council's principles of interest. Currently there are a number of dead-end streets, and the terrain makes it difficult to get around by all modes. A mapping interface was utilized to assess the benefits to the non-motorized community, vehicles, and potential high-capacity transit station locations.

The transit review work included looking at historic route productivity, boarding level activity, and where efficiencies might be gained by restricting the route network serving the area. A number of meetings were held with Bellevue College which figures prominently as a key node for the transit network, and with King County Metro and Sound Transit. The modeling platform was used to generate flow maps for the region.

Mr. Loewenherz said there is little discernable difference in the projected 2030 traffic impacts among any of the alternatives. That is not surprising given that the area is developed and there are limited opportunities for redevelopment potential. That conclusion was reached by using the four-step modeling process. The model inputs include the land use projections for each of the alternatives and the anticipated network improvements, both on local arterials and the interstate. The model generated delay calculations. Not calculated in, however, were the ideas under consideration of the Central Issaquah Plan, which is not yet adopted and would have been premature to include.

Mr. Loewenherz shared with the CAC a map color-coded to indicate the projected levels of service for each of the alternatives, including No Action. He allowed that the number of vehicles traveling the roadways under each alternative is different, but the increment is not sufficient to migrate from one letter designation to another. There are three Transportation Facilities Plan projects currently on the books that are programmed, and all three of the action alternatives include the I-90 mainline improvements. That does not

Agenda Item No. 2
September 29, 2011
Eastgate/I-90 CAC Meeting

mean that the traffic picture will be rosy. There are already congestion and traffic flow issues facing the corridor, and traffic volumes will increase. The current chokepoints will continue to be chokepoints.

Transportation Planning Manager Kevin O'Neill stressed that most of the traffic impacts that will be evident in 2030 are already there. None of the alternatives offer substantial growth. Some intersections will see traffic flows increase by as much as 12 percent, but not enough to bump from a higher LOS category to a lower LOS category. Each of the action alternatives include transportation improvements in addition to land use changes, so to some extent there is mitigation appended to each alternative.

Mr. Loewenherz noted that regardless of the alternative selected, the anticipated increase in peak hour traffic volumes is indicative of the need to include enhancements to address roadway, transit, pedestrian and bicycle considerations to better serve the network. Those enhancements include the intersection of 150th Avenue SE and Eastgate Way. The consultant team, working with transportation staff, built on the Transportation Facilities Plan project that is already programmed by adding an additional westbound lane, which will bump the sidewalk space further onto the Toyota dealership property; the lane will address queuing issues and add facilities for cyclists.

Mr. Loewenherz said construction of the eastbound and westbound auxiliary lanes by the state on I-90 between 150th Avenue SE and Lakemont Boulevard would significantly benefit the freeway mainline and would help to minimize or eliminate the resulting queuing and congestion on city streets that lead to key on-ramps in the study area.

Mr. Loewenherz said the analysis concluded that constructing a more effective interface between the I-90 ramps and overpasses and the city's interconnecting streets through the use of boulevard treatments and/or roundabouts could enhance traffic safety and provide community gateway and identity opportunities. He shared with the CAC an illustration from the state's I-90 corridor study reflecting a widening of the existing roundabout on West Lake Sammamish Parkway and the addition of a new roundabout at the westbound off-ramp location. The fix would greatly improve getting onto the interstate as well. The state modeling work demonstrated significant improvement, with the level of service going from F in the evening peak to E or better by 2030. During the morning peak, the current level of service is F; the modeling work showed the improvement would bring the level of service to D. The state has secured funding to move the second roundabout to design and construction, with an anticipated 2013 completion date. The state's primary focus is on safety, not improving level of service for the city.

Mr. Loewenherz said adding roundabouts elsewhere in the corridor was explored, such as at Eastgate and 150th Avenue SE, Eastgate and 156th Avenue SE, 150th Avenue SE and 37th Street South, and 150th Avenue SE and 38th Street South. WSDOT modeling of existing and future operations of roundabout intersections show enhanced mobility and merit further consideration as a feasible approach to finding balance between motorized and non-motorized uses and the interface between community and regional transportation needs.

Mr. Loewenherz said feedback from the outreach ride participants and the consultant team indicates the preferred Mountains-to-Sound Greenway trail to be south of I-90, and that cyclists should also be accommodated on the frontage road on the north side of I-90. The preferred alignment varied slightly from the No Action alternative in that instead of crossing at the Sunset pedestrian bridge it continues down to Newport Way and links up

Agenda Item No. 2
September 29, 2011
Eastgate/I-90 CAC Meeting

with the existing bicycle facilities put in by Issaquah at the Lakemont Interchange.

Mr. Ludtka disagreed with running the alignment down Newport Way. He said to make it safe would require widening the right-of-way; there is currently insufficient width to accommodate both bicycles and vehicle traffic from about 150th Avenue SE to Lakemont Boulevard. Mr. Loewenherz clarified that the trail facility would about I-90 on the state's right-of-way where there currently is only green space, and would only connect to Newport Way at the southern end.

One enhancement option that could be applied to any of the alternatives is the idea of including additional planted medians on SE 36th Street and making it more of a boulevard. The planted area could serve to separate the westbound lanes from the eastbound lanes. In addition to softening the corridor, the option would slow traffic and create more of a greenway concept.

Mr. Loewenherz said the public feedback throughout the Eastgate/I-90 planning process has suggested the need to develop engineering solutions to facilitate cyclist movements at intersections on both sides of the freeway. The proposal for 150th Avenue SE and Eastgate Way take that into account. One option for the intersection of SE 36th Street and Factoria Boulevard includes highlighting the crossings with ladder markings, extending the curb to force cars to slow down, and highlighting the conflict zone with colored pavement.

Alternative 2 was found to have the most opportunity to improve transportation connectivity vis-à-vis trail connections in Richards Valley, two proposed high-capacity transit stations instead of one, and vehicular connections to the 156th Avenue SE corridor. Mr. Loewenherz shared with the CAC the results of a mapping interface that depicted the route directness index scores for non-motorized, vehicular and high-capacity transit travel. He noted that under the No Action alternative, the results were not beneficial. Under Alternative 1, improvements were shown relative to the non-motorized and vehicular scores, though less so for the latter, and no improvement for high-capacity transit. The improvements were markedly less pronounced under Alternative 3. While having two high-capacity transit stations would improve connectivity, the transit consultant indicated the direct access ramp concept would be incredibly expensive, may not be feasible to construct, and may not even be warranted.

Mr. Loewenherz said some of the improvement concepts depicted in the action alternatives are expected to significantly improve transit operations in the corridor, such as the enhanced connections to Bellevue College in Alternatives 1 and 3, while other concepts, such as the direct access ramp to the I-90 office park complex in Alternative 2, are considered too costly and potentially infeasible to implement. He shared with the CAC a map depicting a restructured route network as developed by the transit consultant. The new map does not take advantage of the direct access ramp highlighted in Alternative 2 because of the costs and feasibility questions.

Mr. Loewenherz reiterated that under all of the alternatives the increased traffic volumes will increase the total CO₂ emissions, though Alternative 1 will reduce peak hour vehicle emissions on a per capita basis because of its improved jobs/housing balance.

Mr. Loewenherz explained that fiscal feasibility is determined by calculating the right balance between value and price. He noted that the No Action alternative is the most consistent with available funding because it includes a limited number of infrastructure

Agenda Item No. 2
September 29, 2011
Eastgate/I-90 CAC Meeting

improvements that are already programmed. The Mountains-to-Sound Greenway trail is not, however, currently programmed, though it is a major element. The combined improvements in the action alternatives represent potentially significant expenses for the city and its partners. The point of the exercise, however, is to think big and to come up with a new vision for the area. There are encouraging trends identified by the alternatives despite the financial uncertainties.

Local street improvements undergo a step-by-step process before reaching the implementation phase. The first step is to get the improvements included a plan document. The Comprehensive Plan outlines the city's long-term land use vision. Long-range facility plans include a wide range of improvement projects designed to meet the mobility goals of specific subareas. The Transportation Facilities Plan is the city's transportation implementation plan; it is constrained by identified city and other revenues projected out for the next 12 years. The Capital Investment Program contains funded projects to be implemented in the next seven years. The state's revenues are very limited currently. If new revenues are realized, however, it is likely the state would move to construct the eastbound auxiliary lanes as a priority project for I-90.

With regard to high-capacity transit improvements, Mr. Loewenherz said it is highly likely that should there be a Phase 3, the station would be constructed proximate to the existing infrastructure at the Eastgate park and ride and the direct access ramp. Funding is available for Phase 3 planning. The preferred alternative developed by the CAC could help position the city for the next round of planning work.

Alternatives 1 and 3 include the concept of reconstructing roads, improving the Snoqualmie River Road and Coal Creek Road intersection, and adding new transit stops, all with an eye on delivering more direct bus service to and through the Bellevue College campus, thus reducing bus running times. Alternatives 1 and 3 also include weather protection for pedestrian comfort and widened sidewalks on the 142nd Place bridge. The alternatives also build on the existing facility investments at the Eastgate park and ride and Eastgate transit access.

Mr. Loewenherz noted that if implemented the vision outlined by Alternatives 1 and 3 relative to transit improvements would include an additional 4800 hours annually; five new buses would be required. The outlay might, however, be realized from Sound Transit resources being made available with the redeployment of 550 hours upon the implementation of East Link. The new strategic plan developed by King County Metro stressed the need to reduce or eliminate unproductive services in order to allow for reinvestment in more productive areas. The land use decisions that will flow from the Eastgate/I-90 project will clearly have an impact on future transit resource allocation to the project area.

Bringing the transportation vision online for the Eastgate corridor will require a number of partners working together. The list includes the city, the Washington State Department of Transportation, Sound Transit, King County, various institutions, and private entities.

Mr. Bergstrom added that the three action alternative each explore partnerships with Bellevue College, but each in different ways. Alternative 1 promotes strong physical, land use and market relationships with private development to the south. Alternative 2 envisions workforce development and job creation through partnerships with Bellevue College and nearby businesses. Alternative 3 suggests partnerships with Bellevue

College, the city and other agencies and organizations to create community-oriented uses on the campus. He suggested that to some degree, each of the partnership arrangements are worth exploring.

Ms. Welti suggested that before the CAC begins the work of picking and choosing from among the various alternatives, information should be presented with regard to how successful housing can be adjacent to a major freeway. With regard to upzoning in a way that would permit taller buildings, she said the Greenway is not opposed to going in that direction. However, taller buildings should be predicated on trading for participating in bringing about the fundamental character change envisioned for the corridor. Mr. Bergstrom agreed that more information should be sought with regard to residential near the freeway. He allowed that when the market study was done, the consultant concluded that it would not be a great idea. Commercial brokers, however, have expressed just the opposite view, going so far as to say if they already had the zoning they would have residential projects in the works, and indeed there are examples of successful projects. As to having property owners participate in ushering in the vision for an area in exchange for additional height or an increased floor area ratio, he said the approach has been used very successfully in the downtown. While it will not be up to the CAC to develop an amenity system for the corridor, it would be good to include the recommendation in the final report.

Ms. Bruce commented that the spaces in office towers that will net the most money for the developer will be those on the upper floors. The development closest to the freeway in Factoria are all up on the hill and have good western views. The same is true along 139th Avenue SE. The office envisioned in Alternative 1 for the old King County site would be in a hole and simply would not be attractive. She added that the Toyota dealership has applied for a permit to construct a three-story parking structure on the back part of their lot up against what otherwise would be a pretty good view.

Ms. Bruce said she is a big supporter of the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway and of bike trail improvements. She voiced concern, however, about having the Greenway trail share roadway sections in places like West Lake Sammamish Parkway has with two-way rider traffic on the same side of the street. Many riders will not ride northbound on West Lake Sammamish Parkway in that section. She asked if enough space will be obtained to accommodate a reasonable bike lane on the south side of SE 36th Street and also have a reasonable section for the Mountains-to-Sound Trail that will allow for safety for both pedestrians and bicyclists.

Mr. Elliot said it has been his experience that people want to live close to a freeway, but they do not want to live where they have to look at or listen to one. Most residents are simply not willing to pay the money it would take to make a residential project successful if it is too near a freeway. Noise walls are not the answer.

4. Public Comment

Mr. Jack McCullough, 701 5th Avenue, Suite 722, Seattle, said he has continued to work on options for the Sunset property directly across from the garage. He said he will have materials ready for the CAC to review in a couple of weeks. The site might be suited to a four-story office building or something that would be consistent with the rest of the Sunset development.

Mr. Eric Richart, 201 South Jackson Street, Suite 701, Seattle, spoke representing King

County Solid Waste. He noted that in Alternative 1 the property adjacent to the transfer station site is shown as appropriate for mixed use. He pointed out that the property is adjacent to the freeway and is down in a hole in addition to being next door to the transfer station. He said if he were looking for a place to live, he would not choose a home in that location.

5. Future Meetings

Mr. Bergstrom reminded the CAC members of the September 29 meeting and said beginning in October the CAC meetings will once again occur on the first Thursday of each month. He said the bulk of the CAC's work will be done by the end of the year, but the group will likely need to come back in January to give approval to the final document.

Ms. Solemsaas said Bellevue College has developed about four reports relative to campus design and transportation issues. Each of the reports has associated pros and cons. She said she would be asking the CAC to review the reports to gain a wider perspective.

Mr. Bergstrom informed the group that staff was in receipt of two letters from auto dealers in the corridor. He said he would send them out in an email to the CAC members.

6. Adjourn

Co-Chair Hamlin adjourned the meeting at 7:37 p.m.

City Manager Sarkozy introduced an update on the Eastgate/I-90 land use and transportation project. He recalled that, last October, the Council appointed a Citizen Advisory Committee to address planning in the Eastgate/I-90 area.

Francois Larrivee, Transportation Commissioner and Co-Chair of the Eastgate/I-90 Citizen Advisory Committee, described the project study area and noted that public involvement activities resulted in essentially no negative feedback on any of the alternatives. The CAC has concluded that all alternatives should be studied further.

Jay Hamlin, Planning Commissioner and Co-Chair of the CAC, noted that the alternatives represent different mixtures of land uses. Later this year, the CAC will use staff's alternatives analysis and technical information to identify a preferred alternative, which is likely to combine elements of each preliminary alternative.

Mike Bergstrom, Senior Planner, noted that the study area is largely developed and few vacant sites exist. However, there are opportunities for redevelopment and infill. The CAC has discussed the need to retain the health and vitality of major existing uses and to address transportation demands. He noted that the Richards Valley is the only significant light industrial area remaining in Bellevue. Mr. Bergstrom noted the land uses in the no-action alternative and the three proposed alternatives.

Franz Loewenherz, Senior Planner, briefly described the transportation elements of the alternatives. All alternatives, including the no action, involve completing certain transportation improvements, the Mountains-to-Sound Trail, and modest pedestrian, bicycle and transit improvements. All action alternatives include capacity improvements on I-90, transit hub improvements in north Factoria, greater pedestrian and bicycle connections, a high-capacity transit station at the Park and Ride facility, and coordination with the State on improvements to the Lakemont Boulevard interchange to the east. Additional elements are specific to each alternative.

Mr. Bergstrom briefly described Alternative 1 (Jobs/Housing mix), Alternative 2 (Regional Employment Center), and Alternative 3 (Functional Improvements). The intent is to study elements of all alternatives to work toward defining a preferred alternative.

Mr. Loewenherz reported on public outreach activities including open houses and an online questionnaire. Respondents were generally appreciative that the area is receiving planning attention, although there were some differences of opinion about which elements were desirable and undesirable. Mr. Loewenherz said the CAC anticipates developing a preferred alternative this fall and issuing a final report by the end of the year. Comprehensive Plan and Development Code amendments will be addressed in 2012.

Councilmember Degginger thanked staff for the update, and questioned whether the alternatives are dependent on transit services. Mr. Loewenherz confirmed that transit uses are anticipated. He said staff will be launching a transit plan update effort to study strategies for improving transit operations.

Mr. Degginger questioned who will be providing the transit services. Mr. Loewenherz acknowledged that the current financial picture is not favorable. However, staff believes there are opportunities to improve operations and gain efficiencies within the existing system. This will involve assessing the priorities for the community.

Councilmember Degginger said he would like information about the level of transit services needed to support each alternative. Mr. Loewenherz said staff is just beginning this aspect of the study. Mr. Degginger noted his recent service on the Regional Transit Task Force, which discussed needed service reductions. He is concerned about the level of transit services that, realistically, will be available for each of the Eastgate/I-90 land use alternatives.

Mayor Davidson questioned whether the Regional Transit Task Force contemplated independent transit service operators which would receive sales tax revenue.

Councilmember Degginger said the Task Force recommended looking at alternative methods of service delivery. However, realistically, he is concerned about the potential for transit funding.

Mayor Davidson observed that perhaps the City could operate its own transit service with its own sales tax base, and link this to the regional Metro system. Mr. Degginger acknowledged that that is a topic for separate discussion. He reiterated his concern about adopting a land use plan with intensified uses that is dependent on transit services, given the current reality of transit funding.

Mr. Loewenherz said these issues will be studied further as the alternatives are analyzed.

Councilmember Balducci said she is grateful that the Eastgate area is receiving attention and study. She noted the potential related to transportation facilities, Bellevue College, and the regional bike trail. Referring to the principle of enhancing the Eastgate corridor's economic vitality without degrading mobility in other parts of Bellevue, Ms. Balducci said it is also important to not degrade the economy of other parts of the community. She suggested that the area should serve different needs than the Crossroads and Factoria areas. She concurred with Councilmember Degginger that it is difficult to become invested in any of the alternatives without understanding transportation impacts.

Responding to Mayor Davidson, Mr. Bergstrom said the study is funded in the Capital Investment Program (CIP) Plan for both the Transportation Department and the Planning and Community Development Department. Dr. Davidson concurred with the importance of emphasizing the transportation aspects of the planning effort.

Councilmember Robertson thanked staff and the CAC for their hard work. Responding to Ms. Robertson, Mr. Bergstrom explained that the no action alternative includes one large vacant site owned by King County. With the existing zoning, that parcel could and would likely develop as a light industrial use. Under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3, that site is not used for industrial purposes. Under Alternative 1, existing industrial development would redevelop as residential uses.

Councilmember Robertson believes it is important to preserve some light industrial zoning, which also provides athletic and dance facilities. She noted her previous concerns about the impact of the Bel-Red Plan on existing LI uses.

Councilmember Chelminiak thanked the CAC for its work. Concurring with statements by Councilmembers Balducci and Degginger, he observed that transit-oriented development without transit results in gridlock. He believes that a favorable alternative is possible. However, it must be something that the market will embrace and implement. Mr. Chelminiak expressed support for completing the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway, and complimented staff and the CAC on their work.