

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

January 10, 2008
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Yuen, Vice Chair Northey, Commissioners Glass,
Van Valkenburgh

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Tanaka and Wendle

STAFF PRESENT: David Cieri, Eric Miller, Goran Sparrman, Kris Liljeblad,
Kevin McDonald, Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: Don Samdahl, Mirai Associates; Randy Young,
Henderson, Young and Company

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 p.m. by Chair Yuen who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioners Tanaka and Wendle, both of whom were excused. One position remains vacant as well.

3. STAFF REPORTS

Transportation CIP Construction Manager Dave Cieri reported that on January 8 the chairs and vice-chairs of all the boards and commissions working on the Bel-Red subarea plan met to talk about process and progress. This was done so that all the boards and commissions would know what each other is working on and how they relate and connect together.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS,
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None

5. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Glass said he is continuing to participate on the Light Rail Best Practices committee along with Commissioner Northey. He said the focus has been on the eight topic areas. The committee members will be traveling soon to California to look at the light rail systems in San Jose and San Diego.

Commissioner Northey added that the group will also be traveling to Portland to visit that system. She said she is confident that every policy related question that could be asked is being asked by the committee.

Chair Yuen said he continues to serve on the Meydenbauer Bay steering committee. The transportation-related issues include a proposal to recommend closing 100th Avenue NE south of Main Street to vehicles and using it strictly as a pedestrian walkway. They are also carefully considering the issue of parking, which has proved to be the hottest topic.

6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

8. STUDY SESSION

A. Impact Fee Program Review

Capital Programming Implementation Manager Eric Miller introduced Don Samdahl with Mirai Associates, and Randy Young with Henderson, Young and Company, consultants contracted to assist the city in reviewing the impact fee program.

Department of Transportation Director Goran Sparrman reminded the Commission that it dealt with the issue of impact fees in 2007, the end result of which was the giving of some very specific direction to staff by the City Council to effect minimal changes to the impact fee schedule and to bring back to the table in 2008 a fairly complete revision to the methodology used to calculate impact fees. Staff was asked to work with the community and affected stakeholders to identify different ways of assessing impact fees, and to develop a methodology that would be easier to explain and implement. The Council asked to have the Commission involved in bringing forward a new recommendation.

Continuing, Mr. Sparrman noted that separate from that effort, the city in 2007 finalized its early planning work on the Bel-Red corridor. The recommendation of the steering committee was forwarded to the Council, and the Council subsequently charged five of the city's boards and commissions for discussion and recommendation regarding implementation. One of those issues is focused on how to finance the Bel-Red corridor transportation improvements, and one of the tools on the list is transportation impact fees. The challenge for staff and the consultant team has been how to deal with the citywide impact fee issue while also looking at the unique needs of the Bel-Red corridor; the intent is to find a way to make sure the two will work together.

The timeline is fairly constrained and is largely driven by the Bel-Red corridor implementation process which is timed to wrap up in the second quarter of 2008. If the Council chooses to include impact fees as one of the implementation tools for the Bel-Red corridor, it will need to be crafted to work for all areas of the city, not just the corridor.

Mr. Young commented that even if Council were to be enthusiastic about Bel-Red having an impact fee as a principal financing tool, the time it would take to create it would make it unlikely to lead the citywide process of updating the impact fee program. Regardless of which ends up leading, the Bel-Red and citywide impact fee programs need to be developed with a common purpose and a common philosophy.

Mr. Young explained that impact fees are one-time payments charged to new development.

The fees are for the specific and limited purpose of paying for capital facilities. Washington law allows for the levying of impact fees for parks, fire protection and schools; a fee like an impact fee can also be levied for public utility functions in the form of connection or hook-up fees. Capital facilities paid for by impact fees must be needed to serve the new development.

Impact fees can be a significant source of revenue for local governments. The fees can also be levied simply as a matter of policy, that growth should be paying some portion of its cost. The revenue stream can improve the ability of a jurisdiction to implement facilities in a timely manner.

Impact fees must be defensible from both legal and technical viewpoints. They must be financially feasible; fair; predictable in the way they are set up and implemented; and they cannot make other regulatory requirements go away.

There are three different ways local governments can ask developers to mitigate their impacts: SEPA, which covers some forms of mitigation; the Local Transportation Act, which was the basis for the first impact fee program in Bellevue; and the Growth Management Act.

Mr. Miller said Bellevue first implemented an impact fee program in 1990. The program is based on roadway and intersection capacity projects that are really a subset of the 12-year Transportation Facilities Plan. The primary methodology has not changed much in the history of the program, though there have been some minor tweaks along the way. The impact fee schedule is based on individual uses and their size in determining the impact fee. When a new development comes forward, an impact fee is levied according to the schedule and the revenue flows into funding the Capital Investment Program (CIP).

Mr. Young said state law is specific with regard to what local jurisdictions can and cannot charge impact fees for. The statute allows impact fees to be levied for system improvements, which are defined as the major roadways that affect the overall community or large portions of the community. Projects that address safety or access management are not eligible for impact fees if they do not add capacity to the system. The statute disallows the use of impact fees for local neighborhood streets.

Under SEPA, new development that impacts the transportation network must do so very directly in order to be eligible for impact fees. The GMA, however, takes a more holistic approach and recognizes that trips from any given development can impact the entire network of city streets. Under the GMA, local jurisdictions can require individual developments to contribute to system improvements within larger districts.

Impact fees must be proportionate, must allow for adjustments and credits, and must take into account data brought forward by developers claiming to have a unique situation affecting impact fees.

Capital facilities plans (CFP) and the corresponding transportation support documents must demonstrate the extent to which there are existing deficiencies in order to be able to prove that the deficiencies are not being funded with impact fee dollars. It is also necessary for local jurisdictions to be able to demonstrate the reserve capacity of existing systems.

The legislature included in the statute the restriction that impact fees cannot be used to pay all of the gross impacts.

Impact fees cannot legally be used to pay for existing problems and deficiencies; operating and maintenance expenses; capital improvements that do not add capacity; on-site improvements for specific projects; or for transit or ped-bike systems. The statute states that impact fees can be used to pay for roads and streets. Many local jurisdictions that have road and street impact fee programs have defined the design standards of their streets to normally include curbs, gutters and sidewalks, and a sufficient right-of-way width to include striped bike lanes; that approach permits them to claim that both sidewalks and striped bike lanes are fundamentally part of the street and therefore eligible for impact fees.

Continuing, Mr. Young said there are several common myths about impact fees, one of which is that growth does not pay for itself. If that were true, there would be no need for impact fees. Growth does in fact pay a considerable amount in the form of on-site improvements, stormwater systems, local streets, and a variety of taxes. Growth revenues do not, however, go into the accounts local governments use to pay for infrastructure. B&O taxes, property taxes and other taxes are not used to pay for infrastructure improvements needed as a result of growth. Therefore, cities need impact fees to make up the difference.

While it appears to be fact that impact fees are paid by the developers, the reality is that the developer pays the fees up front but ultimately pass them on to the consumer.

Another myth is that as development fees rise, development is slowed or stopped. That is not true. There are a number of studies from the academic community that prove conclusively that impact fees do not stop development. One of the best studies out in recent years demonstrates that the communities that grow are those with the highest quality infrastructure, and that communities with impact fees tend to have quality infrastructure. The study argues that there is an improvement in economic development in communities with impact fees. Bellevue has impact fees which have not stopped development. Redmond and Kirkland have much higher impact fees, but growth in those communities has not been slowed.

As development prices increase, the consumer is impacted, particularly first-time homebuyers and startup businesses. The law permits limited exemptions that can be incorporated into impact fee programs in order to help protect the more vulnerable elements of the community.

Mr. Young suggested that the impact fee rates levied by other jurisdictions should guide Bellevue in its deliberations about updating its impact fee program because the market is competitive. Bellevue currently offers the best bargain in the region among the cities that have impact fees; under the district system, the highest district fee is \$507 per peak hour trip, and the lowest district fee is \$329 per peak hour trip. Kirkland is at nearly \$3400; Issaquah charges \$4800; Redmond comes in at \$8400; and Sammamish imposes an impact fee totaling \$14,700 per peak hour trip. Seattle does not have an impact fee program.

What other communities are charging for impact fees are not fully relevant at the technical level to what occurs in Bellevue. Each city in the region has its own mix of revenue streams available to them for transportation. Kent serves as the poster child for getting things done using local improvement districts (LID). Redmond and Renton use some of their business fee revenues for specific transportation purposes. Different cities have different success rates relative to grant revenues. The difference in revenue sources alone may make the apparent difference between two numbers closer than they appear on their face. Some cities have a high value property tax base; others have a much lower one. Bellevue has more real estate

properties, and the turnovers generate more revenues from the real estate excise tax, and because the dollar value is higher in Bellevue than in the more remote areas of the Eastside, the tax dollars generated are higher.

Some cities include in their design standards curbs, gutters and sidewalks, while other cities do not, affecting their impact fee schedules. The right-of-way acquisition costs vary by city. Some cities include transit support in their standards, which drives up costs.

Policy differences play a very large role in the establishment of fees. One jurisdiction will elect to charge the maximum allowable while another will choose to keep impact fees as low as possible for a variety of reasons.

Commissioner Northey asked if impact fee revenues can be used for ITS projects. Mr. Samdahl said they can be used for the hardware part of such systems if it can be demonstrated that the projects are part of the local standard as a method for improving traffic flow.

Mr. Young said developers are less concerned about what jurisdiction charges by way of impact fees as compared to another if in fact they want to put their development in a particular location. Bellevue is the hub of the Eastside and is a very desirable place both for businesses and residents, and that gives the city a valuable edge. To some degree, Bellevue could elect to play that chip and raise impact fees almost to the maximum without fear of losing market share to another jurisdiction.

The Commissioners were cautioned, however, that any proposal to increase impact fee rates in the city will generate concerns on the part of the development community. For that reason it is vitally important for the Commission and the city government to be informed regarding all of the contributing factors.

Commissioner Van Valkenburgh asked if design standards that include curb, gutter and sidewalk have to be included in the Comprehensive Plan or some other planning document, or if they exist in a manual of standards somewhere, in order to be defensible. Mr. Young said they can be included in administrative manuals and the like. He added, however, that the higher up the food chain the standards show up, the more defensible they are. Most cities do not include the standards in plans or the Comprehensive Plan because they become ridge and hard to change. The most important thing is to have the standards in writing.

Mr. Miller said the 2002 Transportation Facilities Plan update and the related impact fee update was adopted by the City Council with the methodology in use by the city ever since the program began in 1990. At that time, the Council directed staff to review the methodology with the next update, which occurred in 2003/2004. That review entailed looking at the number of districts the city uses in its impact fee program, of which there were 14. Consideration was given to implementing a citywide district, and to detailing a two-district approach with the downtown as one of the districts. In the end, the decision was made to simply amend the boundaries of the 14 districts to coincide with the Mobility Management Areas.

Mr. Miller noted that he had included in the Commission packets copies of the city code that governs the impact fee program. He pointed out that it requires updating both the TFP and the impact fee schedule every couple of years, which provides the opportunity to review the impact fee program generally. In 2007 staff found a significant gap between what was

calculated as the development share, the actual fee revenue collections, and what was being spent on capacity projects. The conclusion reached was that the city is under using its code authority in setting the impact fees.

Mr. Samdahl said there are various ways to put together impact fee programs; the one in place in Bellevue is perfectly valid. He said he was hired as a consultant in December to take a look at the current impact fee program from a global perspective. The next step will be to conduct three or four stakeholder interviews with interest groups outside of City Hall. The Council will be given a briefing in the near future. A white paper will be drafted outlining the key issues and ideas to be considered. There will also be some coordination with the Bel-Red financial strategies study which is under way.

Chair Yuen asked if a representative from the Transportation Commission could sit in on the meetings with stakeholders. Mr. Young said the information gathered from them will inform the process. A summary of key points will be developed following each stakeholder interview. The meetings are intended to be informal.

Mr. Sparrman said he would have no objection to having Commission members sit in on the meetings. He noted that the information that comes out of the meetings will be captured and made available to the full Commission and the Council.

Commissioner Van Valkenburgh asked if design standards unique to the Bel-Red corridor could be defensible. Mr. Young allowed that they could be, provided they are documented at the same level as the existing design standards.

Mr. Sparrman said staff fully expects there to be some changes to the standards for the Bel-Red corridor, particularly with regard to stormwater drainage.

Commissioner Glass commented that when the Commission last studied the impact fee program it was clear that the city has a lot of capacity to increase the fees. The crux of the issue, however, is predictability. Developers working on projects have calculated in the current fees, and substantial fee increases should not occur seemingly overnight. Mr. Young said there are a number of strategies cities employ to manage that issue. One of the most common is to have a very public process while the fee schedule is under discussion. Another approach taken by some jurisdictions is to conduct the public process, announce the new fee schedule, but indicate that the new fees will not take effect for a set number of days, giving everyone time to determine how their pipelined projects will be affected.

Commissioner Northey pointed out that when the impact fee program was last on the Commission's table the development community representatives who attended the meetings were very upset about the proposed recommendation to increase the fees. She encouraged the consultants to meet with more than just three or four stakeholders outside of City Hall. The political will of the local business community should not be underestimated. Mr. Young allowed that when the impact fee schedule for the city of Sammamish was being developed there was much angst, table pounding and threats of lawsuits brought by the development and business communities and their consultants. Everyone was brought together in an open and transparent process and all of the numbers were put on the table. Some changes were made to certain of the numbers, but in the end when the matter was brought to the Council for approval there was reluctant acceptance by the development and business communities, because they understood that their individual projects would need infrastructure. The same process would

likely be useful in Bellevue.

Mr. Sparrman commented that during the last update, the focus was making some rather minor changes to the schedule. Therefore, the public outreach process was not extensive. He agreed with the need to draw in all of the stakeholders, including the Chamber of Commerce, the Bellevue Downtown Association, and other organizations that represent broad groups of people. During the last year there has been a lot of work by staff and the City Council to lay out the reality the city is facing with regard to its infrastructure, which is that there is a significant shortfall in the funds necessary to provide the kind of transportation system everyone agrees the city needs to have. Money not raised by new development must be paid for by either existing residences or existing businesses.

Mr. Samdahl pointed out that impact fee programs do not exist in a vacuum. The most important thing for jurisdictions to do first is sell their program. Once people understand the need for the program, the funding portion generally finds acceptance.

B. Roundtable Discussion on Strategic Issues

Mr. Sparrman said the reality is that over the past few years mobility has become a high priority and a more significant challenge. The issues being faced, both by the department and the community, are getting very complex and convoluted. That means the way the city and the department operates is changing, and rapidly. The fact that the issues being faced by the transportation department and other city departments are interrelated is forcing a more comprehensive and collaborative internal approach. The Meydenbauer beach park project is a perfect example; the project is a parks/land use project with a significant transportation element. The Commission will see issues becoming more and more complex, and as a result staff from several departments will be coming to offer briefings.

Another strategic issue being faced by the city is the fact that costs are going up. It is no secret that there have been enormous price escalations over the last several years in the construction industry; some of the increases have been in the double digit range annually. That has had a tremendous impact on the ability of the city to produce projects in a timely fashion. At the direction of the Council, staff has spent the last year trying to map out a long-term financial strategy for the city's capital budget. Traditionally, the seven-year CIP document has been updated and the capital projects appropriations have been allocated every two years. The Council recognizes the need to have a sustainable funding basis for the long-term transportation system, which will mean looking further out in time.

The Council has taken some steps to augment its resources. They approved a supplemental budget in early 2007, funded by a property tax increase.

With regard to the operating budget, Mr. Sparrman said staff has been working to look beyond the traditional two-year planning horizon. Everyone recognizes that as the community continues to grow at a rapid rate there will be new demands brought to bear on key systems, including police, fire protection and utilities in addition to transportation.

The issues will all play out in the coming months as the Council tackles the budget process. Staff expects to be heavily involved in that process during the next six to nine months.

Mr. Sparrman said urban design is also an issue the city is wrestling with. He said the city has

traditionally spent a lot of time and energy making sure baseline projects are provided. The city has done a very good job of providing an attractive infrastructure with amenities everyone can be proud of. There is a strong sense of need to continue in that vein and to do an even better job of dealing with urban design, especially in the downtown but also throughout the rest of the city. That will be a challenge to be faced.

Proposition 1, which would have funded the East Link light rail project to and through Bellevue, along with funding for general purpose capacity on the freeway system, was rejected by the voters. During the coming year a great deal of effort will be put into establishing a Plan B, both locally and regionally. Bellevue staff will certainly be involved in seeking solutions. All of the planning work done over the last ten to twenty years has shown that only so much can be done to add general purpose capacity, and that the real need is to grow the transit system.

The agreement between Bellevue and Redmond known as BROTS is in the process of being updated. The respective city staffs worked on developing the set of principles that were approved by the City Councils of both cities in late 2007. The principles will be used in crafting a new agreement. Substantive work to that end is anticipated to be done in the next six months.

Mr. Sparrman said the Bel-Red corridor implementation project and the impact fee program are two issues the department will be working on in 2008. Both will present challenges.

Under the Growth Management Act, the city has the legal requirement to approve only those new development permits that will be served by transportation projects funding within a six-year timeframe. The forecasts show that within a few years the city will be struggling to meet the concurrency requirements. The department is going to have to take a look at what concurrency is going to look like in the future.

With rapid growth comes a need for transit, general purpose capacity, and freight accommodations. Intelligent transportation systems (ITS) will have a role to play in meeting the challenges. Over the last year staff has been crafting some significant plans for how to move more aggressively into the area of implementing ITS improvements, beginning with accelerating replacement of the traffic control computer. Staff is hoping the City Council will agree to earmark additional resources for the replacement during 2008.

Transportation demand management is something the city has historically done a very well. The city works with employers and residents to provide transportation choices, including the options of not having employees travel at all or at least not during peak periods. The city has received a significant state grant to build on the existing program.

Mr. Sparrman said the department will be looking at development codes and standards in the coming year. While some of the focus will be on the Bel-Red corridor, there will also be a focus on doing a better job generally with stormwater management and water quality issues.

The Commission is already aware that the department is in the process of updating the ped-bike plan. Work toward that end will continue in 2008. The end product will be very important to the city for a variety of reasons.

An agreement has been reached where by the Port of Seattle will acquire the BNSF rail

corridor. There are a variety of issues on the table regarding how the alignment should be used. Some want to see a non-motorized trail created, while others want to see the rails preserved and used in the short term for providing transit services. Bellevue has a lot at stake in the outcome.

The Department of Planning and Community Development have for a long time had on its agenda updating the Eastgate subarea plan. That work has been put in the pipeline for 2008, and the transportation department will certainly have a role to play.

The whole issue of how to meet the obligations of the Americans with Disability Act are also of concern to the Department of Transportation. Staff has been actively involved with the issue over the last year and will continue to be involved in 2008.

Commissioner Glass commented that ITS will help the city to a large degree, but until the freeways are fixed there will continue to be backups on city streets. Mr. Sparrman concurred, noting that ITS will not be a panacea for fixing all of the city's transportation issues. ITS can help squeeze more capacity out of the system. Staff are asking themselves if there are things that have not been thought about in the past. The downtown grid as laid out allows for less than half the amount of right-of-way generally afforded similarly sized cities. Every intersection is operated with full eight-phase configurations, which drives long cycle times and generates complaints from the public. Staff are asking if the city should continue to serve every movement at every intersection in the future.

Answering a question asked by Chair Yuen, Mr. Sparrman said the department has consistently been upgrading the traffic control system, but what is under consideration is a complete switch-out of the software system.

Commissioner Northey said she has heard that the Council is concerned that soon most of the projects in the CIP will be maintenance projects. She stressed the importance of having an ongoing revenue stream for maintenance projects and said if maintenance projects are removed from the CIP there could be long-term consequences. Mr. Sparrman said infrastructure in Bellevue looks like precisely because it is maintained. The diversion of CIP resources to pay for the maintenance of the facilities that have been constructed over the last 20 years or so has become significant, so there have been discussions about securing a different revenue stream to provide for maintenance; that would free CIP dollars for new projects. The fact is, much of the city's infrastructure is getting to an age where it is in need of more significant maintenance. The Council has been very receptive and staff is optimistic that they will deal with the issue in a responsible manner.

Commissioner Northey commented that transportation demand management will be the wave of the future for the state in dealing with congestion. She suggested that it will need to be looked at from the perspective of the state legislature and providing tax breaks to businesses who provide for flex hours. It will be less expensive for the state to pay businesses to implement transportation demand management than it will be to pay for additional infrastructure.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Northey, Mr. Sparrman said the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project is very important to staff, who have been beating the drum for it ever since it was decided what the project ought to look like. The project has a line item in the CIP for the first phase. The project has been put up for an earmark the last two or three cycles,

but there has been no luck to date. Staff believes the project should be part of the mix when the Federal Surface Transportation Act is reauthorized in two years. The Council is very supportive of the project as well.

Commissioner Northey encouraged the Commission to ask the Council for more money for the Neighborhood Enhancement Program. She noted that a great deal of time and attention is being spent on making sure the downtown business community is involved, and a community backlash can be expected if the neighborhoods continue to get the short end of the stick. The NEP program is one of the best ambassadors the city has for getting people involved.

Commissioner Northey said she would like to hear more about the WSDOT I-90 study at some point and how it will interrelate with the Eastgate area. Mr. Sparrman said the study is focused on the long-term future of I-90 from I-405 east to North Bend. That study has been under way for about two years and the city has been involved. The study has not been moving forward very fast.

****BREAK****

C. Bel-Red Corridor Implementation Project Update

Senior Planner Kevin McDonald informed the Commission that each of the boards and commissions that have responsibility for reviewing the subarea plan and providing comments received the draft plan during their most recently meeting. He noted that the policies will be the topic of discussion for the Transportation Commission on February 14. The schedule calls for each of the boards and commissions to provide a preliminary recommendation to the Planning Commission at their early February meetings. That will allow the Planning Commission to begin its consolidated review on February 27.

Chair Yuen noted that there may be a problem getting a quorum for February 14. Mr. McDonald said he will work with the Commission staff and chair to look for an alternative date if necessary.

Kris Liljeblad, Assistant Director, Transportation Planning, encouraged the Commissioners to focus primarily on the transportation policies. He said staff will welcome questions and comments from the Commissioners prior to the next Commission meeting regarding any content issues.

Mr. McDonald asked the Commissioners to consider whether or not the policies in the draft subarea plan meet the intent of the steering committee as set forth in its recommendation to the City Council, and to look at how the various policies support strategies to implement changes in the Bel-Red corridor. He noted that staff wants the boards and commissions to bring to light any issues that have been missed or otherwise overlooked.

Mr. McDonald briefly reviewed with the Commissioners the timeline for developing the subarea plan.

The Commissioners were reminded that the overall goal of the subarea plan is to develop the area in a more sustainable way than it has been in the past, and trying the transportation system policies in with the other subarea plan policies. He noted that there is a lot of interdepartmental work currently under way with respect to development of the plan.

The transportation section goal is to develop a transportation system that is complete grid with connected streets to serve the area that will see additional commercial and residential development by 2030. The adjacent neighborhoods will need to be protected from spillover traffic impacts. The transportation system in Bel-Red will include an urban design component to help create a sense of place, incorporating components of sustainability. The goal is supported by 21 different policies.

Mr. McDonald noted that the draft overall transportation policies are those which apply throughout the subarea across all modes of transportation. The first policy calls for the development of a multimodal transportation system in the Bel-Red corridor. Natural drainage practices are highlighted in the policies aimed at sustainability.

Policy H-3 outlines the need to identify and preserve the rights-of-way needed for new arterials.

Policy H-4 talks about improving arterials within the corridor. Policy H-5 talks about a new arterial along the NE 16th Street corridor that would incorporate every mode of transportation talked about for the area. Mr. McDonald said several alternative methods for developing the new corridor are being discussed at the staff and consultant level; they will all be shared with the Commission in time.

The transportation vision for the corridor includes a new access at 124th Avenue NE and SR-520 that includes access to and from the east, and the development of new streets that add to the character of the community, some with on-street parking. Wherever the streets interface with any of the six streams that traverse the Bel-Red corridor, the intent is to provide public access to the streams and design the roadways to enhance the stream corridors.

Mr. McDonald said the ped-bike system policies recognize that there is room to improve connectivity in the corridor. One way to do that is to development multiuse trail systems, including along NE 16th Street, along the BNSF right-of-way, and along the West Tributary, a stream that flows from the northwest corner of the corridor through the heart of the corridor. Multiple access points are envisioned to interconnect the BNSF corridor. In an effort to make the West Tributary trail pedestrian friendly, the policy language calls for grade-separated crossings of major arterials, including NE 16th Street.

Mr. McDonald noted that there is a section in the subarea plan with transit policies. The policies express the preference of the city for Sound Transit's light rail system in terms of the alignment through the center of the corridor and station locations near Overlake Hospital, at 122nd Avenue NE and NE 16th Street, at 130th Avenue NE and NE 16th Street, and a station in the Redmond portion of Overlake at 152nd Avenue NE. The policies support the inclusion of a light rail maintenance facility in the corridor if needed.

The Commissioners were reminded that transportation demand management is alive and well in Bel-Red as well as in the rest of the city. The subarea plan policies recommend implementation of a comprehensive TDM system in the corridor to encourage the use of alternative modes of transportation, alternative work hours and telecommuting.

Policy H-21 acknowledges that there will be a lot of traffic in the corridor and the steps will need to be taken to minimize the impacts of cut-through traffic on the adjacent neighborhoods.

Mr. McDonald shared with the Commissioners a map depicting the transportation system needed to support the anticipated land use development within the corridor. The map was color-coded to represent the phasing of the transportation system to support the 2013 and 2030 land use scenarios.

Commissioner Northey asked at what time the Commission will be asked if it concurs with the proposed phasing. Mr. McDonald said he intends to bring a project list to the second half of the February discussion, and then to more fully talk about it in March.

Commissioner Northey suggested that 2013 is not too far away and that Redmond may or may not be able to get its projected development on the ground by then. To say that Bellevue must have its projects in place by 2013 is getting out ahead of the development curve. Some of the early projects are the most expensive on the list. The Commission and staff should reconsider whether or not the city needs to be so aggressive.

Mr. Liljeblad said the Council on January 7 had a discussion regarding consideration of a development agreement with Wright Runstad at their request, with the intent that they would reserve a certain amount of development capacity under the current BROTS cap in order to do an early implementation of their development. That will still depend on getting the zoning in place, but it is fair to say the first phase transportation projects may be part of a development agreement; who should pay for what will certainly be part of the negotiations.

Mr. McDonald pointed out that the new arterials will clearly support more land use than just what will happen in the Bel-Red corridor; they will be part of the citywide system of arterials. He shared with the Commissioners a map showing which would be designated major, minor and collector arterials. Work is underway on the design for NE 16th Street and 124th Avenue NE. Design ideas are also being sought for 130th Avenue NE.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Northey, Mr. McDonald said 124th Avenue NE south of NE 8th Street is currently a collector arterial and will remain one. The only change will be that 124th Avenue NE will become a major arterial; it currently is a minor arterial.

Commissioner Glass asked about the absence of NE 4th Street and NE 6th Street on the map. Mr. McDonald agreed to show those streets on the phasing map to be consistent.

Motion to move the date to make a recommendation on the subarea plan from February 14 to January 24 was made by Commissioner Glass; second was by Commissioner Van Valkenburgh and the motion carried unanimously.

- D. Northup Way Project Open House Update (memo only)
- 9. OLD BUSINESS – None
- 10. NEW BUSINESS – None
- 11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None
- 12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. November 29, 2007

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Northey and the motion carried unanimously.

13. REVIEW CALENDAR

A. Commission Calendar and Agenda

The Commission reviewed the items scheduled for discussion in upcoming meetings. It was agreed to consider canceling the February 14 meeting.

B. Public Involvement Calendar

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Yuen adjourned the meeting at 9:11 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

Date