

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BEL-RED PROJECT
PANEL DISCUSSIONS
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

May 13, 2008
8:00 a.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-112

Panelists: Walter Scott, Dave Sharp, Todd Woosley, Scott Evans, Scott Hall, Betty Spieth, Tina Neal, Monica Hudak, David Lee, Chris Mooi, Bill Sherman, Steve Ulrich

Moderators: Emil King, Kevin O'Neill

Mr. King: Thank you for coming this morning. We have about an hour and a half to go over seven questions that are part of your agenda. We'll also have time at the end to go over any other questions you may have for us. I want to first introduce myself. My name's Emil King, I'm the Strategic Planning Manager for the city. I've been involved in the steering committee process all the way through the boards and commissions process. I'll be keeping us on time, and giving us a quick overview of each question. We also have Kevin O'Neill from the transportation department who's going to be recording all of our comments on these boards, and putting them up on the wall. We're also audio recording these meetings and those will be done in transcript format and sent on to the Planning Commission. We also have maps that we're happy to annotate with any site-specific comments for properties or transportation issues.

So what I wanted to do is quickly go around the room and have everyone introduce themselves and give a quick summary of what business or property they're representing.

Participant: Walter Scott. Dave Sharp and I work for Legacy Companies. We operate Bellevue Design Market, which is across the street from Overlake Hospital, and Kelsey Creek, a small industrial building next to Grainger, kind of two doors down from Grainger on 120th.

Participant: What do I say? Dave Sharp.

Participant: Good morning, I'm Todd Woosley, Hal Woosley Properties. My brothers and I own Briarwood Center, which is in the western section of the Bel-Red corridor. I also represent Sherwood Plaza, which has the Trader Joe's.

Participant: Scott Evans with the Evans Company. We represent a couple of facilities on Bel-Red Road and 130th. Mostly the office/industrial market in those properties right now.

Participant: Good morning, Scott Hall, Pine Forest Properties. We own a couple of different properties. We have one right at the intersection of Northup Way and 124th, and we have a larger piece with a couple of structures on it just north of Lake Bellevue, sort of Bel-Red Road and the corner of 120th.

Participant: My name is Betty Spieth and I'm working with Wright Runstad and Company who bought the old Safeway distribution site and is working on the Spring District development.

Participant: My name is Tina Neal. I represent Current Properties, which we are right across from Seattle Boats on 132nd. And it looks like maybe where the park will be.

Participant: My name's Monica Hudak. I own property north of Overlake Hospital on 116th.

Participant: My name is David Lee. I represent J&K Rustad Corporation at 13401 Bel-Red Road.

Participant: My name's Chris Mooi. I'm with Bel-Green Developments. We own what was Angelo's Home and Nursery Center on 156th between Bel-Red south of 24th.

Participant: Morning. Bill Sherman, Sherman Development. We own the corner of 124th and Northup.

Participant: My name's Steve Ulrich and I recently purchased a building on 133rd and Bel-Red Road, Continental Office Park.

Mr. King: And we have two members in the audience. The first is John Chelminiak, City Councilmember.

Mr. Chelmeniak: I'm John Chelminiak, City Councilmember, and I've been liaison for this process.

Mr. King: And David Plummer, a resident who's been following our process as well.

So why don't we start off with question number one. What I wanted to do is not have a strict format where we go around and ask for comments from every individual. We'll pose the question to the group and have Kevin record comments, and note comments on the maps. And what we want to have happen is for as many people as want to give comments on each question. So if you do have comments, try to keep them relatively short. And if there are one or two persons who dominate the conversation, we'll point that out and try to get as much input as we can from as many people, to respect the time that we have.

So the first question is question number one on your list. It talks about the land use and zoning pattern. Paul gave a good overview of the current subarea plan designations and zoning categories. And we want to get your input on whether you think that framework respects the steering committee's vision, and if there are any details of this land use pattern that you feel need to be clarified or you have questions about. So the general land use and zoning pattern is shown on this land use plan map, which has a direct translation into our zoning map. Higher intensities at the node areas, 122nd, 130th, the area across the street from Overlake Hospital. And then as well as a small part on the eastern end of the corridor. Each of these land use categories has a section in our Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan that goes into more detail. We don't expect you to know all the history and detail of it, but if you have any general questions or comments about these, we're happy to entertain those.

Participant: I think it's great that we're talking about this. Would it be possible to change the question? The question is does the proposed pattern of zoning appropriately translate the steering committee's proposed alternative for Bel-Red. That was about a year ago when they came out with that. And this is a panel of property owners here. We should ask does this capture what the property owners envision, or what's our input here, rather than an assessment of how does this relate to what the steering committee recommended. How do we see this, and how can we provide input if the goal is as Paul introduced it. We're the ones that are going to make this vision happen. Would that be fair?

Mr. King: I think that could be an add-on question to this. We posed the question because there was a lot of momentum behind the two-year steering committee process, and it really was the task of the boards and commissions to try and translate that into a plan and code provisions. If there are details of the current land use vision, now's the time to be giving more input to the Planning Commission. So your add-on question is perfectly acceptable to answer if you'd like to.

Participant: Well I did think this does a very good job of capturing what the steering committee recommended.

Mr. King: Did you want to answer your second-part question now as well?

Participant: No. Go ahead and work on the first part.

Mr. King: Any others who were following the steering committee process and have any input as to whether or not the land use and zoning map as shown represents the steering committee's work?

Participant: My concern particularly is the 124th corridor. The transportation plan will enlarge that road to a very wide road. Obviously that could have some effect on the property owners along there. You are going to take property for the arterial, there ought to be some density benefits to the property owners in that criteria. So I don't know if that's what you want. I have some other comments, but that's that.

Mr. O'Neill: So just a clarifying question. You're suggesting that if there's takes needed to expand the roadway, there should be density offsets?

Participant: Yes.

Mr. O'Neill: Okay.

Participant: As someone who's watched this process unfold for the last year or so, I would say that these land use maps actually do a really good job of translating what I heard from the steering committee, which was a really exciting and bold vision around transit area development, around density, around the benefits of concentrating growth, which you've done in those two nodes. So yeah, I think that's what a number of people, including this committee, is looking for in Bel-Red, is a new, dense, very dense development and the benefits that brings along with it.

Participant: Certainly from a zoning perspective and what was out through the public comment period, it seems to match what was asked to be provided for.

Participant: I'm not sure it doesn't meet the criteria based upon these zoning areas are left to be fully divined. But I know that the scoping committee, or the original committee, said they wanted a mixed use sort of like the Hollywood District in Portland, pedestrian friendly. That connotes retail, kind of a mix of various uses in each zoned area. If you look at the map, this block is office, commercial, this block is retail. And specifically referring to some of the residential areas that are far away from the retail. And I'm just concerned that what the steering committee envisioned may not really be reflected in the current zoning map in terms of these large blocks.

Mr. King: So there may be clarifications as we read through the zoning to make sure that we're getting a good mix of uses in some of those brown areas that you're pointing out?

Participant: Yeah. There might need to be some flexibility to allow some retail in there.

Mr. King: Okay.

Participant: We don't have the opportunity to ask what do we think about these zones. I think that's a question that we should be able to answer.

Mr. King: Yes, let's go ahead and cover that during this time period. You brought it up, so now we can move into that question. Opening it up to how people think these zones are going to work. You can talk about kind of uses, character, and you can go into intensities and heights at this time. So we'll spend a few more minutes on this topic.

Participant: I do have a question on height restriction, and how you chose to set the limits in certain areas. I understand that where it's more dense it's going to be higher, but specifically south. My property that I own is on 116th. It's the medical residential transition and it's been limited to 70 feet as of now. So how did you come to that? How was that conclusion come to?

Mr. King: Yes, the number is 70 feet. During the steering committee process we analyzed higher heights, as you pointed out, in the nodes, because there was significantly more intensity envisioned for those areas. So up to 125, and up to 150 feet. The areas outside the nodes, we've had some discussion with Planning Commission over the past few months about what the upper height limit should be. And the Planning Commission staff feel that 70 feet is generally an appropriate upper limit for development outside the nodes, especially given the 1.0 FAR, it's hard to actually go above that. Because of the intensity it's hard to do taller buildings than 70 feet. And in the 70- to 75-foot range is where a lot of the high-rise provisions kick in. So you don't see many buildings 80, 85, 90 or even 100 feet unless there's some special circumstances. You have this threshold where you go up to 70, 75, and then you really want to go up to 125 or 150 feet. The BelGreen developers have thought about this a lot as well and may want to elaborate. But we think that's a good level for those areas outside the nodes as a maximum.

Participant: Off the top of my head I don't know – but the proposed Children's Hospital, do you know how high that's going to be?

Mr. King: Children's Hospital is a special circumstance. They've asked for what's called Medical Institution zoning, so that's a refinement of the medical office color that you see here. We analyzed their site at the most recent Planning Commission meeting, which was at the end of April, and they have a very unique site in that it drops off significantly from 116th. We did site analysis and view analysis, and made some provisions for up to 100-foot buildings on that one site. Medical Institution zoning in the city does typically require an extra process and more refinement. We didn't want to have that 100-foot height spread up the 116th corridor, so we were very strict about where it ended. And it's just on that one site.

Participant: Can you tell me why you didn't want that to spread specifically? Because the reason I'm asking is because all around my property to the south is medical. Across the street is medical. It's all medical, and just to make sense that as time passes the zoning would change.

Mr. King: The Planning Commission and staff felt that having 100-foot height limits spreading all the way up the 116th corridor would not be a good idea, because it would seem like there wasn't really a good limitation and nodal development pattern for that height limit. There will potentially be more analysis done in this general area in the coming years. If you can envision when Sound Transit refines their preferred alignment and station locations, it may make sense for the City Council to direct staff to reexamine a quarter mile radius around the area. So there may be some refinements in this general area right here, but I think the 100-foot height limit going all the way up to SR-520, there's really not much interest in that from the city's standpoint.

Participant: Do you have a specific idea of when in the future they would be reassessing that?

Mr. King: There's some actions that need to happen on Sound Transit's behalf that would lead us to a preferred routing and station location. But it would be a similar type process where we would pick out a station location and look at a quarter mile radius area.

Participant: I would like to raise a point about the BR-R zone. I'm curious, you have a 45-foot maximum height. You have a maximum FAR of 1.0. You know I'm more familiar with the Seattle zones that would have 3.0 or 4.0 FAR for a similar height limit. And – which strikes me as very efficient. You know, you're promoting density but low-rise development with structured parking, which is the vision you would expect for some of these close-in develops. So I'm curious how you arrived at a maximum 1.0 FAR given that height.

Mr. King: The maximum FAR outside of the nodes, there were a number of factors that led us to 1.0 FAR. Number one is we wanted to see a differentiation between the node intensities and the non-node intensities. We just didn't want to paint one FAR over the whole subarea. And there was really a driving factor in that we didn't want to have any of this development directly compete with either downtown or other areas of the city. So we wanted to try and fit a niche where we didn't have a lot of existing zoning in the city of that intensity. A 1.0 FAR for residential is roughly equal to about 40 units per acre. That is different from our highest zone for residential outside of downtown. So that is a niche that we don't have right now. And 45 feet is the general height that you would expect to see with that type of intensity. Comparing it to Seattle and other cities can be

difficult because each city measures their FAR slightly differently, and whether or not they count above-grade parking or what things go into their calculation. The 1.0 FAR number is something we have in the draft planning documents. The Planning Commission wanted to reserve the right to potentially look at modifications to FAR for either superbonuses or other provisions that may tweak that a little bit both inside the nodes and outside the nodes. We have had comments both for the 1.0 FAR and the 2.5 FAR that the Planning Commission and City Council may want to think about those a little bit more.

Participant: It strikes me as a really light intensity given how close in it is and given the big picture goal of promoting density within urban small areas, without having to necessarily – giving an option to not necessarily go to what are going to be more highrise – relatively speaking – more highrise-type structures that are right in the heart of the node. Similar to the difference, say, between in Seattle being in Beltown and being on Queen Anne or Capitol Hill where you are going to see 40- to 65-foot zoning in the outlying areas. It seems to work with a fairly degree of density.

Mr. O’Neill: So just a clarification. You’re suggesting looking at increasing the FAR but not necessarily increasing the height.

Participant: Right. It seems you could increase the FAR pretty significantly without having to adjust the height, if that’s the issue.

Participant: Essentially, if you did a six-story building with an FAR of 1.0 on an acre, you’re going to have 7000 square foot floor plates, which is one-seventh of the site. My conversations with some architects and developers for projects, particularly housing type of things, 2.5, 2.8, 3.0 FAR with a 70-foot height, which allows the first floor concrete construction and five floors of stick frame, is what is feasible and works. So an FAR of 1.0 basically makes it impractical.

Participant: What they are all talking about is economic feasibility. If you keep the FAR too restrictive, then you’re not going to see the change that we all want. And it’s really pretty critical to this whole process. If it stays where it’s at, then the economics may not work to create what we want to create here.

Mr. King: We’re going to be moving on to transportation now. I would encourage the panel, if you have more detailed questions or comments about the land use districts, financial feasibility, heights, or FARs, the Planning Commission and Council are very interested in hearing all these. You can either contact staff or write in letters.

Participant: One more comment. I thought I heard in the other room a comment about the FARs and the base FARs were prior to funding being in place for transportation. So are these base FARs going to come up after funding is in place? So are what we're seeing just the initial?

Mr. King: We can talk about that in the phasing. The phasing applies to the nodes only. The areas outside the nodes will have a base and upper end FAR that's not tied to the phasing plan.

Transportation network, question number two. I think most people are familiar with these projects. There's arterial improvements on 120th, 124th, improvements on 130th. A major lynchpin project on 15th/16th where we don't have a continuous road right now stretching all the way from 116th over to where we have some existing right-of-way and then connecting up to NE 20th. And also improvements near Mr. Woosley's property.

Participant: Can you stand on the other side and point?

Mr. King: Of course. Also some improvements down here on 120th and near Old Bel-Red Road, as well as a new project that's pushed out to the 2030 and beyond time period that would be a NE 11th alignment connecting to 116th. I wanted to get your comments on whether you think this proposed transportation network adequately addresses future needs for mobility in and around the subarea.

Participant: The additional general purpose capacity to five lanes north and south is critical. We know that – I think the modesplit – I'm trying get the latest information from the city on the transportation plan, but my understanding is that the combined – how people are going to be traveling through this area in the future – between bikes, pedestrians and transit, is still in the single digits. Which means that 90 percent plus of the trips are going to be in automobiles on the road network. So we are going to increase the densities, they're going to need reasonable FARs to redevelopment, and the additional trips, nine out of ten of them or so, are going to be in a car of some sort. Maybe it will be plug-in electric or whatever, but it's not going to be on a bike or walking or by transit, whatever it is, bus or rail. So we need to have the infrastructure to accommodate those trips. The other thought on this is a large part is the desire the accommodate Sound Transit's future high-capacity transit corridor through there. I would suggest that Sound Transit be the one to pay for the lion's share of that. Right now under the current approved taxes for Phase I of Sound Transit there's close to a billion dollars Sound Transit has to spend on the Eastside subarea. Rather than charge existing property owners a huge sum for that acquisition, Sound Transit ought to bear the fair share of the costs for that right-of-way.

Mr. King: Okay. Other thoughts about the transportation network?

Participant: How does the failure of Proposition 1 affect the rail in your eyes? Do you think rail will ultimately proceed here, and is this model based upon rail?

Mr. O'Neill: Well that's a very speculative question. I don't know if Councilmember Chelminiak wants to try that one. Basically, one of the leading framing issues around this from the beginning was to plan this in conjunction with transit. One of the messages that came from the steering committee is this land use plan is not all about accommodating light rail. There's lots of other reasons to do nodal, mixed use development. Todd made reference to the modesplit, I mean our EIS projected about a 25 percent, actually, non-SOV modesplit in 2030, about 18 percent of that being transit. If you take transit away, whether it's rail or bus or whatever, those trips have to be accommodated some other way. And we already know the road system is going to be stretched. So I think what the city is interested in doing is getting as much transit to this area as we can. We're obviously following the regional process. We're also doing sort of our own thinking about ways we can get transit in this corridor, not just in 2030 but in the shorter term as well. So I don't know what's going to happen on the regional level. We're obviously paying a lot of attention to the discussions going on with the Sound Transit board right now. But I don't think it changes our fundamental thinking about the land use and transportation network in Bel-Red.

Participant: A question in regards to the process of right-of-way. I notice that on one of the drawings goes right through the middle of one of my properties. And is there a process that you're going to establish for the east/west corridor for transportation along with transit? Is it the same right-of-ways? Are they different rights-of-way? I've seen the drawings, some go through my buildings, some go through my parking lot, some go on my property lines. Is this all up to negotiations, or how is it you guys are actually going to do the process?

Mr. King: I can answer a little bit and then maybe Kevin can fill in a little bit more. We've spent a lot of time thinking about how, for example, 15th/16th is going to happen. As you pointed out, it goes through a lot of the corridor where we have no right-of-way right now. So there's existing businesses, parking lots, et cetera in that corridor. What we're trying to do right now is figure out what components that roadway corridor should include. So we've done some work that's articulated in the packet about number of travel lanes, pedestrian and bicycle provisions. And whether or not there's on-street parking, the land use character along 15th/16th. The land use character you want dictates how much space you want to have there as well for the sidewalk environment, the pedestrian environment. And then

the city's current thinking about light rail and other types of high-capacity transit is that it would happen in the roadway prism and not be a separate thing that happens.

Participant: Separate rights-of-way, or is it a combination right-of-way?

Mr. King: Right now our thinking is that the best way for it to happen is for it to happen together as one combined right-of-way.

Participant: With two public entities trying to get their piece?

Mr. King: Right now staff is talking with Sound Transit about how they've done things in the past for right-of-way acquisition and how they want to think about doing things in the future, both on the Eastside and in the north and south extensions in Seattle. The exact mechanism – there's still a lot of work to be done, but it would be good to have comments from property owners about their views on right-of-way acquisition, especially when it's a fairly significant right-of-way that we're looking at for that corridor.

Participant: Does the package detail out the standards?

Mr. King: There's some discussion of the general right-of-way, but the whole 15th/16th discussion is before the Park Board, Transportation Commission in coming weeks. The Planning Commission would like to talk about the character and overall right-of-way need following the public comment period, because they wanted to hear back from the public. And our City Council would also like an update on 15th/16th. That's going to happen on May 27, so we'll be going to City Council and getting them up to speed. It's really a signature project for the corridor. It provides key east/west connectivity. It provides a corridor for potential light rail, but it's a very expensive project and complicated project as well. So we'd like to hear input from the property owners.

Mr. O'Neill: The only other thing I'd add to what Emil said is we're at about two to five percent design right now. So still a lot of things in flux. That that two to five percent is critical to start identifying fatal flaws, what a cross section might be, what areas to try to avoid, et cetera. The other component of that – in addition to what Emil talked about and just defining what that ultimate cross section is, and like he said we're going to get a lot of input from property owners, from board and commissions and from Council – is the timing of all that. So this shows the reason this map – and I think the reason this map is in the draft subarea plan has different colors on it – is that it envisions the way these things might have to be rolled out over time. So this eastern end of NE 15th Street/NE 16th Street east of 124th is envisioned to happen in what we're calling Phase III, which would be sometime between 2020 and 2030, because we're simply

not going to have the financial capacity to construct this piece in the short term, likely, given the expense of it. So that's all part of what the commissions and Council will be considering, not only what these ultimate projects are but how they get rolled out and how that gets tied into a financing plan, because obviously there has to be a way to pay for these over time.

Participant: So the current cross section is almost 200 feet wide for the area that cuts through your property?

Participant: That's kind of what I wanted to get, is the baseline. It pretty much deters the use of the property if it goes through the middle of the property. But thank you. I haven't seen that anywhere as to how much they're trying to take.

Mr. King: It varies along the corridor. There's certain areas that we've done to this two to five percent design level. For example, 15th/16th is a bridge structure where it goes between the nodes. Much of the area between 124th and 127th is actually a bridge structure based on the topography. And then in the nodes to actually fit a station, the travel lanes, ped-bike connectivity, it does add up to about 200 feet of right-of-way, which is a significant right-of-way, wider than anything else we have in the city right now. But it has many more uses in there.

Participant: Thank you.

Participant: If the desire is to increase the density near where the transit stops are, to increase transit ridership, and we have a 20-year planning horizon for this, but wisely looking beyond that for the ultimate needs here, I suggest that the densities and the FARs and heights of the areas where the current transit stops are located reflect the goal of the city. In other words, we've got a bus stop right next – it's on our property. And in the foreseeable future we're going to have extended bus service out here, whether it's local or bus rapid transit. The transit mode for the 20-year timeframe is going to be in buses. So yes, we've got nodes in the areas that are set aside for that. It could be that the Wright Runstad Spring District project will provide new infrastructure within that timeframe, hopefully in 20 years they'll have the first phase built. But it would terminate at 124th. But the main through routes are going to be on Bel-Red and up at 156th. And so for example we have a base height of 45 feet. And across the street it's going to be up to 150 feet. That doesn't make any sense that we wouldn't capture that, the same up here on 156th where Metro and Sound Transit are planning their bus services, yet they have very low heights and FARs as well. So I would suggest you look at increasing the heights of the FARs where the transit stops will be, are and will be, in the next 20 years.

Mr. King: And it's with a focus on the BRT system?

Participant: Yes, and regular buses as well.

Mr. King: Okay. Why don't we move onto phasing. We've been talking about it a little bit. The general phasing mechanism in the draft materials focuses on the nodes. What it does is it points out the node near Overlake Hospital, the node area at 122nd, and the node at 130th. It seeks to have the Phase I transportation improvements, have a funding mechanism in place prior to allowing FARs greater than 0.5. So the land use intensities in those areas I just described would be limited to 0.5 FAR until a funding mechanism is in place for NE 15th Street/NE 16th Street from 116th over to 124th, and 120th from generally just north of NE 8th up to NE 15th. They don't need to be built, but we do need to have a funding mechanism in place for those. Once that mechanism is in place, you can think of that as unlocking development intensities up to 2.5 FAR in this area, 122nd node and 130th node. It's important that we have that commitment for the first phase of transportation infrastructure because there is a great amount of intensity, both in this node and this other node, that really is going to need that infrastructure to serve it. So we don't want to have a disconnect between land use actions happening and infrastructure being in place.

In the draft materials we also have a number that we put out for the first phase of parks and open space investments, and that number is \$16 million. We'd like to see that amount of investment happen, or commitment for it to happen, prior to unlocking this as well. So there are two things that would need to happen before the FARs would be allowed to go up to 2.5.

Participant: What was the second amount?

Mr. King: Sixteen million for parks and open space investment. We specifically gave that as a monetary amount that would be adjusted over time for inflation, but instead of picking out one or two specific parks that we thought would have to happen, we wanted to give some flexibility on an overall investment package for parks and open space.

Participant: So that's \$60 million for the entire corridor?

Mr. King: Sixteen million. One-six.

Participant: For the entire corridor?

Mr. King: The general idea would be for it to generally happen in this area, but we haven't drilled down to be as specific as not allowing things that happen out here to be part of that goal.

Participant: How much was the transportation investment for Phase I?

Mr. King: Transportation investments, we're still figuring out those exact numbers. That is in the hands of the City Council, who is doing our finance plan.

Participant: Okay.

Participant: What did you say about the outside areas in answer to Todd's question?

Mr. King: Parks and open space could happen anywhere in this area.

Participant: No, you said a half FAR, 0.5 FAR, wouldn't necessarily be limited to the outside areas.

Mr. King: The phasing mechanism only applies to the node areas, with the exception of the area out at Uwajimaya/Angelo's.

Participant: Thank you. Sorry.

Participant: I just wanted to mention – I know you're hearing a lot of from our group, the Wright Runstad group, on this – but I just sort of wanted to reiterate this is a policy that impacts the Spring District development substantially. And you know just to kind of mention that I think it's a great idea if it happens in conjunction with all the rest of the sort of the adoption of the planning and the code, and the financing is in place. But if those become separate for very long, it makes it a real challenge to, you know, attract the kind of tenants that you need to begin the development. Because it turns the financing into a political process. It's no longer something that's written in code. You can correct me if I'm wrong, but I think the way it's written now it has to be a plan that would be adopted by Council so it's no longer something that a developer could look at in code but would go, then, would depend on a political process down the line.

Mr. King: It would need to move on to the Council level to have a mechanism put in place. Having a policy in our Comprehensive Plan or a line item in the Zoning Code doesn't meet the definition of a funding mechanism in place.

Participant: So, which in effect really prohibits any kind of attraction of tenants until you have that political process accomplished. So I think, you know, I think the point being if these can all happen together, you know. But if they're separated, it really becomes a challenge and makes development very much of a challenge.

- Mr. King: Out City Council is doing a lot of work and will be doing more work on the finance plan. The goal is to have that mechanism in place happen sooner rather than later. You're right, and you've made this comment before, that having that uncertainty out there is a concern for property owners.
- Participant: Right. I think we certainly recognize the whole chicken and egg challenge here that, you know, you need some sense of where this infrastructure is coming from. So that's understandable. So it's about certainty.
- Participant: A couple of questions. One, you're talking about the phasing, a lot of it is in the western section. Yet you've got two or three properties out in the tail gearing up to go. Are there going to be any prohibition on their ability to develop?
- Mr. King: The road infrastructure needs are not nearly as great on this map for the area in the east. So the Uwajimaya/Angelo's triangle is not part of the phasing mechanism, or phasing plan, right now.
- Participant: The second question I have on the parks infrastructure is, there's a – Metro owns quite a bit of property in the area alongside the creek. It could stand some cleaning up. They've got bulkheads against the stream wetland area. Has there been any conversation with King County Metro on their participation in providing some of this public amenity, enhancing the wetland degradation their bus barn operation has had, as well as creating more of a multiuse capacity. At least on the public property where not only do you have the bus storage but you have some park and perhaps some pedestrian/bicycle trails.
- Mr. King: There's been a limited amount of conversation to this point with King County, provided that there are great opportunities up in those areas. We're now just trying to get the whole planning framework in place. Then when it would come time for implementation to drill down a bit more on what investments would happen and how they would be financed.
- Mr. O'Neill: We've thought about a lot of the same things. Because there's so much public ownership next to the West Tributary, it is a great opportunity to sort of punch a trail through there. We've thought about opportunities for parks combined with – Obviously that's a very difficult use for Metro to relocate in such a centralized location, so they're probably going to want to be there for a while. But yeah, we are very interested in exploring other opportunities for that site in conjunction with bus parking.
- Participant: And then my last question – sorry to dominate here – it's on one of the policies that was announced during the introduction was that the

development would pay for itself. We're talking now about this very expensive new infrastructure, especially transportation, right-of-way, but also parks and open space. Then there was conversation about local – one of the funding mechanisms would be a local improvement district. I just want to be on record as opposing that because we don't think it's fair. We actually see that as devaluing our properties. The reason being is we don't plan to redevelopment in the foreseeable future. Yet if we were assessed an LID to accommodate additional generation from adjacent developments – and this is for both properties at the west end, east end – the LID assessment would count against the value of the properties ((inaudible due to tearing paper)) reduce the net income of the properties, which devalues the properties in that regard. While we support the investment in infrastructure, it should be – the cost of that should be broad based mostly, because the whole city will benefit from it. That which is directly attributable to the new development, there should be a reasonable way for that development to pay for growth.

Mr. King: Okay. So if other people have comments about the phasing or funding mechanisms, you can put those into your comments. The funding discussion is going to happen primarily at the City Council level, but Mr. Woosley is correct that the Council has discussed a little bit about local improvement districts, something that the city doesn't do very often, but when it does do it there's usually a major reason why it's needed to happen to get a roadway built.

So why don't we try to keep on time. Let's move on to provisions for existing uses, so this is number four. I think Paul did a good job of highlighting the discussion that happened both at the steering committee level as well as the current code provisions. We need not need to spend a lot of time on this. You may want to look through the Zoning Code and pay special attention to the P's in the land use boxes, the land use tables, for existing uses. And you may kind of want to look at your specific use and see how it would be reflected in our existing use provisions. If there's any kind of general comments if people have had a chance to look through that, we can write those down now.

Participant: So, general comments, not specific to sites?

Mr. King: If you've had a chance to look through it and kind of understand what we're proposing. But I think every one of you is going to have a different circumstance, so it may be better if anybody has any general things about this, looks like it's good or not good. Probably detailed ones about your specific property would be better to do in written format.

Participant: Emil, maybe for those who haven't covered all the meetings, let everyone know what the general policies are about, allowing existing uses and

where, rather than creating nonconforming uses, there's the existing use category.

Mr. King:

Yes. In our land use tables we have an existing use category, which means it's not a nonconforming use, it's an existing use. So the steering committee was very deliberate in recommending that they didn't want to be creating a bunch of nonconforming uses, so we've got a new name for that. The BR-GC zones, or the pink area up along Northup, is going to be very similar to the existing GC zone today. So most uses that you can do up there now would be allowed to happen in the future. The CR zone, which is this blue area, would be very similar to our CB zone, with some modifications. We've been having some public interest from auto dealerships, for example, about locating there where right now you couldn't locate there. So there'll be some modifications, slight modifications, to that zone. And then generally the idea is that, based on steering committee direction, kind of going through the Planning Commission process, the kind of heavy light industrial uses are something that, our existing uses can stay there for as long as they'd like but are not something that the steering committee and Planning Commission wanted to be allowing any major new ones. So it's things like Coca Cola type things, the Safeway distribution, the heavy industrial uses. As well as some of the service-type uses that have LI-type characteristics, like auto body shops and other similar uses, within the nodes. So you can think of higher intensity, mixed use environment, and not wanting to allow a bunch of new uses that are going to be creating odor, noise, in the nodes. So the Zoning Code outlines these in more detail if you want to look through those. And look specifically for the zone your property is in. Go down and read through and see if this adequately meets your desires. We have provisions for expansion and being able to reconstruct if your use is destroyed, or is destroyed.

Participant:

One question. I think I might be the only one in the BR-ORT zone, is that proposal similar to the existing?

Mr. King

The BR-ORT is similar to – a little bit greater intensity than existing zoning. And it allows for residential development down there as an option, not a requirement. So the steering committee's direction and kind of what the Planning Commission took was historically that's been kind of an office, transition area, kind of low scale. The Planning Commission and steering committee thought that infusing in the opportunity to do housing in that area as an option is something we provide for in the code right now.

So let's move on to the amenity system. I'm sure we're going to have some questions and comments about this topic. The draft amenity system falls into a Tier 1 and Tier 2, as Paul pointed out in the presentation. The

idea with the amenity system is that there is going to be an upzone for many properties in the corridor. We want to kind of recognize that there will be an upzone and that there is some portion of that upzone that should be captured in public amenities. The discussion now both in the public and at the Planning Commission is kind of what's an adequate incentive system that will both provide public amenities but also have redevelopment occur. So we want to find that balance. And I'm sure everybody will have ideas on what the correct balance is.

The general way an incentive system works is that you have a base FAR that you're allowed to do as of right, and then there's an upper end FAR. Staff has analyzed both the areas inside the nodes and outside the nodes. And inside the nodes we think that there is the opportunity to do an incentive system based on the current economics of things, provided that there may be details on specific areas that people want to comment on about the economics. To go from a base FAR to an upper end FAR, as Paul pointed out, for residential development there'd be a Tier 1a, Tier 1b, and then a Tier 2. For residential development, the Tier 1a, based on Planning Commission direction, would be participation in an affordable housing program. Tier 1b would then be investment in parks and open space, whether doing it yourself or doing a fee in-lieu. Tier 2, which would take you all the way up to 2.5, would be picking items from the list of amenities.

For commercial development, a little bit simplified version where Tier 1 is participation in parks and open space. Tier 2 is picking from anything on the list.

We've had significant public comment on both the list of things, people wanting to add or subtract things from the list, and also numerous comments from property owners about the economics of the incentive system and what's a reasonable amount to expect for a contribution. I'm sure most people have comments on this, so we can start out. If people haven't commented yet, it would be good to hear from them as well.

Participant: I think on the whole it's generally a broad-based approach. The thoughts are good, but until we get farther along – you have to define it more to be able to comment on it. I mean, affordable housing, sure, great, but is it 50 percent or 80 percent affordable. I mean, who knows. Until you define it more it's hard to even comment on it.

Mr. King: In our public – In our draft packet, we have laid out some general – I know not everybody's been able to look through everything yet. So it's great to just – just hearing that you want to know the details. But we've basically laid out that the affordable housing bonus ratios would be pegged at the 80 percent level for rental, and then the 100 percent median

level for ownership. And if you have questions about how that translates into lease rates or sales prices, we can drill down. But we have put something out there for you to respond to, as well as the range of ratios that the bonus would be at. So we've deliberately had a low end and upper end for the bonus ratios thinking that would generally bracket things, provided that the Planning Commission has said that they even want to be able to extend up or down from that range. So it's just putting things out there for people to respond to. And we've gotten down to pretty good detail for each one of the things on the list for you to look at.

Participant: Okay.

Participant: I have two questions. One of the relates to affordable housing and the second one relates to parking. Affordable housing, that duty of supporting affordable housing, will that rely only on the residential, or will there be a component for commercial development for supporting affordable housing, a citywide endeavor, a policy. That's the first question. And the second question is, I notice in this handout that the parking allowances, the minimum and maximum per type of development, is pretty much painted with a broad brush. It occurs to me that in the nodes where you want to encourage ridership and mass transit, and where the walking distance isn't so far from the nodes to outlying areas – and my point is I think the maximum parking allowances are doing what the city wants to encourage, which is ridership in the nodal areas. But the further you get from the nodal areas, people aren't going to ride it because of the walking distance no matter what you do in terms of parking. All you do is punish those areas that are redeveloping. So I think that there should be a bifurcated ((inaudible due to paper tearing)) to increase the maximum allowable parking in the outlying areas away from the nodes.

Mr. King: I'm going to answer the second question first and then go back to the affordable housing. The first one is, we have put in at least a two-tiered system for parking, minimum and maximum ratios, in our draft proposal. So we have highlighted at least the node areas, so Design Center area, 122nd, 130th, and the Angelo's site. So we do have slightly more kind of transit-supportive parking ratios for those areas. And then it relaxes a bit as you go outside. So if you wanted to look at those, see if those still meet your criteria for graduating it. If there's more refinements to that, we're welcome to hear those comments.

Participant: I apologize for being uneducated.

Mr. King: No, that's okay. I think if there's more refinements, I think that's fine. But we did try and at least hit two components for kind of the close in and then a little bit farther away.

The affordable housing question. Affordable housing is an issue not only for the city of Bellevue but for all other Eastside and Puget Sound jurisdictions. I guess the underlying theme is that it's kind of a once in a lifetime opportunity that Bellevue is doing right now for creating the opportunity for 5000-plus more housing units in this corridor. And both the steering committee and the Planning Commission felt that trying to have some amount of affordable housing happen as part of that 5000 new units is important. The mechanism that they're wanting to put out there for public comment is at least tying some of that to the incentive system that would apply as a Tier 1 for residential development incentive. There's still other ways to have affordable housing happen, through ARCH, through other tax incentives. So the incentive system is not the only way that affordable housing happens. The affordable housing bonus would still be on the list for commercial development if they wanted to do a fee in-lieu, but it wouldn't be one of the kind of Tier 1 components they would be investing in. They would be investing in the parks and open space as their Tier 1.

Participant: On this affordable housing issue, has the city been giving some thought to where you already have public property and getting involved with tax credits, workforce-type housing developments like –

Mr. King: Yes. Like I said the incentive system is a small piece of the overall toolkit. Part of the toolkit is multifamily tax abatement to kind of encourage affordable housing, and then another is thing on the list is using public properties or remnant properties for affordable housing. So that's something that as you go down the line of doing either major parks, park investment, or other roadway infrastructure, if there are remnant properties, that's something that could be thought about. We haven't picked out any on the map yet and said that's where there's going to be a remnant sufficient in both surrounding amenities and size to do an affordable housing project. But it's on the toolkit list.

Participant: Emil, just talking a bit about the incentive program, and you've obviously heard us make some other comments earlier. We're in the process of trying to get a building under way as quickly as we can. So we've done a lot of work sort of analyzing on the ground what this means to us. And I guess I just want to talk on a couple of important bits. You mentioned one earlier on, this question of the upzone, which is what are the economics of a 1.0 FAR today on a site, what would you build at 1.0 FAR, which is basically a building with surface parking. When you create the density upzones to go to 2.5, you change the whole costing of the economic model of the building. And it suddenly becomes – from a square foot standpoint, it changes the whole way anyone – and we're a business operator – would look at how the economic model works. And I think there's a very important balance there of how you move out of that cost bracket into the

next bracket. And Bellevue wants to see this area develop. So there's a real sort of piece that that I think sort of has to be resolved better.

I'll tie that into what I call the balance of incentives. Emil showed a little chart earlier on that had a series of blocks on it. And there's a block at the bottom that had here's your entitlement, and there's another block that had here's your cost incentive, and then it had two big blocks that were the values attached to the incentive program. And I think visually that's a real problem, because the implication is that if your base is at 1.0 FAR and you're going to 2.5, you're buying the extra 1.5 effectively. And I think there's a real need to look at the balance between the fundamental levies that are going to change in this district anyway. You are going to change transportation levies, you're going to change a whole pile of different cost factors that automatically affect whether a landowner is going to do something on their land. And then the actual value of the incentive should actually be a very thin wafer on top of that levy size. Because otherwise you won't get any incentive because the incentive will kill the ability for the land to develop. And that's what we're seeing sort of pop up for us. So I think it's a function of really understanding the balance between those three factors and what they mean to a landowner, and whether or not it's of any motivation to you to actually do something on the land. And that's the thing I'd be worried about, what we're seeing happen, is that there is no reason to do anything on the land. And maybe you will revisit the fees twenty years from now, but I don't see any need to change. I don't see something that would encourage you to develop or to move – I'm sorry, a landowner – from where they are today, to move into a different scenario.

Mr. O'Neill: So you're saying that in order to capture – you need to understand the full range of economic factors, land values, the economic structure, the incentives, the full circle, and the allowable zoning.

Mr. King: So what Chris was point out was on the presentation Paul did, he had those two bars that kind of had the arrows going up and down representing the variable fees and other funding mechanisms that may go into the underlying economics of the property.

Participant: Yes, exactly.

Participant: I'll just say briefly without sort of elaborating, because you've heard a lot, again, from our group. But I think we agree with what Chris has just said in terms of the current system which really, mostly encourages properties to stay as is. So I think – and the city's been great about continuing the conversation. So I think that's just the comment we would make, that we need to continue this conversation. Because the current system, as is –

Mr. O'Neill: You're talking about the current proposed system when you say the current system.

Participant: Yes, yes. I mean the proposal, the draft recommendations. They mean that probably there will be warehouses on the Safeway site for a while.

Mr. King: Todd.

Participant: I think incentive is a bit of misnomer with the FARs being proposed. What you have essentially is extractions and then there's a little bit of that that might be incentive. But my question is, how do we recognize the general tax funds that go for this, can we create a level of service for each – identify a level of service for transportation, design the infrastructure, figure out what it's going to cost, and can we do that for the parks as well and for the arts and for the streams, and come up with a standard and then just determine how can that be paid for. We've been paying property taxes for parks for example for 40 years but haven't have a park built to serve the area. There's been lots of other parks built, partially through the property taxes we've been paying, but none to serve us. And I think that's consistent for a lot of the Bel-Red area. So we should get credit for that contribution. We've been underserved. Maybe that's as it should be. A lot of these things are so expensive. We're looking at up to \$450 million for infrastructure. And when you look at broad-based funding sources and a long-term plan to put this in, because what you're hearing is by saddling the existing properties as well as the new development with a high percentage of the cost will kill the feasibility for redevelopment, so everything stays the same. So can we recognize contributions the properties have already made and the lack of benefit from that to date, and look at broad-based funding sources, and do that by looking at a level of service, for example, for parks, for open space, and for the arts.

Mr. King: Okay, we've captured your comment. The City Council is the one that's going to be doing the heavy lifting on the finance plan, but those are great comments to forward to the Planning Commission and the Council. We have taken a cut at things like parks, proposed parks, in the subarea. Glen from our parks department is here so he can jump in if I'm misstating anything, but we've looked at both mini parks, neighborhood parks, civic plazas ((inaudible due to paper tearing)). Primarily all of those would be for the Bel-Red subarea, so all those would be kind of to meet the commercial and residential need of the subarea. Things like streams are different. We've calculated the stream investment and included it in the \$450 million number. Not all of the stream enhancements would be specifically to serve the Bel-Red area, they are more of a citywide benefit, so we've done kind of a ratio of that to be Bel-Red specific and citywide specific. But your other comments about what about the past investments is a good one to pass on to our Planning Commission and City Council.

Participant: I don't want to repeat everything that's been said, but what I've been doing is taking the proposed code and the zoning and then applying it to my property. I would suggest that the city might want to consider just taking a property and look at all the impacts of everything we've talked about today and see whether or not if you owned this property you would develop it. I think if you did that, you might find some concerns.

Participant: Emil, can I just add something else about this, the way the incentive tiers are being created. If you're a residential you have affordable, if you're not you have parks and streams as the starting point. And there's a lot of conversation tonight for example about road rights-of-way that have to be given up, so what do you get for that, right? I mean you might get a shift of density onto the rest of your land, but how is that really defined. The questions about if you are going to redevelopment and put underground parking, what happens to the underground parking costs that come into the economics of the model. Is that offset against anything that takes place.

The affordable housing one, I look at that from a residential standpoint. And I'm not sure in the current environment whether you actually will get affordable housing, or whether you'll get the cash in lieu. You'll get the incentive paid to you, but you won't necessarily get the affordable built. And I wonder if that's actually what you're after. And that's a matter of where it sits now as a hammer versus an incentive. And I think that's a very important piece about what it is that you – I mean, we're in the seniors business, so you've probably heard our conversation about the model for seniors is actually effectively an affordable model. Well at the moment you're not discussing that, and we're in the process of obviously – you know, we are interested in that area. But I think there's some realities to the nature of where Bel-Red starts. It's fundamentally an industrial-type sector, so how you shift it into a world that encourages those kinds of things to take place without them being forced on you. And I'm sure a lot of landowners today are probably looking at that and thinking how the hell can I do that, it's not part of my world today. Where's my incentive for me to do it. I like the word incentive, but it doesn't feel like what you're doing at the moment is that. So I think that's an important thrust that somehow has to get into the framework. The comment earlier that if you look at the map and you look at the site, it doesn't make sense for me to do it. So I think that's an important piece that somehow has to come from planning and the Council.

Mr. King: Thanks, Chris. We have two more questions and about twelve or thirteen more minutes. Question number six is concerning the design standards and the design guidelines. There are many pages in the draft materials and the Zoning Code. I would recommend that you go through both the standards and the guidelines. The general way that these work are that

standards are things that apply to all properties in the corridor. Some of the maps that Paul showed you up on the screen would apply to your property, the build-to lines, required on-street parking, required ground floor uses, the active edge provisions. Those are things you want to look at to see if your property is in that general area and see if you number one understand what's being proposed, and then number two agree that that's the right way to do things. So the standards are basically requirements.

The design guidelines would kick in to development that is above 0.5 FAR. So anywhere in the corridor, if you're above 0.5 FAR there's a separate document called design guidelines that has the guideline, the intent for the guideline, and some recommended and not recommended provisions. And if anybody's ever been through the design review process in the past, that's where you come in, sit down with your project, talk to a land use staff, and kind of go back forth about does the proposal meet or not meet those guidelines. Probably more thought that you guys need to do on the details, but if there's any general questions or comments about standards and guidelines, we can record those or try and answer any questions.

Participant: Emil, a question about provision for existing uses. My understanding is from listening to Carol that for areas that are not light industrial zoned that essentially all the uses that are permitted in that zone will continue to be permitted uses. And there may be some additional possibility in there. Is that an accurate understanding of what the change will bring? Is that an accurate recommendation of the steering committee recommendation and the policies for the corridor, or will there be uses that are currently uses that are currently permitted outside the light industrial zone that will not be permitted outright?

Mr. King: I can try and answer that, but however I answer it there may be some minor tweaks once we go through and look at every single use category. The general intent was that we identify all of the existing uses, so the LI and the service-type uses, and then we've actually expanded the ((inaudible due to paper tearing)) zoning areas. And I don't think we've eliminated a significant number, if any. I don't want to answer that we haven't eliminated any uses, but I think the general intent was we were expanding the overall bucket of use and mix of uses that could occur. That will be question that comes up at the Planning Commission phase. We'll do some research to actually go through and try to itemize each zone, the before and after. I don't think we've been more restrictive, we've actually been less restrictive, but there may be one or two that you find that may not be allowed and they were before. And it would be good to know those.

Participant: Okay, thanks.

Mr. King: So about standards and guidelines, any questions or comments about how those work? Okay.

So, the last question, we talked a little bit about the workforce and affordable housing. If there was any other comments about that topic? It's many ways to accomplish the goals of workforce and affordable housing. It's a tough challenge, not only for Bellevue but for other jurisdictions, and we at least have part of it in the incentive system, and other ways we could explore in the future.

Participant: I'd just like to comment that we are projecting to have 1.7 million people here by 2040. We need to have the housing for them. On the map –

Mr. O'Neill: Not in Bellevue, though. ((laughter))

Participant: Not in Bellevue, right. The single best way to address the housing affordability problem will be to let a significant amount of increased supply be built, whether it's market rate or not. So as Chris was saying, if it's impossible to get there, to even provide anything, then that just continues to restrict the supply of housing throughout the region, and the price goes up. So right now, as some of you know I also work with the Association of Realtors, when we looked just this month at what's affordable to people making the median income in King County, less than four percent of the housing on the market is affordable. That's to somebody making \$68,000. So anything it takes to just allow more to get built will help. If we can put 5000 housing units in this region, and if they are feasible to be built right away, I'd put forward that that's the best solution. We need stuff that's affordable to the middle class, essentially, as much as to the people who are working down at Bellevue Square or the service retail jobs. We've done this in the past where we've made an inclusionary requirement where nine units had to subsidize one unit, and no units got built. So that's counterproductive. My question is how are we going to address the macro supply issue for housing in this?

Mr. King: I wanted to have just a little bit of time for general comments or questions. Tina or Monica, do you have any general comments or questions?

Participant: I'm just taking all of this in. I'll have to figure out how it applies and everything else. This is just very informative to me. It seems like 15th/16th is going to be my main concern. I know that's also an improvement, but on the other map where it shows the parks and stuff like that, I don't know if you're going to be taking out one of my buildings or if you're going to be going around it.

Mr. King: What we can do is either after this meeting or at our open house, which is on Thursday afternoon, either Glenn or I can talk to you about how the 15th/16th is envisioned right now and what the different blobs on the map either mean or don't mean for parks investments.

Participant: Okay, I'll take it up on Thursday. Until then I can do my homework.

Mr. King: Okay. Monica, do you have any other general comments or questions?

Participant: Not at this time. I've just been taking in information and observing. I've already made the comments I needed to make. I do have a suggestion, going back to the area north of Overlake Hospital. You mentioned that in the future because of the transportation situation the city would consider rezoning about a quarter of a mile north of 20th. Is it possible to initiate putting into place another kind of zoning that would be approximately from NE 20th Street north and have a different height? And then from NE 20th Street south would be a higher zoning.

Mr. King: That second comment would be a good one to make at this point, right now, if you think that there is a reason why heights should be different as you go up the corridor. If there is something that you want to Planning Commission to consider now.

Participant: Well, aesthetically – again going back to the question of why it was restricted – it butts up to I-405, so I don't see a reason why the height would be restricted. I know you said that, you know, you felt that at this time it was the best –

Mr. King: Yes –

Mr. O'Neill: I'm sorry, where would you draw that line?

Participant: NE 20th.

Mr. O'Neill: So, about right here?

Participant: No, farther south.

Mr. King: So is 20th about the top of the hill right there?

Participant: No, 19th is the top of the hill.

Mr. King: So 116th kind of goes up steady climb to 19th or 20th and then goes back down.

Participant: Uh huh.

Mr. King: So I would itemize that first comment at this point. The second comment about reexamining the overall node there is something that is a number of years in the future. So there are other actions that need to happen. I wouldn't necessarily characterize it as the city is going to go rezone the area, but more we're going to go analyze what the current transit alignment and station idea is for that general area. If anything comes across I-405 in that location, we'll see what makes sense from a zoning standpoint. There's two options for coming across I-405 with high-capacity transit. One is at NE 12th and the other is at NE 6th, the alignment that comes up the BNSF corridor. So clearly if there was something that came up here with a station down in this area, then the idea of doing upzones in this area probably wouldn't be as critical.

David, do you have any parting comments?

Participant: Not today. I'm just here to listen and understand it. But I would like to get more information regarding incentive to affordable housing. More detail.

Mr. King: Okay. So we can either meet up after this meeting, or if you want to schedule an appointment to come in and talk to city staff. At the open house there will be a number of people who can talk about the incentive program. That's on Thursday afternoon. We're happy to get everybody up to speed on all the details of this proposal.

Participant: Well, I'm not sure I was – I want to be clear about my previous comment about use ((inaudible due to tearing paper)) commercial areas. Our site's right across the street from Metro and it's bracketed by looking at the back side of office buildings along 116th I guess. So it's not really from our perspective the most ideal residential site. We view those buildings along there being converted to retail. So I think that you guys might have interpreted hey, if it's a mixed use, develop it with residential and little shops on the bottom floor. The site makes sense for retail, and our idea is to convert that to retail.

Mr. King: So you are speaking of the tan colored BR-R zone right there.

Participant: Yes. Metro is right there and it's not exactly right for affordable housing.

Mr. O'Neill: I wanted to make a general comment based on what a couple of people had to say. We've gotten a lot of comments today and also a lot of questions. And the questions are actually great because they help us figure out what people need to understand more. So part of the reason we're doing this is to get everybody ready for the public hearing at the end of the month. So the thing I would say is the Planning Commission

appreciates comments, but they also appreciate questions for the same reason. If you just have questions you'd like to pose for the Commission, don't feel like you have to go the public hearing and submit a specific comment. Submitting a question to the Commission is just as valuable. I just wanted to make sure that's understood.

Participant: I've got a question. In the BR-OR zoning, apparently it includes financial, insurance, real estate, medical clinics, healthcare, professional service, and general administrative, but it restricts computer programming and research and development-style offices. Why?

Mr. O'Neill: I'm sorry, Bill. That was the BR-OR?

Participant: Yes. It's restrictive to computer programming and research and development-style offices, and I want to know why.

Mr. King: Okay. Scott.

Participant: Just a clarification. On the transportation system improvements, Phase I is listed as 2008 to 2013. Is that ideally completed, is that a funding mechanism in place on the outside of 2013? What's the thinking on that?

Mr. O'Neill: Well, the thinking is that that would link up with the first phase of the CIP that would be part of the 2009-2010 budget. So every time the Council does a budget, they designate a six-year financing plan, and those are the projects that are going to be financed and built. So I think when we talk about Phase I, ideally those would be the projects that would be in the CIP, meaning there's a six-year commitment. Not all of those get built in that six-year period. Sometimes during that six-year period they're being designed. But essentially it represents the Council's commitment to finance those. So I think that's probably what realistically we're looking at when we talk about Phase I, those projects in the CIP that there would be a financial commitment to doing. But they're probably not all on the ground by the end of the six years.

Participant: But for redevelopment to happen –

Mr. O'Neill: Well I think that's what we have to kind of look at the way they –

Mr. King: Those Phase I projects are actually part of the phasing discussion that we've been having.

Participant: Yeah. Quite frankly, though, that first phase impacts our property significantly. I mean that forces us into redevelopment right away, which I don't know that we're ready to do.

Mr. O'Neill: I think that's a really good question.

Participant: Do we have a comparison of how the city finances these types of projects in other parts of the city, particularly in commercial areas? Just so we know how much – I'd be curious for example in the CBD and out in the Eastgate area and other commercial zones, Crossroads, how much of the infrastructure cost is being borne by the existing properties, the redevelopment properties, and through general resources.

Mr. King: Okay. Any other final comments or questions? Kevin and I will be around afterwards if anyone wants to follow up with more details.

Okay, well thank you everybody for coming. We will have what's called the spring forward expo on Thursday afternoon, four to six-thirty. And then there will be a meeting that's open to the public of all of our boards and commissions. They'll meet in a single room and get a little more detailed presentation than you received this morning.

Participant: Can you give us an idea what the agenda for that joint board and commission meeting is. How's that going to unfold, that meeting?

Mr. King: We're still tweaking the final agenda, but generally it is an opportunity to get all of the boards and commissions in one room. We did the same thing back on October 10, or maybe the 14th, to give some closure to their work.

Participant: So are they each going to just report out, or are you going to talk about a substantive topic?

Mr. King: We'll try and hit an overview of all the pieces of the public review document, acknowledging that each board and commission spent their time kind of focused on their piece of the puzzle. The Planning Commission has had the opportunity to see everything in one place, because that's their responsibility. They will forward a whole package eventually to the City Council. It's mainly to bring the other five boards and commissions up to the speed of the Planning Commission. There will be an opportunity for dialog among the Commissioners, and as you might imagine depending on how many show up, not everyone will be able to say all they want. But there may be some specific things said about affordable housing, the incentive system, 15th/16th has been a key piece of dialog. And what we found the last time we got all the boards and commissions together you'd have people from one commission interested in a topic that they weren't going to be analyzing or don't really have responsibility for but are just curious.

Mr. O'Neill: I just want to clarify. It is, as Emil said, to get all the commissions in the same place. But candidly, it's not about having all the commissions spiral

off to another round of review. If that happens, you're kind of in a death spiral that you'll never get out of. I mean the Planning Commission sort of owns this at this point. So the Transportation Commission can hear about the Land Use Plan Map and the incentive system so they can understand how their work links up to it and everybody else's work, but it's not a whole new round of work.

Mr. King: It's more about closure and acknowledging that the Planning Commission is now on point for reading all of the comments, having the public hearing, and ultimately transmitting everything to the City Council.

Alright. Thank you, everyone, for coming.