Enclosed is your packet of materials for the March 3, 2011 Eastgate/I-90 CAC meeting. As you can see from the agenda, primary topics include:

- Evaluation Criteria for the Land Use and Transportation Alternatives – finalize and confirm (agenda item 3)
- Relationship of the Eastgate/I-90 corridor to other city and regional market areas – staff presentation (agenda item 4)
- Alternatives work session (agenda item 5)

MEETING CONTEXT
This meeting follows several meetings at which the CAC has reviewed, digested, and discussed much background information about the project. On February 3, 2011, the CAC began discussing Evaluation Criteria that will help inform and evaluate land use and transportation alternatives as they evolve through the process. The criteria have been revised to reflect input given by the CAC on February 3 (see agenda item 3 and related materials).

The CAC also requested a brief overview of the Eastgate/I-90 corridor’s market relationship to other commercial areas, including Downtown Bellevue, the Bel-Red corridor, and commercial areas in the surrounding region. Staff will provide that information at the March 3 meeting (agenda item 4).

The alternatives work session at agenda item 5 will provide the CAC with the opportunity to start identifying ideas or concepts to support the development of land use and transportation alternatives. The results of this work session, together with the evaluation criteria, will provide the design team with “building blocks” that will inform the development of alternatives for consideration at your future meetings.

NEXT STEPS
Following your March 3 meeting, the design team will begin developing alternatives for CAC consideration and evaluation. We expect to have an initial set of alternatives in time for your May 5 meeting. In the meantime, the April 7 meeting will focus primarily on transportation-related issues, opportunities, and possible solutions to support the ultimate land use vision. This will allow us to more effectively integrate land use and transportation considerations as the alternatives evolve.
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MEETING AGENDA

Thursday, March 3, 2011
5:30 P.M. – Room 1E-108
Bellevue City Hall – 450 110th Avenue NE

1. Call to order (5:30)
2. Approval of February 3, 2011 minutes * (5:30)
3. Finalize evaluation criteria (continued from February 3, 2011 meeting) * (5:35)
4. Relationship of Eastgate to Bellevue and the region (City staff) (5:50)
5. Alternatives work session (6:00)
6. Public comment (7:15)
7. Adjourn (7:30)

* related materials included in packet

Visit our website: www.bellevuewa.gov/eastgate-corridor.htm
CITY OF BELLEVUE
EASTGATE/I-90
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

February 3, 2011
5:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-108

MEMBERS PRESENT: Tom Bohman, Lindy Bruce, Dave Elliott, Jay Hamlin, Jeffrey Hummer, Francois Larrivee, Mark Ludtka, Tom Perea, Rob Pucher, Rachel Solemsaas, John Stokes, David Vranizan, Cynthia Welti

MEMBERS ABSENT: Carrie Courter Blanton, Jim Stanton

OTHERS PRESENT: None

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

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. Call To Order

Co-Chair Larrivee called the meeting to order at 5:33 p.m.

2. Approval of Minutes

   A. December 2, 2010

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

   B. January 6, 2011

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

   C. January 15, 2011

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

3. Presentation by Bellevue College

Rachel Solemsaas, Bellevue College Vice President of Administrative Services and CAC member, explained that the college’s last master plan was developed in 2008. The document is considered to be a live document that is constantly being updated, particularly as funding allocations change. Bellevue College is a regional facility that is focused on student success, excellence in continued learning, a strong college culture, and engaging and enriching the community. The college was established in 1965 and is
the state’s third largest educational institution, followed only by the University of Washington and Washington State University. The current enrollment exceeds 37,000, 1600 of which are international students. The college confers some 83 degrees and certificates, and provides continuing education and basic skills training. Accreditation as a four-year university was awarded in 2010, which triggered the name change from Bellevue Community College to Bellevue College.

Ms. Solemsaas said the college is in the process of updating the 2008 master plan. The goals are respecting and enhancing the campus environment, respecting the environment as a whole, maximizing flexibility, maintaining a safe, healthy and accessible place for learning, and supporting the community. A state-of-the-art science building was constructed in 2010 and is in operation. Signage reflecting the college’s new name was updated.

A map of the campus was shared with the committee. It was noted that the plan for the campus is to create more of a presence on 148th Avenue SE while capitalizing the current buildings and facilities. Funding for design of a new health sciences building has been received but it will not be constructed for another six years. Property acquisitions aimed at increasing the overall size of the campus and enhancing the student housing program have been made and are being planned.

Mr. Perea asked how many on-campus students the college currently has. Derek Grown with Bellevue College indicated that some 13,000 cars come to the campus on a daily basis. Ms. Solemsaas said classes are offered as early as 7:00 a.m. and end as late as 10:00 p.m. which helps to spread out the campus load.

Mr. Hummer asked if there are plans to increase the number of recreational facilities on the campus. Ms. Solemsaas said the current master plan does not include expansion in that direction. The college continues to offer physical education and outdoor activities for students and the community. The softball and soccer fields were recently updated, and there are two full gyms for indoor events. The facilities can be rented by the public.

Mr. Elliott asked how state funding reductions and increases in tuition will impact Bellevue College. Ms. Solemsaas said the school has three basic funding sources for capital projects. One is the state allocation of bond dollars. About ten percent of the tuition fees go to help pay off the bonds. Over the past few years the allocation has totaled about half a billion dollars which was split among 34 colleges. With reduced funding from the state, capital projects are having to be stretched over longer periods of time. A second source is local capital, which can be borrowed. Public/private partnerships are the third source of funding; they are usually focused on housing programs.

Ms. Solemsaas explained that Bellevue College has several satellite campuses that offer continuing education programs. In November 2009 a new location for the north campus center was purchased; it is located on NE 29th Street. This is a former Microsoft building, and is being remodeled and will open in April 2011. A purchase and sale agreement was recently signed for a 20-acre property in the Issaquah Highlands; the site could eventually house 314,000 square feet of additional educational space.

Ms. Bruce asked if the new campus on NE 29th Street will attract additional commuters to 148th Avenue NE. Ms. Solemsaas said a traffic study has been conducted which concluded that the site will not have a major impact on 148th Avenue NE given that the
Mr. Growen said currently about 75 percent of the college’s employees and two-thirds of the students drive their own vehicles to the main campus. Twenty percent of the students use transit, while another eleven percent carpool or rideshare. Between 7:00 a.m. and 9:00 a.m. more than a thousand vehicles per hour enter the campus; the rate slowly decreases as the day progresses. Overall, however, more than 500 vehicles per hour move onto or off of the campus between 10:00 a.m. and 9:00 p.m. A parking study was completed as part of the permitting process for the new health sciences building; it revealed that the most cars parked on campus at any one time is about 3500. The issue is less with supply and more with distribution; the lots closest to the main building fill quickly during the peak hours, while the outer lots are never completely full. The new building will displace some parking, but the study suggests there will still be an oversupply of at least 100 stalls. Various transportation demand management scenarios are being considered to reduce the parking demand; one option is to establish a parking charge for both students and faculty.

Ms. Solemsaas said the projected annual increase in enrollment for the main campus has conservatively been tagged at five percent. During the economic slowdown enrollment has increased substantially. The highest growth potential, however, is anticipated to occur at the satellite campuses and online.

Answering a question asked by Mr. Perea, Ms. Solemsaas said the college is in the early stages of discussing its housing program. The experiences of other colleges and universities have been studied. Green River Community College has a housing program that offers apartment units; Edmonds Community College has a secure building with apartment units. The focus is generally on housing international students. Bellevue College does not believe it is in a position to offer dormitory housing.

Ms. Solemsaas said the master plan will address on-campus vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Along with improved campus movements, the focus will be on improving safety. Accommodations for bike commuters will be improved as well, including a connection with the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway.

Mr. Elliott said the commercial area along 148th Avenue SE was studied by the city several years ago. The study included looking at redevelopment of the gas station area and the potential of putting an office building up against it. A college version of transit-oriented development was not studied, though perhaps it should be. Either the Redmond or Renton transit-oriented development could serve as a good model.

4. Study Area Discussion

A. Tour Debrief

Senior Planner Mike Bergstrom said staff assembled all of the comments made by the Committee members at each stop along the tour. He said quite a few comments were made regarding the first four stops, which were around the Factoria area. The comments had to do with everything from visual aspects to the lack of greenery, the need for better signage regarding how to get back to I-405, and the status of the Factoria development. There were also questions asked about the trail connections, positive comments about the consolidation of office buildings with good access to retail, and the need to keep scale and massing in mind as future development is contemplated. Several suggested the area
would be a good place for a light rail stop.

Questions about how well a traffic circle would work were asked about several areas in along the tour. The first point where it came up was at the fifth stop on Factoria Boulevard.

While traveling up Eastgate Way one committee member indicated support for having a vehicle overpass spanning the freeway, but the person concluded the topography would make such a facility very difficult to construct. A non-motorized access in the general area was mentioned as a possibility.

A question was asked about the portion of Richards Creek that extends to the south of I-90. Mr. Bergstrom explained that while the mapping shows the creek only on the east side of Factoria Boulevard, it appears that the stream might split and include a branch on the west side. The drainage is all to Richards Valley.

One committee member wanted to know if the owner of the RV park beyond the Eastgate Plaza is involved in the Eastgate/I-90 study in any way. Mr. Bergstrom said staff has been in regular contact with the property owner to provide updates about the process.

A comment was made about the eastbound access to I-90 near point 12 that might reduce congestion at the intersection of 150th Avenue SE and SE 37th Street.

On the north side of the freeway, suggestions were made regarding locations that might be appropriate for roundabouts.

In response to the discussion about a potential connection from 156th Avenue SE to 158th Avenue SE, a resident on the tour said they would not be in favor because of the low-speed, two-lane residential character of the street; their concern was that the connection could add traffic on that road.

Around points 16 and 17 in the interior of the office area questions were raised regarding whether or not additional retail uses should be allowed. Some pointed out the opportunities for new road connections, and someone suggested a new parking garage should be built and the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway trail should be run through the area.

A number of comments were made regarding the area near the park at point 18. Some of the comments were related to the park itself, which is not part of the planning study but which does have a connection to the study area. Someone suggested the potential for making stormwater treatment a part of the future park. It was suggested the park should include a connection to the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway trail, and that part of the field should be restored to more of a native state. Mr. Bergstrom noted that the park master plan proposes no vehicle access from 156th Avenue SE.

With regard to the area farther east past Sunset Village and the access to Bellevue College, the suggestion was made that a landscaped entry should be created near the freeway overpass. The suggestion was also made that the area would be appropriate for increased density and mixed use development. The same suggestion was made regarding the area near the entrance to the college. A few comments were made in support of housing and/or retail at that location.
With regard to the area closer to the park and ride, the suggestion was made that a trail connection via the SE 142nd Place overpass should be created. Another person suggested high-capacity transit serving the eastern area be considered for the site. Someone commented that floors should be added to the park-and-ride garage to support additional uses, including commercial.

To the east near the Lincoln Executive Center, the suggestion was made that the area would be appropriate for retail and residential uses given its proximity to the college campus and the park and ride. It was suggested that incentives should be considered for allowing increased height and density in exchange for community assets. Another person suggested the back side of the Lincoln Executive Center should be rezoned from Light Industrial to something more appropriate.

Similar comments were made with regard to the area to the west along Eastgate Way. Some suggested the King County site that was used temporarily as a park and ride would be appropriate for mixed use or retail. The comment was made that something should be done to make the intersection with Richards Road more inviting by adding something like a coffee shop. The general area might also provide opportunities for new development adjacent to the residential and thus serve as a natural buffer to the freeway.

Comments were made that within the Richards Valley industrial area there are opportunities for linking to the college with research and development facilities. Additional height and density could be allowed through incentives, though increased connectivity to the existing roadway infrastructure would be required. One suggestion was made that the area should be used as an experimental land use project with green buildings that might attract a national or global interest. Another comment made was that the area should be left as industrial provided it does not grow and continues to provide jobs.

Mr. Bergstrom said there were some general comments made that were not specific to any site. A couple of the comments dealt with King County Metro Route 271 and the need for general improvements. Some general comments were also made regarding the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway trail and the need to flush out whether it should be on the south side or the north side of I-90. One suggestion made was that the CAC should set aside one session to focus on that issue.

Not much was said specifically about the Eastgate Plaza Shopping Center. The center clearly is dear to those who live in the surrounding neighborhoods and to many who work in the corridor. The market report suggested the use will remain healthy for the foreseeable future but could become threatened in the future by the growth of grocery stores elsewhere. It is a use that will need to be kept in mind.

Mr. Perea pointed out the forested area south of I-90 and asked if, once the Eastgate area is incorporated, the city could assist in providing a part of the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway trail.

Ms. Welti asked if the Committee should assume annexation of the area will occur. Mr. Bergstrom said annexation has been tried a couple of times but has not yet occurred. It will continue to be on the plate but it will not happen unless the residents want it to happen. He added that an increased level of interest in annexation has been noted. King County certainly wants the area to be annexed.
Co-Chair Hamlin commented that adding access within the Sunset Village area would have a profound impact; it could change the whole character of the area. Mr. Bergstrom said the area is a large pocket of unbroken property, which is unusual.

Mr. Hummer asked if there is room for expanding the Eastgate Plaza Shopping Center. Mr. Bergstrom said he did not know the terms of their lease agreement or anything about their future plans. Some of the adjacent commercial properties are not owned by the LLC that owns the shopping center. To the east of the plaza the zoning changes from Community Business to General Commercial, so the options are different. Any future vision for the area, however, could cross individual property boundaries.

B. Land Use Issues and Opportunities

Mr. Bergstrom explained that the goal of the agenda item was to discuss potential evaluation criteria to help provide direction to the land use consultant and serve as a touchstone for the CAC in reviewing the findings of the land use consultant. The evaluation criteria will ultimately be the CAC’s refinement of the Council principles. Having the criteria will help the process be more efficient in that it will inform the work of the land use consultant in developing alternatives.

Mr. Bergstrom said the suggestion of staff was to break down the criteria into the thematic areas of market feasibility, economic development, neighborhood compatibility, environmental quality and sustainability, community character, land use and transportation integration, fiscal feasibility, and partnerships. Additionally, staff came up with criteria for each topic area as follows: economic development helps to maintain the city’s economic diversity, recognizes the special role the Eastgate area should play in the overall economic mix, accommodates a balance of uses that contribute to the area’s economic vitality, and provides for special opportunities in the Eastgate area; neighborhood compatibility promotes the role of providing neighborhood services for nearby residential neighborhoods, and provides an appropriate transition between Eastgate and the adjacent neighborhoods; environmental quality and sustainability provides measurable benefits when compared to no action, protects or improves sensitive natural features, provides opportunities to integrate the natural and built environments, and improves the environment for public health as compared to a no action scenario; community character creates a sense of arrival or corridor gateway, promotes a legible character and sense of place, improves the beauty and aesthetics of the area, provides an appropriate scale of development, and integrates parks and open space with land use; the integration of transportation and land use matches up local access and circulation patterns, provides accommodations without degrading mobility in other parts of the city, reduces the number of vehicle miles traveled, reduces the use of single-occupant vehicles, addresses the potential for housing to improve the land use/transportation mix, supports planned uses, and includes multimodal transportation solutions; fiscal responsibility seeks accommodating alternatives with modest local public investments in transportation and other infrastructure; and partnerships provide opportunities to implement the desired land use and transportation solutions.

Mr. Stokes where the issues of parks, open space and recreation would be placed in the thematic areas. Mr. Bergstrom proposed including them either in neighborhood compatibility or community character. Mr. Stokes said he would prefer to see the issues stand on their own. He noted that in other parts of the city, parks have specifically been emphasized in line with the notion of the city in a park concept. There are not many park facilities in the Eastgate corridor. He agreed his concerns could be addressed by
retitling the community character theme to community character, parks and open space.

Ms. Welti suggested that the notion of neighborhood compatibility should include the concept of neighborhood character. The sense of character in a neighborhood is different from the issue of parks and open space. Neighborhood compatibility absent community character would seem to focus more on good transitions and whether or not there are enough retail uses to support the neighborhood.

Mr. Ludtka suggested neighborhood compatibility could have more to do with the transitions between adjacent neighborhoods, whereas community character is more about the specific study area.

Co-Chair Hamlin said he was not opposed to pulling out the parks piece from community character. That would make the parks aspect more prominent. If the Committee were to conclude later that the separation is not necessary, it could be put back in with community character.

There was agreement to change the title of neighborhood compatibility to compatibility with adjacent neighborhoods.

Ms. Bruce observed that community character should be focused on new community character features, such as gateways, rather than on already established community character. With regard to integrating parks and open space with land use, she referenced Sunset Park which was constructed by Wright Runstad and noted that it is an active facility for the most part, not a passive park. She suggested that similar opportunities might exist elsewhere in the corridor.

Senior transportation planner Franz Loewenherz said there is a lot of research being conducted nationwide focused on the extent to which land use can promote and encourage health and fitness. Mr. Perea said the river walk in San Antonio, Texas, and the trails in Scottsdale, Arizona, implement those principles. He suggested the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway trail could be implemented in some way through incentives offered to developers. The trail could be part of the collective open space for the corridor.

Mr. Stokes concurred, pointing out that it is a quality of life issue that would enhance the corridor as a place to live and work.

Ms. Solemsaas suggested community character involves economic vitality, recreation, and neighborhoods combined in ways that make an area unique. Mr. Ludtka agreed but suggested that when talking character as it relates to land use the focus should be on scale, building styles, providing access and similar characteristics. Parks and open space as a topic is more focused on landscaping, passive and active recreation, and gateways.

There was agreement to retain the community character theme with parks and open space broken out as a separate theme.

Mr. Ludtka suggested the planning horizon for the study should be clearly stated in the criteria. Mr. Bergstrom said official planning horizon was 20 years.

Co-Chair Hamlin suggested that the overall character of the corridor could potentially constitute an extensive discussion and would difficult to capture in a couple of bullet
points. Mr. Bergstrom said elements of each of the themes will ultimately influence the character of the corridor. For instance, there is not much housing in the area currently, and if more is added the character of the corridor will change. Keeping an emphasis on office will have one impact on character, whereas increasing retail uses will have another.

Mr. Ludtka commented that much of the work will be driven by ideals relative to the market feasibility and economic development. The Committee should give consideration to how the corridor relates to the rest of the city. The Bel-Red corridor has been heralded to be the next area of real growth for the city, but the Committee should think about how much new growth should be absorbed in the Eastgate/I-90 corridor.

Mr. Stokes said the Eastgate/I-90 corridor is unique in that it has the freeway running through the middle of it. People pass through from the Eastside and from Seattle. Growth in Issaquah during the next 20 years could have a very large impact on the corridor. Mr. Bergstrom said that certainly will come through in the planning process.

Ms. Welti questioned why market feasibility and economic development should be separate themes. Mr. Ludtka said the market feasibility element is tied to what the market will support, while economic development is focused on the kinds of things missing and needed to make the area whole.

Mr. Pucher said he did not grasp exactly what was meant by the notion of providing for special opportunities in the Eastgate area and thought it should be clarified.

Mr. Ludtka referred to the integration of transportation and land use and suggested language should be added identifying and promoting opportunities for all components of transit-oriented development.

Ms. Bruce commented that the SR-520 and light rail projects likely will be proceeding, as will the redevelopment of the Bel-Red corridor. The Eastgate/I-90 corridor will not be completely redeveloped but it will serve as the other side of the bracket, though probably not within 20 years. The corridor certainly will become the entry point from the east. One unique feature the corridor will have to deal with is the fact that it is divided by I-90.

Co-Chair Larrivee said the talk has been about treating the corridor as a unified area, but the challenge and one criteria should be that whatever is done will bring unity to the area as a whole. Ms. Bruce agreed and suggested the criteria should be under either community character or integration of transportation and land use.

Mr. Bohman stressed the importance of unifying the corridor and suggested it should not be swept under the rug based on cost.

Ms. Solemsaas suggested the partnerships criteria may be too simplified. She said she did not want the theme to limit partnerships to Bellevue College in terms of market stability and economic development. The notion of partnerships should be included under economic development and community character as well.

Co-Chair Hamlin agreed and said he did not think enough was being said about what the college does for the area. The college is a major player in the corridor and should be recognized as such.

Mr. Ludtka agreed as well and pointed out that there are also private development
opportunities for partnerships, as well as the state.

5. **Public Comment** – None

6. **Adjourn**

Co-Chair Larrivee adjourned the meeting at 7:41 p.m.
At your March 3 meeting, the CAC will continue discussion of the Land Use and Transportation Alternatives Evaluation Criteria. This follows an initial discussion of the criteria at your February 3, 2011 meeting.

**ACTION REQUESTED:** Discuss revised criteria, modify as necessary, and approve.

**BACKGROUND**

On February 3, 2011 the CAC reviewed and discussed a draft set of Evaluation Criteria to be used in the development and evaluation of land use and transportation alternatives. The criteria have been revised to reflect CAC input. Enclosed are two versions of the revised criteria:

- A “mark-up” version showing the changes made, using strike-throughs and underlines; and
- A “clean” version showing the resulting language.

The enclosed draft reflects several revisions to the version reviewed on February 3. Primary changes include:

- Addition of an Economic Development criterion addressing the important role of Bellevue College;
- Creation of a separate “Parks, Open Space, and Recreation” theme with support criteria.
- Expansion upon the importance of partnerships with both public and private sector interests.

Additional changes were made in order to provide clarification and to capture the ideas and suggestions raised by the CAC on February 3. Some of those ideas and suggestions have been combined with other criteria and/or paraphrased in a general fashion, in order to avoid too much specificity or an overly-cumbersome quantity of criteria.
RECOMMENDATION
Review the revised evaluation criteria, modify as appropriate, and approve with any modifications.

NEXT STEPS
The evaluation criteria, once approved, will help inform both tonight’s alternatives work session under agenda item 5 and the development of alternatives for your consideration at future meetings. We anticipate having an initial set of alternatives ready for consideration and discussion at your May 5 meeting.

closed:
    Evaluation Criteria – Mark-Up Version
    Evaluation Criteria – Clean Version
Eastgate Land Use & Transportation Alternatives

Evaluation Criteria – *Mark-Up Version*

The criteria below will be used as a framework to identify and evaluate Eastgate land use and transportation alternatives for the Year 2030 planning horizon. They are intended to help the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and staff consider multiple needs and objectives; the best land use alternatives will optimize multiple criteria rather than just one or two. The draft criteria are informed by a number of sources: the City Council’s Eastgate Project Principles, the Existing Conditions report and other background studies conducted to date, and early discussions with the public and CAC.

**Market Feasibility**

- Promotes private investment; provides meaningful opportunities for development or redevelopment
- Meets market needs; is grounded in economic realities

**Economic Development**

- Helps maintain Bellevue’s economic diversity; recognizes any special roles ensures that Eastgate should will play an important role in the City’s overall economic mix of the city and the region
- Accommodates a balance of uses that contribute to the area’s corridor’s economic vitality and marketability
- Provides for special opportunities in the Eastgate area Capitalizes on characteristics and growth opportunities unique to the Eastgate/I-90 corridor
- Provides opportunities for education, work force development, and job creation through partnerships between Bellevue College and area businesses

**Neighborhood Compatibility with Adjacent Neighborhoods**

- Promotes Eastgate’s role in providing neighborhood services for nearby residential neighborhoods
- Provides for an appropriate transition between Eastgate and adjacent neighborhoods; respects and preserves the character of those neighborhoods

**Environmental Quality/Sustainability**

- Produces measurable environmental benefits compared to no action (e.g. reduced GHG emissions)
- Protects or improves sensitive natural features
- Provides opportunities to integrate the natural and built environment
- Improves the environment for public health as compared to no action
**Community Corridor Character**

- Creates a sense of arrival or corridor gateway
- Promotes a legible character and sense of place; this may be linked to the Mountains to Sound Greenway, enhances unity through design, transportation system treatments, or other techniques
- Improves the beauty and aesthetics of the Eastgate area
- Provides an appropriate scale of development
- Integrates parks and open space with land use

**Parks, Open Space, and Recreation**

- Integrates parks and open space with land use, and capitalizes on the corridor’s location on the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway Trail
- Promotes health, fitness, and life enjoyment through a variety of public and private open spaces, amenities, facilities, and/or passive and active recreation opportunities

**Integration between Transportation and Land Use**

- Land use is well suited to regional and local access and circulation patterns; can be accommodated without degrading mobility in other parts of the City
- Land use reduces Vehicle Miles Travelled and dependency on single-occupant vehicles
- Addresses the potential for housing and transit-oriented development to improve the land use/transportation mix
- Planned transportation system supports the planned land uses
- Includes or anticipates multi-modal transportation solutions (transit (including high-capacity transit), pedestrians, bicycles in addition to private vehicles)

**Fiscal Feasibility**

- Can be accomplished with only modest local public investments in transportation and other infrastructure
- Positions the corridor to attract and leverage investment from other public and private sources and to capture opportunities that might arise from improved future economic conditions

**Partnerships**

- Provides opportunities for partnerships in implementing desired land use (e.g. with State of Washington, Bellevue College, Mountains to Sound Greenway, private sector, others)
- Provides opportunities for partnerships in transportation solutions (e.g. with WSDOT, Metro, private sector, others)
Eastgate Land Use & Transportation Alternatives

Evaluation Criteria – *Clean Version*

The criteria below will be used as a framework to identify and evaluate Eastgate land use and transportation alternatives for the Year 2030 planning horizon. They are intended to help the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) and staff consider multiple needs and objectives; the best land use alternatives will optimize multiple criteria rather than just one or two. The draft criteria are informed by a number of sources: the City Council’s Eastgate Project Principles, the Existing Conditions report and other background studies conducted to date, and early discussions with the public and CAC.

**Market Feasibility**

- Promotes private investment; provides meaningful opportunities for development or redevelopment
- Meets market needs; is grounded in economic realities

**Economic Development**

- Helps maintain Bellevue’s economic diversity; ensures that Eastgate will play an important role in the overall economic mix of the city and the region
- Accommodates a balance of uses that contribute to the corridor’s economic vitality and marketability
- Capitalizes on characteristics and growth opportunities unique to the Eastgate/I-90 corridor
- Provides opportunities for education, work force development, and job creation through partnerships between Bellevue College and area businesses

**Compatibility with Adjacent Neighborhoods**

- Promotes Eastgate’s role in providing neighborhood services for nearby residential neighborhoods
- Provides for an appropriate transition between Eastgate and adjacent neighborhoods; respects and preserves the character of those neighborhoods

**Environmental Quality/Sustainability**

- Produces measurable environmental benefits compared to no action (e.g. reduced GHG emissions)
- Protects or improves sensitive natural features
- Provides opportunities to integrate the natural and built environment
- Improves the environment for public health as compared to no action
Corridor Character

- Creates a sense of arrival or corridor gateway
- Promotes a legible character and sense of place; enhances unity through design, transportation system treatments, or other techniques
- Improves the beauty and aesthetics of the Eastgate area
- Provides an appropriate scale of development

Parks, Open Space, and Recreation

- Integrates parks and open space with land use, and capitalizes on the corridor’s location on the Mountains-to-Sound Greenway Trail
- Promotes health, fitness, and life enjoyment through a variety of public and private open spaces, amenities, facilities, and/or passive and active recreation opportunities

Integration between Transportation and Land Use

- Land use is well suited to regional and local access and circulation patterns; can be accommodated without degrading mobility in other parts of the City
- Land use reduces Vehicle Miles Travelled and dependency on single-occupant vehicles
- Addresses the potential for housing and transit-oriented development to improve the land use/transportation mix
- Planned transportation system supports the planned land uses
- Includes or anticipates multi-modal transportation solutions (transit (including high-capacity transit), pedestrians, bicycles in addition to private vehicles)

Fiscal Feasibility

- Can be accomplished with only modest local public investments in transportation and other infrastructure
- Positions the corridor to attract and leverage investment from other public and private sources and to capture opportunities that might arise from improved future economic conditions

Partnerships

- Provides opportunities for partnerships in implementing desired land use (e.g. with State of Washington, Bellevue College, Mountains to Sound Greenway, private sector, others)
- Provides opportunities for partnerships in transportation solutions (e.g. with WSDOT, Metro, private sector, others)