

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BEL-RED CORRIDOR PROJECT
PROPERTY OWNER PANEL
VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT

March 14, 2007
7:30 a.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room(1E-109)

PANELISTS: Steve Willard, Scott Hall, Chris Eide, TJ Woosley, Don Pickens, Bill Byers, Roger Parasota, Roger White, Betty Speith, Dave Robertson, Jim Reid

MODERATORS: Kevin O'Neill, Emil King

Mr. O'Neill: First of all, thank you for coming. What I would like for us to do first is just take a couple of minutes and go around the table and introduce ourselves. Tell us your name, where your property or business is located, what your interest in the corridor project is.

Panelist: Steve Willard, LWR Associates, Bellevue Business Park on the corner of Northup and 124th.

Panelist: Scott Hall, Pine Forest Properties. We own a couple of different properties. One right at the corner of Bel-Red and 120th, and just north of that the Sharebuilders property. And then we have the property right at the corner of 124th and Northup.

Panelist: Chris Eide, Eide Construction, we own property on 116th and 20th.

Panelist: TJ Woosley, Hal Woosley Properties, Briarwood Center on NE 12th and 120th to old Bel-Red. Also manage a property just up on 919 124th, an office property there, and live just off the edge of it on Cherry Crest.

Panelist: Don Pickens, we represent the ownership for Sherwood Shopping Center up in the triangle on 156th and NE 20th, and also the McDonald's property on 140th and Northup.

Panelist: Bill Byers, Crescentview Investments, and we have the Angelo's Nursery property under contract. We hope to close on it tomorrow. We're interested in the mixed-use housing/retail action in the purple area up there.

Panelist: Roger Parasota, also with Crescentview Investments.

Panelist: Roger White, Lexington Pacific, we own two acres of land in the medical center here, Naples Tree Plaza, three buildings on NE 20th, four buildings on NE 21st Street and one building across from

Overlake shopping center at 14904 NE 20th, that may be the Bel-Red Center building.

Panelist: Betty Speith, with Langton/Speith, representing Wright Runstad.

Panelist: Dave Robertson, two family partnerships, we own several on the Bel-Red corridor on 132nd and 130th.

Panelist: Jim Reid, we have a small piece of property remaining across the way from 136th and Bel-Red.

Mr. King: Emil King, Strategic Planning Manager in the planning department here in the city.

Mr. O'Neill: So, we have gone through the introductions and we are going to walk you through a series of questions that Kevin suggested in the presentation. We also want to have an open-ended question, because we want to make sure if you want to say something that isn't captured in one of the specific questions that you have an opportunity to say what you want to say. What we are doing is, Emil and I are going to take detailed notes and we are going to give the steering committee copies of all notes that we have taken from all the sessions we are doing today, and the committee meeting, so they have the benefit of all this feedback as they start thinking about methods for alternatives. We have various maps on the walls, so if you are talking about something and you would like to refer to an alternative or a site on the map, we have some sticky notes here so Emil can help with that process, too.

So the first question, as Kevin pointed out, we have several features in common with the various alternatives, such as medical office uses along the 116th corridor. Keeping the densities pretty much as they are along the south end of Bel-Red Road is certainly another constant. As Bill mentioned, the kind of mixed-use housing/retail on the east end is common to all the action alternatives. Keeping pretty much of a retail focus on NE 20th, although in some of the alternatives we think about the idea of introducing housing in addition to retail. So, within those, there are a lot of variables, but within those sort of things that are pretty consistent across the board, any comments meaning you like them or don't like them, you would like us to change something, just of those first before we get into some of the things that are very different. So anybody feel free to, you're welcome to start.

Panelist: (Inaudible)

Mr. O'Neill: The main commonalities are the medical office along 116th, so this orange area you will see on all three action alternatives. The next one is the mixed-use housing over on the Uwajimaya area, so you can see it on all three maps, showing up as that purple area. The retail along Northup/20th, this pink swath, you'll see it on all three alternatives. It is a slightly different shape on each one, but for all intents and purposes it is the same on all three. And that is all, even on the no-action alternative, that's all general commercial and community business on that corridor.

Panelist: What are all these green lines here?

Mr. O'Neill: These green lines are the stream corridors, so another one, thanks for pointing that out. That is actually the second-to-last slide Kevin showed on the common features, so these are just where the existing stream corridors are and that is a commonality to all the alternatives, that it is some reference to where these are and if there is any restoration. A variable is how you go in and do that, and we can get into more depth when we are talking about the variables and what areas may be more appropriate for restoration.

Panelist: Do you have any idea what you are going to require for setbacks along the streams?

Mr. O'Neill: I think that will be a big point of discussion at the steering committee meetings over the next couple months, really getting in on some of those details. We're still a little bit at the high level right now and as we go farther along we'll start narrowing down on the actual implementation of things.

Panelist: So the medical office on 116th, basically everything west of 116th is going to be converted to office. Changing that to medical office, what does that do to all these small units that are being used – my office is there, architects, child care, the services that are provided in there – what happens to the ability to rent to these people or be an owner/operator there?

Mr. O'Neill: That's a really good question. It is zoned office right now, and I think that what is contemplated by all of these signs here, all these descriptions, is a general description of what the predominant use might be, but not – it's not – we're not drilling it down as a zoning-permitted use level yet, so presumably any other office of any kind would fit into that description. It's just with the hospital there, as we know there is already a concentration of medical office along the east side of 116th, and that would be contemplated to be a fairly strong market. But there are lots of other types of office uses that

are there now that could be perfectly compatible with that kind of description. And then there are a lot of existing residences there that are already grandfathered since it was already zoned office and those rights would continue.

Panelist: Well thinking about that issue and then looking at the whole area, one of the fundamental things that has to occur, this is going to take a lot of years for this all to happen. I had one of my tenants come in when one of the first articles came out about this and he was just stressed out that he was going to have to move out because the whole area was going to get redeveloped in the next couple years. And so I equated it to how long it has taken the downtown to redevelop just to the extent that it has and how many old buildings are still there, and this plan is 1981, I think, for the downtown plan, so it's going to take a long time. And during that process I think it's really important that the Land Use Code does not make any existing uses legal nonconforming. Yeah, you can stay there because you're grandfathered, but we changed it to a higher use, so as soon as you're out of there you're out of there. I think the economics of the situation over time will allow that to happen, or will inspire it to happen. To make these uses legal nonconforming really puts a burden on the property, and it puts a burden on the businesses in there.

Mr. O'Neill: Now, TJ, just a clarification, you are making that comment as a general comment across the board, not just for these specific areas? You're saying that should be true for the whole thing?

Panelist: Yes, I think it should be true for the whole thing, and as you bring up the Dogwood Park area that's a perfect example of this. Nobody should be forced out of there or even have any kind of regulation that clouds the situation for them you put on. I think we raised the lid on what can happen here. All the good development is going to happen where we'd like it to, but I strongly believe there should not be legal non-conforming uses created with this.

Mr. O'Neill: Okay, other thoughts?

Panelist: I would second that.

Panelist: Yes, I'd like to expand a little bit on what TJ said. Our concerns are exactly the same as it relates to the triangle area, and if you look at that area in its block it really is predominately retail now that the folks that are purchasing the Angelo's site want to go vertical. And we are in support of that mixed-use type of concept and height issues, but that should be encouraged and permitted

under an overlay concept where there are bonus issues that would encourage that type of development. In reality, for quite a number of years, probably a decade or two, you really locked in to what you had there anyway. The Uwajimaya center has been controlled by Walgreen's under a master ground lease. Their intent is to start redevelopment of that property, and they'll have a Walgreen's, Uwajimaya, and a Shucks, and faced with that, and they have a twenty-five year primary term, so that is pretty much going to be retail whether it's got a residential mixed-use derivative as a definition to it or not. Our property over time, the Sherwood Shopping Center, ten or twenty years out – fifteen, thirty – could easily be redeveloped into a vertical direction, but in the interim period it is a good neighborhood shopping center to serve the community. We don't want to be in a position where a major tenant goes out that represents say thirty-five or forty percent of the property, and another rehab of that property takes place to update it and attract a new anchor tenant. And we should be able to accomplish that redevelopment of the existing retail use and not be forced into some higher use because of a definition as opposed to an overlay concept that would give us the option at that point of saying it's more valuable to us to sell this property to the next developer who's going to take it vertical, or it's more valuable to us to retain it and to recycle and to redevelop it as the property and the retail derivative that it is now. The final comment is that in one of your earlier slides there is an office zoning slice along the triangle that goes along the existing condition –

Mr. O'Neill: You can kind of see it on the left hand side.

Panelist: Yeah, there's an existing condition of that office zoning, which was from my understanding, from talking to the staff over the years, designed as a buffer to the residential properties to the east, and that after Unigard had done their buildout that was deemed to not be significant any longer. The further feedback we had was that the city was willing to take it to CB entirely, but that they wanted all the property owners along 156th to participate in that application and that was not practical. I think a housekeeping item here, since there is gross violation of that anyway as it exists, I mean Uwajimaya and Walgreen's is not conforming, and I think just to make that whole thing underlying CB and with your overlay on top of that is probably a housekeeping measure that would be appropriate.

Mr. O'Neill: Any other comments?

Panelist: I think the other commonality that kind of got sidetracked on

agreeing with Jim's comment is the transportation corridor through the middle on all three alternatives.

Mr. O'Neill: We're actually going to have a whole separate question about all the transportation stuff, including this. You're absolutely right, there is a common thread across the board that I would just rather show when we'll have the whole additional set of discussion about that, but right now I just want to focus on land use. But thank you and we'll come back to that.

So, Don, just to clarify what I think I heard you say, but I want to make sure to capture correctly, is the long-term vision that's shown in that area is okay but it's going to happen over time, it's going to be phased in, it needs to happen when the market or the property owner's ready to do it and have nothing imposed that makes it happen sooner than that, rather than from zoning or nonconforming.

Panelist: Absolutely. We want to have the right to continue as a retail property and to redevelop it as a retail property as major tenant demand requires it, turnover requires it. For instance, we have Long's Drugs going out now, That was a decision they made. Eventually we will have a new anchor tenant for thirty-five percent of the property. It's conceivable that anchor tenant may make demands for certain updates or redevelopment, and you want to not have a thirty-five percent redevelopment activity where you're going in for permit trigger some demand to go to a different type of zoning.

Mr. O'Neill: So it would be about allowing mixed-use but not requiring it. So if somebody wanted to keep it all retail?

Panelist: That's what I call an overlay. So, I consider this type of zoning to be an overlay type of mechanism where you have bonus features that will encourage the property owner to want to go in that direction because of the value his property is there, through that development opportunity. But if he wants to continue his existing use and redevelop it and prove it, he can continue to do so as long as he wishes.

Mr. O'Neill: So I want to move to, frankly, probably, the more contentious issues, which are the differences between them and what people like and don't like. But before we move off, any other comments on any of these three or four areas that we've just been talking about?

Panelist: Let's say in a perfect world I can get my hands on the three properties surrounding mine, which would allow me the ability to develop, being that I would have direct access to 116th. So within its current structure, I build the building, or even if the three other tenants/owners around me, we all partnered and did it, and we're all going to have our offices there, in this new building, I don't know the specifics of heights and whatnot. How does that play into now? Obviously there is a permit, this new zoning would be medical office. Now to get back to my original, would a typical and professional office still be allowed to occupy that as a new building?

Mr. O'Neill: Yeah. Again, I mean, we're not at a point, really – or anywhere near a point – where we are crafting zoning regulations –

Panelist: No, yeah, I understand that. Just hypothetically, say.

Mr. O'Neill: Yeah, hypothetically, absolutely. The office generally being the predominant use would remain, and so if you were able to get several properties together and come in with a new office development, as long as it was consistent with the new, all the regulations –

Panelist: Yeah, I understand that, I'm just saying as a hypothetical –

Mr. O'Neill: Yes.

Mr. King: So would your comment to the committee be that just a normal type of office should be permitted there even if kind of the overlay is a medical office?

Panelist: Yes. Thanks for that clarification.

Panelist: How would the city handle such things as right-of-way, I mean there could potentially be a right-of-way. At what point do you guys start looking – are you going to go through this whole steering committee process and a preferred alternative – and the Council comes up with their plan, then part of that plan, which we'll get advance information obviously, is going to start dealing with right-of-way needs to conform to the environmental as well. All the other transportation improvements, how, you know, we could go in next month for a development plan, yet two years from now 116th needs to be widened to five lanes and you'll need more right-of-way.

Mr. O'Neill: Yeah, I think that's a great question. We are identifying now in

the EIS what we think some of the base transportation needs are. None of those have been approved or adopted yet because it is all part of the planning exercise. So that is actually something the steering committee is grappling with now. So for example, at their last meeting in March, they said, hey wait a minute, you know, we've heard issues about a connection at 124th and SR-520, do we really need that and can we take a look at what would happen if we didn't do that? And we've heard the same thing about the extension to NE 10th. That's going to be extremely difficult to do that because we're already extending it, as you know, to 116th, that's already a project that's under construction. But this would require right-of-way, essentially where there is no way to do it, to get between 116th and 120th, without going through these Lake Bellevue properties. So they also said, hey we really would like to do some additional analysis on this. So that could happen for, truthfully, any of these projects. So that will all be part of the package that comes – so I guess I would again, try to defer people's comment on the transportation on this question, but you are absolutely right, I mean, that all has to be thought about as part of this. So – yes.

Your question?

Panelist: What about the development of infrastructure? Because I see other than the existing situation of no change, all of these proposals are going to need significant infrastructure improvements.

Mr. O'Neill: That's correct.

Panelist: Is that something the city is going to stand up for, or is that going to be an assessment of the property?

Panelist: Good question, I was just going to ask that.

Mr. O'Neill: That's a great question. We are – the Council is right now looking at a long-term financing strategy for the whole city, because there is a lot of untapped capacity in the city now. So in terms of a financing plan, it would probably be a combination of grants, city money, and potentially – we already use transportation impact fees – so it would be potentially a continuation of that. We haven't identified any other specifics, the city doesn't use LIDs, local improvement assessments, very much. Council has been resistant to doing those in the past, a lot of you know. But that is going to be a really important sort of balancing act for the Council.

Panelist: I differ. In my mind I see something that you cannot develop until

you have the infrastructure, if you own the cart and horse theory. But I certainly would not want to come in there and say that I don't want to develop my property for twenty-five years but I'm going to be assessed for infrastructure improvements now. And that's a little bit hypothetical, I don't want to develop, but I'm saying.

Mr. O'Neill:

Well, I think what you just said is an important point that we need to capture and convey back to the committee. So thank you for making that comment.

Okay, so with regard to, again, sort of back on land use, as Kevin – and Emil maybe you can get up and sort of point to some of these – But we have the no-action alternative, which is essentially leaving about half the area zoned LI, the rest a combination of Office, and General Commercial, and CB and zoning as you can kind of see over there. In the action alternatives, we have a lot of different things in play. We have concentrations happening in different parts of the corridor, more concentration happening in Alternative 2 there over by the hospital, for example. That would be more intensive development than the LI zone would allow. In Alternatives 1 and 3, we have more intensive development happening around the Safeway site, for example. In Alternatives 2 and 3, we have more intensive developments happening in the middle of the area, that 130th/132nd area. We don't have that happening in Alternative 1. In fact, in Alternative 1 we have this notion of this sort of services core, which would almost be taking extraordinary measures that we don't take now to sort of protect service uses. So it would almost be sort of, in a sense, deflating the ability of other uses to come in. It is really important to note that services could be accommodated all over the corridor like they already are in any of these alternatives, but what that alternative does ultimately is just say we not only don't want to allow more intensive development there but we want to do everything we can to keep a lot of those uses in the corridor.

Some other differences are Alternative 2 keeps some LI around where the Coke site is and the Safeway ice cream plant, and again that could be expanded upon. Another difference is in a couple of the alternatives that same concept that we talked about here, what Don talked about, a vertical mixed-use could also happen over here in various areas as opposed to just keeping it as stand-alone retail like it is now. So, kind of a lot of different ideas in play, and what the steering committee was really wanting, what they are going to be deliberating on, is how to take all these ideas and start to mush them together into a preferred option. And so we would really like to get your ideas on that.

Don?

Panelist: I don't know what the definition of services is in this plan because they haven't drilled down that deeply, but I do recall from an earlier, long time ago, scoping meeting, comments about a lot of this auto services and support services for people's needs in the area. And I do think we need to retain a small component of that in the Overlake area. I think having those services is important. Yes, the rent factor is going to go up over time and a lot of the mom and pop's might go by the wayside, but it is important to have those types of services in that central core of the community.

Panelist: And I agree with that, otherwise we are going to have so much traffic on the road going to Woodinville and other places. It's just going to defeat the purpose.

Panelist: What are some examples of services you had in mind?

Mr. O'Neill: That's a really good question because about half of the businesses in Bel-Red are under the services umbrella, because services can be anything from office use, architecture, office is a service use, professional office, printing shops, services that serve businesses, construction, and then everything like auto body/auto repair, shoe repair. So it's really a term that covers a lot of ground, and I think that's one of the things that the community has been struggling with a little bit. We want to keep service uses in the area, but the nature of service uses, even if we did nothing, would probably change over time, based on what the market and demand is and all those things. So, Emil – we have been trying to sort of drill down a bit on that question – is there anything that you want to add?

Mr. King: Yeah, I think for right now there are two different categories. One is the community, what they view as their services, and they brought up things like where do I get new tires, where do I get my oil changed, where do I get my car fixed if I get in a fender-bender. And then the whole business service is one that is a bit more tricky to actually map out, all those different ones, because there are really different uses.

Mr. O'Neill: And they're all over the corridor, they're up and down 116th, they're up and down NE 20th, they're up and down Bel-Red Road.

Mr. King: So really the issue that staff has been struggling with is do you go to the point of drawing a line on a map, like is shown on Alternative 1, and that being the services core, acknowledging that

there is probably quite a few other existing uses in that area but there is also a lot that is spread out throughout the corridor? Or is it a more type of just incentive program to try and keep service uses there without really drawing a specific area on a map and hoping that all those stay and even other ones that get displaced in the corridor move there?

Panelist: Well, I think you have to provide permissible service uses within a variety of different zoning districts as part of this, so that you do retain the ability to have their services continue, by definition, or you have to draw a line, which might be more arbitrary. So the ability to expand your definition of a variety of different zoning categories to allow for community services is probably an option to look at.

Mr. O'Neill: Any other thoughts?

Panelist: I would agree with what Don has said, because otherwise I am a greed-motivated individual, and if you happen to downgrade the zoning in my particular parcel you would, I don't want to say devalue, but not increase the value of that as much as others. So I would rather see a broad zoning covering the entire area with permitted uses, and if we want that, encourage mixed-use or whatever, that would provide some bonus type of mechanism where if you want to go five story mixed-use you get some trade-off as opposed to trying to arbitrarily say this particular parcel right here is now automotive repair use and by definition that has a lower value than the multi-story mixed-use zoning.

Mr. O'Neill: Okay, thank you. TJ, you had something?

Panelist: I'm going to read some answers, a comment letter on the draft EIS, but it encompasses this whole thing that I see distilling itself up to the surface about allowing all kinds of uses and not requiring only certain uses here and there. I'm going to read it because it is going to be more accurate if I do. The study should identify methods to protect the economic viability of existing businesses and properties. Any economic impacts from zoning changes need to be assessed. The study needs to recognize that due to the very long-term frame being considered, the need to allow existing business to remain as outright permitted uses is critical. There is an additional opportunity for the city to meet the first four planning principles, this is to utilize a method of zoning that protects existing economic vitality, provides the performance criteria and impact protection the city desires, and creates the greatest opportunity for the future vision to become reality. It is flexible use zoning. So we urge the

city to consider changing the permitted-use zoning to flexible-use zoning in the Bel-Red corridor by explicitly identifying the performance criteria allowed for land uses. The city would create the most flexible market-oriented zoning available for the corridor. As businesses evolve and new business types are created, having a flexible-use zoning code would remove unnecessary obstacles for economic development. In addition, both the city and the private sector would have much more clear understanding of the performance criteria – traffic impact noise, impact height restriction, setbacks, all that stuff – they would have, it would be real clear and everybody would know what to expect. What that does is allows for all these things that keep arising in this conversation, all these different zones, types of business. But it keeps traffic, setbacks, building height, that kind of stuff regulated, the impacts of these things. But the actual specific type of uses is going to be market driven, and we strongly feel that that should be a concept over all these areas.

Panelist: Does the city have any idea what kind of height restrictions they are going to have out there?

Mr. O'Neill: Well, right now all the zoning districts out there have height restrictions, as you know. I don't think there is any zoning district out there that allows more than forty or forty-five feet, that I am aware of. I think LI actually has more generous height limits in the commercial and office zones out there. So what has been contemplated in the action alternatives is that where there is sort of a more intensity identified, that heights could be greater than what is allowed out there now. So what the steering committee has talked about is certainly buildings up to like six stories say, what – Betty, you might want to address this – but Wright Runstad came before the committee and talked about the potential on their site thinking about buildings taller than that. So I think that will be, that whole height density issue is a variable right now, and the committee and the Council will ultimately need to decide what they are comfortable with. So the issue there is how much higher intensity to allow and where, because you could, if you rezone the whole corridor for higher – it is nine hundred acres – so you could be accommodating many millions more square feet than what has been looked at in the complete EIS.

Panelist: So I just think it is something to think about if in fact you are going to build a transfer line through there you should be able to accommodate moving a lot more people, which would eventually call for highrises.

Panelist: In your office definitions in the handout, you talk about several office densities, and on the plan where you talk about office you don't specify, or do you, specific density.

Mr. O'Neill: Well the different – what he is referring to is the handout here that we put together for the committee called the glossary, it sort of defines what these terms are – And yeah, there are different designations of office and they actually are suggested to have different levels of intensity. So as was mentioned before, this would remain low-density along the south end of Bel-Red Road, this is sort of, in this alternative this is sort of more of a kind of office campus-type of thing where you probably really wouldn't be going above four stories, for example. Whereas in this alternative, or in this alternative over here by the hospital where you have got a transit station, there you would be potentially allowing more of the six-plus, sort of the more midrise office intensity. So the thing about Bellevue right now is that in our current zoning there is either pretty low density office allowed – floor area ratios of less than two point five, so they typically tend to be two-story buildings at the most – then there is highrise office in downtown, but there is not really much in between. And I think it has been thought all along – and our market study that we did early on in the process sort of confirmed this – that there is sort of an untapped market for that sort of in-between product that Bellevue doesn't really offer much. Somewhere in this corridor would be a good opportunity –

Panelist: So office medium-density correlates with medium density in this handout, and office campus would be low density?

Mr. O'Neill: Lower density, probably. Yeah.

Panelist: Along those lines, you are asking us to comment on specific areas there? On three out of the four alternatives, in no-action and Alternatives 2 and 3, our particular area, NE 12th/120th just east of Lake Bellevue and the area east and south of Lake Bellevue, on three of those is pretty much left the same. It is currently a GC, General Commercial zone, and that is noted on three of them. Only on one of them is it noted as being included in a mixed-use housing/commercial higher-density. On two out of the three, excluding the no-action, the adjacent properties are office/campus or office medium-density, and I think as long as we are going to be going through this whole process, we don't want to end up with our property just having the same zoning that we have got right now with something that is currently light-industrial zoned being allowed to go up in density, height and value. So I think that speaks again to the idea that we should have the flexible zoning.

The retail may be demanded there, but I don't want it to be required there, I would like the opportunity to build a medical office building on that parcel, we'd like the ability to maybe build a nice housing property – we've got views over Lake Bellevue and downtown and all that – so I don't want to be restricted to what we have today as we go through all this big expansion.

Mr. O'Neill: Okay, other comments?

Panelist: I think that in general, with TJ's comment earlier about allowing the market to dictate what goes in there, just sitting here thinking off-hand, Ready Sand and Gravel used to be out there, the market dictated and they're gone. Down in Evan's Plaza there in that area there used to be some steel fabricators that are gone. White's Carver Brothers used to be up there off 16th and they're gone –

Panelist: And Bud's is gone.

Panelist: – Bud's is gone. Bellevue Bulldozer is gone. So I think that a lot of these things that historically you have seen that the market is changing the mix of tenants by itself, so I would rather allow the broad zoning to let the market dictate.

Mr. O'Neill: Other comments?

Panelist: Kevin, in Alternative 3 there where the transportation sits in there on the Safeway site, you don't have any housing listed in that general vicinity.

Mr. O'Neill: Yes. In Alternative 1 that area was identified for mixed-use housing/office. In large part because that was the only area in the corridor that really was going to have a concentration of those uses. In this alternative it was assumed that that would be more of an office focus. There's nothing to say though – and this kind of gets to Kevin's comment about mixing and matching – there's nothing to say you couldn't have this as a base alternative but still allow, or contemplate then allow, but contemplate housing or mixed-use here as well. So you could certainly mix and match pieces together, so that is not necessarily a constant, but it was just the way this one was set up.

Panelist: I guess my general comment would be I favor Alternative 3 just because it allows the most. Who knows how much development is going to happen here in the next fifteen to twenty years, but you want to be able to allow the capacity and plan for it. But I'll echo the sentiment that flexibility is key and you have to be able to let

the market somehow dictate what it is you can do. And I like the way Redmond is approaching it as far as Bellevue Heights and not limiting it to six stories, and making some sort of an incentive base to approve other areas – they are talking about more sensitive area improvement to allow that – but I know you guys don't want to compete with the downtown high-rise, and I don't think high-rise needs to go here, but I think we need the flexibility to allow a potential rezone depending on if the market demands it. And if a transit-oriented development happens on the Safeway site, I know it is noted for office but certainly the flexibility should be there. If they want to do residential as a component of that office, that certainly should be allowed. So again, flexibility, letting the market decide, would certainly be my opinion on a lot of these.

Panelist: Does the capacity of 520 and 405 create the ceiling on the number of trips that can be supported in this planning area that would say that you could only do one alternative or another?

Mr. O'Neill: Maybe. The reason I say that is because, as a lot of you have zoned land or have done development in Bellevue know, there is a requirement called concurrency. When a development comes in you have to be able to show that you are not failing local streets and intersections and et cetera. State facilities typically are not part of that equation, so the city doesn't do a concurrency analysis and examine what it is going to do to 520 or 405. The reality is that there is a huge need to increase the capacity of this corridor. Our modeling that we did for the EIS assumed that those were in place in 2030 because they were part of adopted plans.

Panelist: Which plans?

Mr. O'Neill: Improvements to 405 based on the adopted 405 plan, and SR-520 based on the six-lane bridge replacement that has been, essentially, determined as their alternative. So the 2030 modeling assumes those state improvements have been made. So if they are not made, again it doesn't necessarily legally constrain us in terms of how much development can happen, but it threatens probably not just Bel-Red but downtown, if you have a huge gridlock on the regional system that spills over.

Panelist: If you can't get onto 405 or 520 the level of service in all your other intersections will fail.

Mr. O'Neill: And when we get to transportation, which will be the next question, we can talk more about that because that was exactly what was contemplated in some of the transportation

improvements that were identified, offering more relief valves for some of that.

Panelist: So let me ask the same question in a different way. The transportation improvements they are contemplating in the transportation plan, not including the state facilities, can they support any one of these alternatives from the lowest to the highest?

Mr. O'Neill: Yes. As of our modeling work right now.

Panelist: So it doesn't constrain any?

Mr. O'Neill: Right.

Panelist: You could select in favor of any one – it is totally elective?

Mr. O'Neill: Yes, based on the assumed network.

Panelist: Okay.

Panelist: I was in Portland earlier this week and there is a very similar area to the Bel-Red corridor, north of downtown. It was all warehouses before, and I know for years they have talked about redeveloping it. Well it has taken off, it looks like downtown Bellevue now, and I was listening to Wright Runstad's comments on their proposed – or their ideas, preliminary – which would be about a third of the Alternative 3 residences that are proposed and also about seventy percent of the office on roughly seven percent of the total of Bel-Red corridor. I'm wondering if we aren't, if the scale we are looking at is what the market is actually going to do. Because I just have a sense that you are going to see a lot more than even Alternative 3.

Mr. O'Neill: My response to that is, one of the difficult things about an exercise like this is you have to pick a timeframe to do your planning. You can't do your transportation analysis unless you pick a year and assume what is going to be on the ground from a land use standpoint and from the transportation network standpoint to see if it all works. And that gets back to your question. That said, when we do planning and zoning, and downtown is a great example, you don't do it for a specific market year, you have to do it for a broader long-term build-out scenario. The downtown zoning – and Emil correct me if I am wrong – the zoning that is in place downtown could accommodate well more than the 2020 forecast that we used for the downtown plan update, right?

Mr. King: Yeah, even beyond the 2030. What we often do is, for downtown, do a build-out analysis, which we'll often want to kind of peg a year to that. And typically I'll come up with like 2035 or 2040 for downtown Bellevue, so even when we are doing 2020 modeling or even 2030 modeling we weren't having every single site developed. And for downtown that makes sense because there is still – even though the amount of development we have had happen and stuff under construction – there is still a lot of surface parking lots that are going to take a long time to redevelop, as TJ has kind of pointed out.

Mr. O'Neill: So the challenge there is as we do zoning you want to kind of think about the ultimate vision and the ultimate build-out, because 2030 is just – the world doesn't stop in 2030, there is still going to be a market beyond that. The challenge is – and it gets back to your question –the city realistically can't allow huge levels of development without, as you said before, having the transportation structure in place to serve it. So that becomes the balancing act.

Panelist: Right. Just from seeing what I have seen in Portland, and I saw it just earlier this week, but if Wright Runstad were to do what they have in mind, and it were to be wildly successful, and that were to account for twenty percent of what's going on in the Bel-Red corridor, we're talking about a scale that isn't on here, and that could occur in the next ten to fifteen years.

Panelist: I have got to agree with him. Using Issaquah as an example, twenty-five years ago I don't know anyone left alive that had any idea Issaquah would look like it looks like today. And fifty percent of all growth is still generated with the other fifty percent coming from out of the area. And if the past is any indicator of the future, I think we may be looking at a lot more people than we are taking into consideration here, and we are going to have to accommodate them.

Mr. O'Neill: So just, kind of putting that question out there to the group, is there a sort of a feeling or consensus that even the ambitious development program is A, is it realistic and B, is it potentially modest? Is that – do other people feel the same?

Panelist: I think if you have mixed-use with transportation, housing and office and mixed use, then people want to live near their office, then I think it is probably sustainable. That's what I think about the transportation issue and the density issue. If you mix office use and residential together, people don't have to commute to work,

then they're happy.

Panelist: It wouldn't surprise me if that kind of development were to occur, and I just want to make sure that – I mean what do we do if it happens, if we're planning for something that ends up to be one fifth of what it ends up being over the next fifteen years? Is that going to create some restrictions or some problems or –

Mr. O'Neill: Well, I think that is part of the challenge of doing long-range planning. If you looked at this area twenty-five years backwards, there have been a lot of viable businesses, but there also hasn't been an explosion of development, in large part probably because the zoning has constrained it to some extent. So our twenty-five year look forward, which we hired our economic consultant to help us with, was based on the regional market, what's happening in Overlake, what's happening in downtown, what's happening in Seattle, what's happening throughout the whole Puget Sound area. But who knows whether it's right or not. It's hard to look in an hourglass and think are we going to be exact. So if we did undershoot it, that means probably five to ten years down the road we come back and we look at the plan again and we update it, and that happens all the time with long-range plans. You probably need to every five or ten years take a look at what you did and say, wait a minute, we need to think this through better and update it. So that is how I would explain it then.

I do want to move to transportation so just a couple more comments on land-use.

Panelist: Just to address your thought, are we not thinking big enough in this, and might we even surpass even the highest density? I guess with almost forty years of family experience in this area, and business, and it's our place – looking at any of these alternatives I never had the idea that there wouldn't be enough demand to meet these. So, you ask about just a feeling, and I never thought about that until you posed the question, Kevin, but I would guess that we are going to have the demand to max this out, as opposed to the alternative of we have this great big plan but nobody ever builds anything. I don't think that is going to happen at all, I think we are going to max it out. I think we ought to be prepared with concurrency situations and all to realize we need to make the investment to make this happen. This is a gift of a chunk of property in the city that we have, and I think we need to do it right, we need to be thinking big about it.

Panelist: I want to just add something. I don't think that the zoning is what

kept this area from growing. I think that it was zoned a certain way and developed that way, and it has taken that many years for that land to be worth tearing down what's there.

Panelist: I differ. I oppose that point of view because most of the zoning was placed on it after a lot of the properties were developed. It was a statement of this is what is here, as opposed to this is what we want here and everybody built to that. And I think one of the main reasons that this whole thing is finally occurring – two reasons. One is that it is being driven by the need to come up with a transit corridor through here and deal with all that. The other is the ratio between the improvement value, from the assessor's office, and the land value is so out of whack in this part of town because the buildings are old and they are not anywhere near as proportionally valuable as other parts of the city. And from a lot of experience in this area I think it is because of the zoning – it's restrictive – it's not worth tearing down an old building and building a new one to the same codes – it doesn't pencil.

Panelist: Well you're paying eighty to a hundred dollars a foot for the land for existing ones, which ten years ago might have been the high price for downtown.

Mr. O'Neill: So just a quick – and there have already been some really good questions to sort of tee this up – in order to accommodate land-use contemplated in any of these alternatives, given the question you asked about can you do it, we had to assume some pretty dramatic increases in transportation capacity. So those increases are: extending NE 16th, which is not here now as you all know, past about 132nd or so; widening of 124th/120th; potential widening of 116th here, you had asked about that; extending NE 10th across; adding and eastbound interchange on 124th that does not exist now as you know, to sort of take some of the relief off of the 148th interchange and the 405/520 interchange; and light rail transit, which is part of Sound Transit's East Link project; and local bus transit that would both go there in the interim before light rail gets there and then serve the light rail station once it is there. So, under all of those assumptions, with the regional network also in place, we can basically accommodate even the high-end land use. So the question is for this group, should we be considering taking some of these off, are any of them more critical than others, which ones would you say that has to be there and that has to be there just from your perspective as property owners in thinking about future development? So that is really the question.

Panelist: Okay. Well first of all, your growth management planning cycle is

every ten years, so you are going to have a chance to look at all this every ten years, in case any of these need to be revised. I personally believe that 405 and 520 are limiting that case. I think the city did a great job in the last fifteen years of getting cars out of the city through improvements, but it does nothing for the functioning of 405, and the same problem exists on 520. They are both at gridlock at PM peak. When the district was created there were three major properties that made this district kind of the heart of it: Coca cola, Metro and Safeway. And when those uses materialized because of the limitations on transportation in this neighborhood, the city had the opportunity with these big users, because they had truck traffic to assign truck routes to them, and even managed their PM peak – Metro has a shift change at three o'clock – and so they are ahead of the PM peak. As soon as these land-uses change, all that ability to direct those trucks leaves, there are more trucks, and they will all seek the intersections, unless everybody is living and working in that neighborhood. And so I think every single improvement shown on that page is required, but I don't think even if they're made that the district will function at the level of service that is necessary to support those land uses. I believe that the demand is there. Totally I agree with everybody in this room that the demand is there to support that, or whatever your planning horizons are. I don't believe the transportation will function. And so what happens for the early development – the highest uses – the rest of these properties and property owners become a detention pond for the traffic impacts in the district if you can't meet concurrency. So, I am concerned about that.

Panelist: Yeah, that's a good point.

Mr. O'Neill: Okay, other thoughts?

Panelist: When you look at the transportation, if you pick one of these alternatives, tomorrow we are not going to start construction on all these road improvements. How does it start I guess is my question? As soon as someone wants to develop the Coca Cola site, yeah, okay, we're going to have X amount of traffic we'll need to accommodate for that. You know, excuse the kindergarten question, I just –

Mr. O'Neill: No, that question is a critical question. And we've, you know, really been scratching our heads about it. Because in a sense in any of these alternatives, looking out to 2030 and saying, okay, we think this is the general land use pattern, this we think is the general amount of development, this we think is the transportation network, is actually the easy part of the job. The hard part of the

job is how to get there incrementally over time. And that's going to be an enormous challenge for us in working with the Council and the community on how we do this. It's sort of like, it's just been embedded from the beginning of this project that you kind of want to figure out what your vision is, but then you have to ratchet back to figure out how it gets accomplished over time. So that's going to be incremental land use change with incremental transportation capacity change serving it. I don't know what happens first. That's actually part of what we have to figure out. I think if the people in this room are right, that this area's just ready to take off, that's going to be a difficult challenge for the city. We're going to have to say wait a minute, if it takes off at this level in 2010 or 2012 or 2015, and we can't get the projects in place to serve it, then we do have the scenario you're talking about where we've got just massively increased traffic congestion and intersection failures. So we have to be very careful about how we do that. So in a sense, the more challenging work is going to be the implementation phase and how that happens.

Panelist: Do I hear you saying that he who gets there first gets the most and they'll be a moratorium on other properties until the city gets caught up?

Mr. O'Neill: I wouldn't say it quite that way, but I think the fact of the matter is —

Panelist: How would you say it?

Mr. O'Neill: I would say that we have to figure out how much land use we can accommodate in what time period, and what transportation projects will really be needed.

Panelist: That's back to my original comment regarding infrastructure. I hear you beating around the bush, but the basic underlying thing is before this area can develop the infrastructure has to be in place.

Mr. O'Neill: I think a lot of it will have to be, absolutely, just to meet our own level of service standards.

Panelist: And that goes back to my question about what the setbacks for the streams are going to be. Who's going to wait thirty years to determine that? Most of us are sitting there with properties along streams will miss all our opportunities, if we ever have one. We are concerned over how much setback there's going to be.

Mr. O'Neill: Well, just quickly on the stream issue, and then I want to come

back to the transportation issue. We have a critical areas ordinance now, which is a citywide requirement. What has come across for many people, and what the steering committee has thought about, is not necessarily imposing a different standard in Bel-Red from a regulatory standpoint with streams. But the steering committee is interested in thinking about how some of the stream corridors could be enhanced and improved. That could be a combination of acquisition in some places, could be the use of incentives to get more stream setbacks in exchange for greater height allowances. On a really small piece of property that's not going to work, because you don't have enough land to play with. But on a larger piece of property it could work very well. So that's the kind of thing that's been talked about.

Panelist: I'm really worried about the stream question because one of our parcels has a stream going right through the middle of it that's currently in a pipe. And it was done with the concurrence of the city thirty-five years ago. And it would destroy the property if somebody comes in there and says number one you've got to open it, and number two you've got to have a hundred-foot setback on each side. We might just as well walk away from the property and give it to the city. Or the alternative is to engage in extensive and protracted litigation.

Panelist: There'll be many of us on that one.

Mr. O'Neill: Other comments on transportation?

Panelist: I think talking about the question you raised, Dave. I think it's going to be really important that we do build the infrastructure. One of my very first comments early on in this process was one of the most important things we can do is do everything we can to complete the grid system and allow for mobility. And we need to keep in mind, I guess the term is modesplit, which is going to be 99 percent single-occupant vehicle. We need to realize that. It's nice to accommodate pedestrians and things for bicycles and buses and rail and all that, but we've got to address the reality and accommodate the people who are going to live and work there. But the main thing that I want to make sure that this plan does is have consistency between the infrastructure capacity and the proposed densities out there so that the scenario that you posed never happens, that the last guy out of the gate doesn't get anything because the capacity's been used up. I think that we need to be consistent with those two, the transportation infrastructure capacity and some of the densities. Because if not, it creates kind of a false race situation. It adds a synthetic impetus into the whole

redevelopment process. I don't think any of us want to be sitting around competing with each other for the last batch of density because the intersections are going to go dark after that, and three of us are sitting there with, oops, I guess we missed that boat.

Mr. O'Neill: So basically it is sort of an equity issue.

Panelist: We need to be consistent with the density so that everybody, when the time comes to develop their property, that's not a big issue. Like did I get my LOS ten blocks away from me or not, or did the guy next to me get it. We should be consistent with those in this plan, and that needs to be analyzed thoroughly. On the transportation also, all the alternatives are based on this set of transportation improvements. And some of them were brand new just when it came out. For instance, one of those proposes to go through some of our buildings that have businesses in them right now. And it was kind of a surprise to come across that in the draft EIS. It was like, oh, there's a street through our buildings, let's deal with that. I think that – I don't know what the estimate – Has an estimate been done on just the right-of-way acquisition on these proposed improvements?

Mr. O'Neill: We're in the process of working with CH2MHill in doing some sort of preliminary cost numbers. And again, it really depends on the improvement you're talking about. The improvement you're talking about, which is the NE 10th extension, would be probably the greatest cost for acquisition.

Panelist: NE 16th is going to go across here. Would a lot of that be funded by Sound Transit?

Mr. O'Neill: Some of that would be funded by Sound Transit, if that's the alignment that they choose.

I want to make sure other people have a chance to talk. So anything else?

Panelist: Well, I think obviously my thing would be – I know the transportation models were built to model the density plan, but I think the transportation models should almost look at higher densities and accommodate more traffic so as to avoid the issues that we're talking about. And maybe that's a 2040 window you're looking at for transportation. I think all the improvements – I think the city is going to have to invest in a lot of these improvements before the development can happen. I don't think there's any way around it. I would also argue – I mentioned this in an earlier

meeting we had last year – I still think there should be an intersection with access at 130th Street and 520. That should still be on the table. I know that was pretty contentious, but I still think that needs to happen.

Mr. O’Neill: In addition to 124th?

Panelist: Yeah. I also have, you know, a couple of properties that certainly, like TJ was saying, are now mentioned in the EIS as having the potential for condemnation. One question I do have is, on that particular map right there, the Sound Transit line takes a jog south right at the 122nd Street station. Whereas if I look at the current Sound Transit planning maps, they follow more these three models.

Mr. O’Neill: Yeah, I think that’s right. I mean, this jog was essentially meant to just suggest either a NE 12th crossing or NE 6th crossing of 405, which are both on the table. That’s not intended to be an alignment. It’s basically representative. I would actually yield to the Sound Transit map on that, the EIS work they’ve done on that issue.

Panelist: I trust that none of these transportation improvements are in your Capital Improvement Program?

Mr. O’Neill: No.

Panelist: So, in order to meet concurrency they would be?

Mr. O’Neill: They’d have to be, yes. As we update our CIP and our TIP, our Transportation Improvement Plan, we would start moving some of these projects in. Now in our current CIP, we actually have early implementation money in the CIP. So what we have is funded design work to start working on some of these actually now, this year. So we don’t have any money to build any of it because the Council hasn’t made a decision that any of them should be built. That’s part of the planning process.

Panelist: Which ones?

Mr. O’Neill: Which ones what?

Panelist: Which ones are in the plan?

Mr. O’Neill: All of these are in the draft plan at this point. What’s in the currently funded CIP is money to do the design work on whichever

ones make it into the final plan vision. But there's no adopted CIP money to build any of these because the Council hasn't said we think we should build any of these. Because they haven't adopted the vision yet.

Mr. King: There's a pot of design money that hasn't been allocated –

Mr. O'Neill: It hasn't been allocated to specific projects yet. What we need the steering committee to do – and ultimately the Council to do – is say yes, we think these projects are important. Any planning process like this is an iterative process. And once we get a green light from the committing saying yes, we think you should start working on these, then we can start doing early design on any number of these projects.

Panelist: Related to that, is there any idea, some kind of estimate, of how much this set of improvements is going to cost relative to the CIP over a certain period of time for the whole city? In other words, is this ninety percent of the CIP budget for a period of time.

Mr. O'Neill: Well, the short answer of that is that right now, without Bel-Red, about a five hundred million dollar funding gap in the city between all the projects we've said we'd like to do – so that's the downtown roads, parks community centers, all over the city – The infrastructure tab for Bel-Red just on the city end could easily be well over a hundred million dollars.

Panelist: Oh yeah.

Mr. O'Neill: Again, we are not anticipating the city will be the sole funder of any of these. We're talking state, we're talking grants, we're talking Sound Transit, we're talking Metro. I mean there's a whole bunch of transportation funding partners. But if we're already at a five hundred million dollar gap and we're adding northwards of a hundred million, then it's going to be – And that's why – and I want to give other people a chance to talk because we only have about ten or fifteen minutes left – but when the Council is considering the overall CIP funding strategy, looking long-term, we want to pull the Bel-Red work into that equation. So it's good timing to be doing that this year.

Any other comments anybody wants to make?

Panelist: In my definition of infrastructure, I put sewer, water, stuff like that. I haven't heard any talk about anything but transportation. And if you're increasing the capacity, then certainly you're going to

exceed the current capacity for those types of utilities.

Mr. O'Neill: We've talked to all the utilities. That was something we did during the EIS process. We talked to all the utility providers, the city, PSE, Bellevue School District, and basically what they all say is their long-range planning, which they do – Basically when you size sewer and water infrastructure you generally size it for the long haul anyway. They didn't see actually any big issues that we're going to have accommodating this development program through 2030. So thank you for raising that question.

Panelist: I would make a comment to not underestimate the amount of traffic that it's going to be. I mean, 520, you know, we beat expectations on whether we'd meet capacity there by – I don't know, I can't be specific, but I believe it was a significant amount of time. On 405, you know, it could be triple the size it is. So, I guess, you know, don't underestimate what needs to be there, because we seem to do that consistently.

Mr. O'Neill: So I have two more questions I want to ask the group. And I'm find with staying a few minutes past 9:30, but I want to honor people's time. Don, did you have a –

Panelist: Just going back to a comment on transportation, which is really not addressing what you have here. But once you start going this way, there's a lot of subtleties and additional issues that would develop as they relate to tweaking and adjusting the corridors and access issues. And we've addressed that in our comments as relates to Sherwood Shopping Center. But I think one of the issues the city needs to do perhaps a little better job than they have historically on is involving affected property owners before they lay down the concept at the point at which it's really just a discussion, and get the property owners involved. For instance, we have critical delivery areas and we have fifty-three-foot trucks coming into our property. We've had issues where things have kind of cropped up and we've had to go in and deal with it after the fact and address those issues. So I think it's important that – particularly in the commercial properties – you do have an aggressive plan to try and talk to the property owners about what is on the drawing board. Not that we're always going to get what we want, but it's a lot easier to have that as a collaborative effort than it is to have this kind of battle after the fact. So I would just encourage that.

Mr. O'Neill: Okay. Thank you very much.

I have two remaining questions I want to ask. The first is going to

be any other broad comments for the good of the order. You can come back to the alternatives and say something you've been wanting to say but haven't had a chance to say. You can ask a question about capacity. So I'm going to ask that question. Then I'm going to ask if there were any major points of consensus that this group would want to deliver to the steering committee. I thought I heard a couple of them which I could give a shot at. But let's ask the first question first. What are any general comments you'd like to pass one.

Panelist: I want to sort of go back to the land use, and we talked a little bit about height. I think for the Wright Runstad project, Wright Runstad is clearly interested in the third alternative, recognizing if the demand is really there. And to have some flexibility in the height to allow better urban design so you can do some open spaces in tradeoffs, maybe for some height. So that kind of flexibility in height so you don't just get everything at six stories or something. So you have some ability to carve out some sort of plaza and open space.

Panelist: I'll second that.

Panelist: In line with that is that if Wright Runstad's concept expands further into the Bel-Red corridor, I think they really need to look at capacity issues for utilities and transportation that would accommodate it being a lot bigger success than any of these proposals do. That way at least they can accommodate the growth.

Panelist: The second thing I would add I think is the ability to do some really cooperative work on transportation, some public/private partnerships in there with transit stations, and doing some real innovative transit area development I think is possible. So again, the idea of what you can accomplish through cooperative public and private partnerships.

Mr. O'Neill: Okay. Other comments?

Panelist: General comment. I would encourage the steering committee, Planning Commission and Council to really take a lot of these comments to heart for the reason that early on when this process started there was supposed to be at least one Bel-Red subarea business owner and one Bel-Red subarea property owner on the steering committee. And we were basically excluded. That was not done. And so this is a group of people around this table that at least somebody ought to have been on that committee. And I would encourage the committee to give all these comments a lot of

weight in their process, since we were not part of the group.

Mr. O'Neill: Other comments?

Panelist: I still want to talk about flexibility in regard to zoning and planning and uses. And maybe not focus so much on a set building type, focus more on architecture, and the higher you go more air and light requirements being in play. Shrinking the footprint the higher you go. Focus more on those principles than just a set six story or eight story or whatever. And letting the market decide.

Mr. O'Neill: Okay. Other comments, questions?

Panelist: Can we forward comments?

Mr. O'Neill: Absolutely. All of these will be forwarded to the steering committee. The steering committee, first of all, they have public comment at all their meetings. Anybody that wants to address something in email or writing to the committee can do that separately on their own. There's a Bel-Red website and you can use that. So absolutely, yes.

Okay, so sort of points of consensus. I heard a couple. Weigh in if there's others that I missed. One I heard is allow base uses to remain but then also use sort of overlay ideas or other ways to allow uses that are contemplated in the vision, but don't make existing uses nonconforming. That kind of gets back to the flexibility issue generally, but that concept was discussed specifically. Is that sort of a point of consensus?

Panelists: Yes.

Mr. O'Neill: The other point of consensus that I heard is that our development program might be modest. We might be looking at a lot more development than our development program looks at. So is that a fair statement?

Panelist: Yes.

Mr. O'Neill: And the other thing that goes with that is as we think about infrastructure we need to be looking even beyond what we've talked about. A third point of consensus I heard is the infrastructure question, that as we are phasing, particularly transportation – and the reason we focused in on transportation infrastructure is because of the GMA concurrency requirement, that's a switch that we don't have for like parks or other types of

facilities. But as we look at transportation and land use capacity issues, make sure we are doing it in a fair and equitable manner so we are not sort of punishing the last person in line, or putting undue requirements on the last person in line.

Other points of consensus? Emil, can you think of others?

- Mr. King: The only other one I heard multiple people speak to was clarification on the stream issues and encouraging the staff and the committee to really get into the details on that sooner rather than later.
- Panelist: I'd like to see the existing enclosed streams be grandfathered. And if they're grandfathered, then you could get out of that grandfathering by providing tradeoffs. Say the city wants the thing open, then you are going to provide a higher density on a joint adjacent property or something of this nature. But I think that the – because I know there are several properties besides ours where the building's right over the stream. And I don't want to get caught up in something where I want to redevelop a building and have to pay to open up a whole stream.
- Panelist: I'm not sure how to articulate this, but I thought when we had the conversation on services that there was some consensus about the need for flexibility in zoning throughout the district for that and for some other types of uses. So there was some flexibility concept in the zoning.
- Mr. O'Neill: Right, that's a good clarification. What I heard on that was that – and what I heard, at least Mr. Robertson articulate, is the idea of not deflating the zoning to protect service uses, but not allowing anything else. It sort of gets back to the market allowing them to happen but don't take extraordinary measures to necessarily protect them. Is that a fair assessment?
- Panelist: Yes. I just think the services aspect is not addressed in these plans adequately.
- Mr. O'Neill: Other major points?
- Panelist: I have a question. TJ mentioned the fact that there weren't any business owners or property owners on the steering committee. Who is the steering committee?
- Mr. O'Neill: The Council appointed the steering committee. It is made up of fifteen people. There are three ex-City Council members, two of

whom are the co-chairs, and also used to be mayors of Bellevue. There are representatives from the Planning Commission, the Transportation Commission, the Parks & Community Services Board. The Chamber of Commerce has two designated representatives. The Bellevue Downtown Association has representatives. And there are citizens from every – the Bridle Trails, Wilburton, Sherwood Forest, downtown. So that's the composition of the committee. And I think the challenge the Council would have had was, because there are so many property owners and businesses, who would be the voice. So you can take issue with their decision, but it was the Council's call who was on the committee.

Panelist: I already took issue with them some time ago, with both the mayor and one of the Council people. And frankly I think that meetings like this, and I know there have been others involving the property owners, are their kind of compromise.

Mr. O'Neill: I think that's probably right.

Other questions or comments for the good of the order?

Okay, thank you for coming, and we'll pass all of this on to the committee.