

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

November 5, 2009
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Tanaka, Commissioners Glass, Jokinen, Larrivee, Northey, Simas

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Kiel

STAFF PRESENT: Paul Krawczyk, Jen Benn, Drew Redman, Eric Miller, Mike Ingram, Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:32 p.m. by Chair Tanaka who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioners Larrivee and Northey, who arrived at 6:34 p.m., and Commissioner Kiel, who was excused.

3. STAFF REPORTS

Senior Project Manager Paul Krawczyk reported that on November 18 there will be an open house at City Hall for the EastLink project. The open house runs from 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., with a presentation starting at 5:00 p.m.

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

5. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Sara Vega, program manager for TransManage, thanked the Commission and the staff for the time put into developing a new model for TMP requirements. She said the Bellevue Downtown Association particularly appreciates the response staff developed regarding each of

the requests made of the City Council on October 5. TransManage has proven itself to be a valuable partner in implementing transportation demand management activities in the downtown. While the staff has not recommended increasing the point value, the TMA performance criteria outlined in response to the second Council issue provides a solid framework for evaluation and should be used to consider an increase in points for TransManage membership in the future. More importantly, in order for the menu of options to influence modeshift effectively, the city must focus on keeping buildings engaged at all times, not just during reporting and surveying periods. It is unfair to have property managers invest in transportation solutions and deliver outstanding results while a few are able to avoid making such investments with no repercussions, a reality caused by the current city code limitations. It is enforcement that will make or break the success of the TMP as a modeshift tool and Bellevue's transportation network. Downtown Bellevue's 39 percent non-drive alone commuter modesplit would not have happened without collaboration among a variety of stakeholders. The TMP menu of options offers the potential for building on that success, if implemented and monitored properly.

Mr. Bruce Nurse, vice president for Kemper Development Company, 575 Bellevue Square, said he first became aware of the terms TMA and TMP in 1989 when Bellevue Place opened. The building had a TMP drafted and presented to the city. It remains something the company is committed to as a way to reduce the number of SOV trips in the downtown. High modesplit goals have long been the goal of the city for the downtown, and the city has come a long way toward accomplishing those goals. Bellevue was one of the first cities in the nation to use the TMA model. Kemper Development supports the recommendation for a citywide approach to the program. The company continues to support Alternative 4 and the menu of options. Imposing the requirements for the life of the building is a concern to Kemper Development. For developers who construct with an eye on selling, the provision is not a big deal, but for those who build and intend to operate, the requirement should run for something less than the life of the building to avoid conflicts with property title and financing arrangements. The number of carpool spaces at Bellevue Place has been doubled since the building opened; the spaces are given preferential location as well. However, responding to demand is better than stepping out ahead with setting aside spaces that might not get used.

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to approve the agenda as printed was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Larrivee and the motion carried unanimously.

8. STUDY SESSION

A. Transportation Management Program (TMP) Menu of Options Review

Chair Tanaka noted for the record that the Commission had the TMP on its plate some eight months ago. The issue was supposed to be before the Council in July, but the schedule got pushed back for a variety of reasons. The Commission spent a great deal of time focused on

some of the particulars of the plan. The recommendations were taken to the Council, and the Council came back with a number of questions, sparked in part by written comments from members of the public and the business community. The Council asked the Commission to address the specific questions outlined in the memo in the packet.

Chair Tanaka asked the Commissioners to limit their focus to the specific questions posed by the Council and not to go back over previously plowed ground.

Implementation Planning Manager Eric Miller said the package of recommendations from the Commission was before the Council on October 5. For the most part, the recommendations were well received. They did raise some questions and some follow-up with the Council will be needed. Staff was directed to draft legislation to adopt the proposed code amendment. The Commission was asked to review the menu of options and the point scheme, and whether anyone besides TransManage can provide TMA services and gain the 18 points.

Mr. Miller pointed out that the menu of options is not itself proposed to be part of the code; rather it would be referenced by the code and serve as an administrative tool to help implement the requirements of the code for the transportation management programs. That will allow staff in the years ahead to be responsive to the changing times and to new and innovative strategies that may be developed.

Associate Transportation Planner Drew Redman noted that there are no TMP requirements for buildings less than 30,000 square feet. Above that threshold there are some basic requirements that add up to 20 points; they include posting and distributing information, designating a transportation coordinator, and biannual reporting. For larger buildings of 50,000 square feet and above an additional 25 points is needed; those points can be garnered by selecting from additional items on the menu. The total points would be 45.

Typically, TMP-conditioned buildings involve office developments. Office developments of less than 30,000 square feet are exempt, but for those that exceed that threshold there are requirements in addition to the basic requirements because of the unique impacts office developments have on the transportation network; they include indicating line item parking costs in lease agreements, a ride matching service, a biennial survey aimed at determining the drive-alone rate, and establishing a performance goal of a 20 percent reduction in the drive-alone travel over a ten-year period.

Senior Transportation Planner Mike Ingram pointed out that all of the basic requirements are elements of the current code.

Mr. Redman said office developments of 50,000 square feet and above must choose an additional 25 points from the menu, making the total for office buildings 69 points.

Mr. Redman said four different criteria were utilized in developing the menu of options and the various points. He reviewed the criteria and points with the Commissioners. He pointed out

that the points given for membership in a TMA do not add up to 18, explaining that the value was given because of an observed improvement for those who are contracted with a TMA.

Mr. Redman said the Council pointed out that the proposal did not include an allowance for a new TMA service. One of the stipulations that the TMA be awarded points was that they had to have an average client drive-alone rate either equal to or below the area average. For instance, the downtown drive-alone rate is 61 percent and the average TransManage client averages 59 percent, thus is eligible for the 18 points. Any new TMA would come on the scene without an average client drive-alone rate, so consideration was given to looking at what the TMA potential might be over a two-year trial period; the experience of the staff and their affiliation with various organizations would be taken into account along with the mission statement, goals and strategic plan. The conclusion reached was that no more than nine points should be awarded to a new TMA for the trial period.

Commissioner Larrivee asked why an organization would elect to contract with a new TMA for nine points when they could get 18 points for contracting with TransManage instead. Mr. Redman said a property owner outside of the downtown area where TransManage does not currently operate could find it advantageous to contract with a new TMA. Commissioner Larrivee pointed out that by difference of the point differential, TransManage will serve as a virtual monopoly.

Commissioner Northey said she would be uncomfortable putting a damper on other organizations that might be interested in providing the service, which is the very thing the city would like to see encouraged. She said she would be inclined to give a new TMA the same points as an existing TMA and deal with the issue of effectiveness in a different way.

Commissioner Larrivee asked what happens if the effectiveness of a TMA decreases over time. Mr. Redman said that originally was accounted for by disallowing the points should the areawide drive-alone average exceed the TMA average. However, there is value in consistent service and if a TMA's output falls below the line it should be afforded at least a partial credit.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested devising a system under which the 18 points would be offered automatically and reduced if necessary based on performance over time. That would provide an incentive for folks to engage with a TMA.

Commissioner Simas said he could see no harm in offering the full 18 points for a new TMA and then giving them a reasonable timeframe, say 24 months, in which to show their effectiveness and develop a track record. Mr. Miller said that would be tantamount to offering all new employees at a company the level of pay as the CEO until they prove they are not worth it, at which time their pay would go down.

Mr. Redman said one of the stakeholder comments for the October 5 Council presentation was from the BDA seeking an increase in the number of points assigned to TransManage for the service it provides. Staff took another look at the criteria used to develop the points and

suggested that no increase be given. The BDA also proposed adding a menu item awarding points for providing a tenant roster for contact information. Staff agrees that the addition to the menu would be suitable and should be given two points.

Mr. Redman said Kemper Development Company (KDC) also offered a number of comments on October 5. Among other things, they suggested that the 20 percent drive-alone goal is not achievable. He said staff's research indicates the goal is in fact achievable and is reasonable, and the recommendation is not to change it. Another comment made by KDC was that changing the financial incentive from \$15, as it is in the current code, to 20 percent of the monthly parking rate is a substantial increase, especially for the buildings in the downtown that have expensive parking. Staff's analysis indicates that currently the average incentive is actually more than 20 percent of the monthly parking costs in the downtown and no change to the current approach is recommended.

With regard to the suggestion made by KDC that there should be a sunset provision of less than the life of the building for implementing the TMP, Mr. Redman said staff recognizes the ongoing burden for property owners, especially long-term property owners. At the same time, it must be recognized that there are ongoing impacts that occur over the life of the building. Accordingly, a sunset provision would not be reasonable.

Mr. Redman said staff concurs with the comment from KDC that achieving a 70 percent response rate for employee surveys is difficult to achieve. The fact is 70 percent is needed to be statistically accurate and mirrors the Commute Trip Reduction law. The city will, however, accept less. The current code states that for responses of less than 70 percent the difference is to be counted as drive-alone employees. Staff does not believe that is particularly reasonable and is recommending removal of that provision from the code.

Commissioner Northey agreed with KDC and said a 70 percent response rate is unreasonably high.

Mr. Ingram pointed out that buildings with multiple tenants can experience wide-ranging performance differences between the tenants; there could be a lot of representation from one tenant and very little from another. Participation with the surveys revolves heavily around what is communicated in a given workplace. Staff believes that the higher response rate is appropriate.

Responding to the comment made by KDC that setting aside parking spaces ahead of the demand might be wasteful, Mr. Redman said staff recognizes that parking operations are very dynamic in a building, and that the current transit service in place will not fulfill the drive-alone goals. A reasonable setting aside of carpool and vanpool spaces is necessary to make up the gap. He said staff was not recommending a change to that provision.

Mr. Ingram stressed that the parking spaces do not need to be set aside if the developer does not want the points.

Mr. Redman noted that the KDC also asked why the guaranteed ride home element is not subject to the availability of a city-sponsored program. He reminded the Commissioners that a number of alternatives were investigated when developing the TMP code, one of which involved a minimal change to the code under which the city would make available a city-sponsored program. Staff recognizes that it is very difficult for property owners to facilitate such a program; it is more of an employer-facilitated program. Accordingly, staff believes it should be an optional provision and not a requirement. If a property owner chooses the menu options to offer a guaranteed ride home program, it should not be funded by the city.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Northey, Mr. Redman explained that the current code calls for a 35 percent reduction in the drive-alone rate per building. A survey done a year after occupancy establishes the baseline from which to measure, and the required percent reduction is expected to occur within ten years. If the baseline drive-alone rate for a building is determined to be 80 percent, the code calls for reducing the 80 percent by 20 percent within ten years. Commissioner Northey suggested that a building having an excellent modesplit should not necessarily be held to the same reduction percentage as a building that starts out with a very high drive-alone rate. Mr. Redman said the fact that the code calls for a percentage reduction of a percentage baseline accounts for that to some extent; those who start with a higher drive-alone rate will need to facilitate a much greater reduction.

Mr. Redman noted that Wright Runstad offered a comment to the Council on October 5 regarding modifications to create a financial incentive for developers to implement an effective TMP. He said staff previously discussed the issue with the Commission quite extensively and concluded that the issue should be addressed through the impact fee code.

Commissioner Simas asked if anyone has compared how well the TransManage buildings do when compared against buildings in general. Mr. Redman said that comparison has been made. Commissioner Simas suggested the city should offer as much incentive as possible to join a TMA by giving more points for the practice, especially if the end result is better performing buildings.

Commissioner Northey pointed out that if TransManage would add more services, their members would be able to get the seven extra points the organization wants.

Commissioner Simas said he assumed that there are costs associated with membership in TransManage and adding more services could increase the cost. Of course, if the company can offer more points to the table by offering more services, it might be worthwhile. Mr. Redman said the criteria established to determine points were well thought out and fairly applied. He agreed with the statement of Commissioner Northey that by adding services TransManage could increase its point value. To change the point allowance without adding services would require coming up with different criteria or different ways to apply them, and that would neither be fair nor reasonable.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested that to the extent a TMA can demonstrate its effectiveness, the point system could be tied in some way to the increase in effectiveness. If creative solutions were unveiled that resulted in even fewer drive-alone employees than required, the current rating system would not allow any additional points. If more is achieved, more points should be permitted. Mr. Redman referred to the materials in the Commission packet and the attachments to the menu of options and pointed out that in fact the points are tied to performance. If a property demonstrates that it has met its target performance goal, it can reduce the number of points it is required to meet. By the same token, if they do not meet their targets they must add five points.

Commissioner Simas commented that if a building has its number of required points reduced by demonstrating excellent performance, then in effect the building can do less. By giving additional points for exceeding the goals, the property manager will be driven in the direction of continual improvement.

Commissioner Northey said the Commission from the beginning has wanted the program to be incentive based. She said while things have moved in that direction, it is still not there.

Commissioner Jokinen asked how many fewer trips per day the two percent reduction in the number of drive-alone trips for buildings allied with TransManage translates to compare to the average in the downtown. Mr. Redman said he did not have an answer to that question. Commissioner Jokinen suggested that a two percent reduction would not translate into all that many fewer trips for the downtown as a whole.

Commissioner Glass asked how many total points are available to buildings in the downtown that are required to have 69 points. Mr. Redman said the total available is 125.

Motion to approve the staff recommendation as outlined in Attachment 1 was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Northey.

Commissioner Simas asked what the average monthly parking cost is in the downtown. Mr. Ingram said the proposed menu item structures the points as being available if an incentive is provided to non drive-alone commuters equal to at least 20 percent of the value of monthly parking. If the monthly parking cost is \$180, 20 percent would be \$36. The current average subsidy stands at \$43.

Commissioner Larrivee pointed out that several of the specific items, depending on which way the Commission decides, could affect the menu of options. He proposed holding off any vote to approve the menu until the individual items are discussed.

Commissioner Glass withdrew his motion and Commissioner Northey her second to the motion.

Commissioner Glass disagreed with the position of staff relative to limiting the number of

points a new TMA could have.

Motion to change the number of points allowed for a new TMA from nine to 18, subject to a performance review after two years, following which if an average client drive-alone rate equal to or less than the current areawide average is not maintained the number of points allowed would drop to nine, was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Jokinen and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion to approve the staff recommendation relative to BDA comment #1 was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Northey.

Commissioner Larrivee encouraged reviewing at some future time the point system for TMAs and the opportunity or incentive to be granted even more points depending on their ability to achieve or exceed the goals. Reducing the number of points required does not build in an incentive for continuous improvement.

The motion carried unanimously.

Motion to approve the recommendation of staff relative to BDA comment #2 was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Jokinen and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion to approve the recommendation of staff relative to the KDC comment #3 was made by Commissioner Northey. Second was by Commissioner Larrivee and the motion carried unanimously.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Glass regarding KDC comment #4, Mr. Redman clarified that currently the code requires a flat rate and the proposal would change that to a percentage and make it an option.

Motion to approve the recommendation of staff relative to KDC comment #4 was made by Commissioner Northey. Second was by Commissioner Glass and the motion carried 5-1, with Commissioner Simas casting the vote against the motion.

Motion to approve the recommendation of staff relative to KDC comment #5 was made by Commissioner Northey. Second was by Commissioner Glass and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion to approve the recommendation of staff relative to KDC comment #6 was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Larrivee and the motion carried without dissent; Commissioners Larrivee and Simas abstained from voting.

Motion to approve the recommendation of staff relative to KDC comment #7 was made by Commissioner Northey. Second was by Commissioner Larrivee.

Mr. Redman pointed out that carpool and vanpool parking spots not filled after the peak morning period can be opened to regular parking.

The motion carried 4-2, with Commissioners Simas and Glass voting against the motion.

Motion to approve the recommendation of staff relative to KDC comment #8 was made by Commissioner Larrivee. Second was by Commissioner Northey and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion to approve the menu of options and their points as outlined in Attachment 1 and as amended by motion was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Northey and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Jokinen asked what penalties are associated with violating the ordinance. Mr. Redman said currently an assurance device is required to assure compliance.

B. Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) Transition Plan Development

Transportation ADA Coordinator Jen Benn said there are two key issues for the city to focus on. First, the law requires a self-evaluation report of programs, services, facilities, sidewalk and curb ramps. She said with that work done, the focus has shifted to the second key issue, which is the development of a transition plan.

When the ADA law was first enacted in the early 1990s, the city responded to the requirement by conducting a self-evaluation and performing a transition and mitigation plan to take care of certain issues. However, the law requires a sense of permanent improvement and so an update is being conducted. A citywide team has been formed to look at all the various aspects; Transportation is working on the public rights-of-way, the sidewalks and curb ramps specifically but is also part of the team looking at programs and services, some of which are offered by the Department of Transportation. Some implementation work has been done owing to the fact that the city folds ADA projects into all CIP projects to the effect that the system is constantly being improved.

Facilities is approaching their part of the work with a different focus. There are over 300 city-owned buildings and Facilities is phasing its work. Four buildings were selected for the initial phase: access to City Hall and three parks facilities. They did an inventory and created a report, then developed a transition plan. Currently they are about halfway through the implementation phase. Funding to conduct the inventory and evaluation work for the next phase has been identified and that work will be done in 2010.

Ms. Benn said the inventory work was completed under a partnership with the Federal Highway Administration, which created the technology, and King County Metro, which provided the funding for the staffing. Over the course of two months at a cost of less than

\$250,000 some 321 miles of sidewalk were inventoried.

With regard to curb ramps, Ms. Benn explained that there are a variety of elements that must be evaluated. A more low-tech approach was utilized that involved staff on bicycles visiting all 4000 locations to take readings and photograph each curb ramp; that process took about three months.

The result of the inventory work was a great deal of data which then had to be dealt with. The first step was to take hand measurements at various sidewalk locations and compare them against the high-tech readings for quality control purposes. A digital elevation model produced by the GIS group helped evaluate where the ADA standards could not be achieved by virtue of being technically infeasible owing to steep grades; more than 90 miles of sidewalk were thus excluded from the plan.

Staff also took a look at driveways. In older neighborhoods, the returns or flares on the sides of driveways create barriers. It was found that 70 percent of the sidewalks in the inventory that had ten percent or greater cross slopes were attributed to driveways. How that issue is dealt with in the transition plan will be very important.

Quite a lot of public outreach was conducted in accord with the ADA requirements. The disability community was engaged from the start where direction was received from focus groups, then toward the end of the process additional feedback was sought relative to setting priorities.

All of the information was drawn together and used as a foundation for the ranking process. The process produced three scores for block faces and curb ramps: an activity score that includes information about density of citizens with disabilities; an activity centers score that highlights retail and services establishments; and impedance score that determined how egregiously over the standards various elements were. It was found when the data was clumped together it broke in some natural ways making it easy to determine high, medium and low designations.

The ADA relative to transition plans requires jurisdictions to identify problems and explain how they are going to be fixed, on what schedule, and how they will be paid for. Taking the full list of projects and applying the types of corrective measures needed, the full package of projects has an estimated price tag of \$935 million in 2009 dollars.

Clearly the repairs cannot be made all at once, nor does the ADA expect that to happen. The purpose of the transition plan is to have an outline of how to achieve continued improvement in the systems over time.

Ms. Benn placed before the Commissioners five questions important to the framing of the plan and how to move forward with ADA implementation: 1) How can the city leverage existing CIP projects to advance ADA improvements; 2) How should corrective measures be

prioritized; 3) What should the annual financial target be; 4) How should the city utilize the transition plan in future CIP development; and 5) Should a CIP ADA implementation program be developed.

On the question of how to leverage existing CIP projects, Ms. Benn said staff has suggested the “if we’re in the area” approach. Recently a project was completed on NE 8th Street between 106th and 108th Avenue NE in which the roadway was widened by one lane and the sidewalk on the north side was rebuilt. A number of ADA nonstandard elements were identified in the area, and the sidewalk project fixed all of the elements associated with the north side of the street. One approach would have been to include all of the barrier elements on the south side while the crews were in the area, even though the south side of the roadway was not in the original scope of the project. That could, of course, have major cost implications: adding the south side of the NE 8th Street project would have added about \$155,000 to the total cost. The West Lake Sammamish Parkway corridor is five miles long and has few existing pedestrian facilities; it has only 14 ramps in the entire corridor and some small sidewalk segments, so addressing all of the barriers in the corridor would add only \$150,000 to the total project cost.

Cost impacts will vary on a project-by-project basis. The options are not to go beyond what is already being done, encourage project managers to look at situations on a project-by-project basis, and to aggressively work to mitigate all barriers associated with stand-alone CIP projects.

Ms. Benn said the recommendation of staff was to make it a best practice to incorporate ADA barrier fixes with stand-alone CIP projects and to recognize the cost perspective by giving consideration to putting a 20 percent construction cost limit on any project adds. That approach is consistent with what the courts have found in various ADA case rulings.

Commissioner Glass suggested that adding 20 percent to CIP project costs could mean having to remove or delay adopted CIP projects in order to come up with the funding. Ms. Benn allowed that incorporating ADA projects could have a potential impact on how much could be programmed in the CIP.

Commissioner Simas pointed out that the ADA projects will have to be addressed sooner or later, and all it would take is a single ADA lawsuit to make the city wish it had added to an existing CIP project.

Commissioner Simas asked who would be charged with making the final decision to add an ADA component to a particular CIP project. Ms. Benn said that will need to be worked out internally. Deputy Director David Berg said ultimately all CIP projects end up on the Commission’s plate. Final decisions are always made by the Council, but the Commission would be afforded the opportunity to pass on a recommendation.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested that in all cases the priority level of any proposed ADA project add to a CIP project should be taken into consideration.

With regard to how the barriers should be prioritized, Ms. Benn reminded the Commissioners that staff had presented to them one potential tiered scheme in October. The Transportation Action Team for ADA (TATADA) reviewed the suggestions of the Commission and developed a recommendation of its own. Their recommendation was to include the block faces associated with CIP projects; programming in all of the barriers for the transition plan but cycling back in any barriers that do not get done with CIP projects so they will not be lost; and looking at the TFP project list and include any barriers associated with them in the out list, prioritized by the activity and impedance scores in the self evaluation. The TATADA recommended following the model used for street maintenance in which there are five sidewalk districts in the city and the focus is on one district each year. Within the rankings it will be necessary to prioritize the high-high projects because the city will not be able to afford doing them all at once. The outreach efforts with the disability community highlighted three main issues that affect access: missing curb ramps, obstructions located in the middle of sidewalks, and three-quarter inch or greater heaves. All of that information will be used to help prioritize the list of top priority projects.

The TATADA recognizes that opportunities will present themselves over time and that there might be times when it will make sense to tackle projects outside their programmed cycle.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested that the inventory of ADA fixes has the likelihood of impacting the CIP process. Every time a project comes up for review it will be necessary to look beyond the project boundaries to see what ADA work needs to be done, and if there are issues identified the CIP project cost will raise accordingly.

Ms. Benn pointed out that ADA is already part of the project development process, so the question staff put to themselves was whether that is sufficient to address the goal, or if there should be a push to give ADA a bigger role in the broader plan development process. TATADA thought one option would be to leave unchanged the CIP development process in place that does not currently explicitly involve ADA. Another option would be to use ADA projects as a tiebreaker in deciding which projects should be placed above the funding line. A third option would be to make the ADA rankings part of the weighted scenarios utilized in prioritizing CIP projects. TATADA recognizes that ADA already has a role in project development and did not favor having the completed transition plan in any way directly influence the CIP development process. That said, as projects are scoped and cost estimates completed for CIP projects, a discussion of possible ADA add-ons will be included.

Turning to the question of whether or not the department should seek to establish a separate ADA implementation program, Ms. Benn reminded the Commissioners that in the last CIP update program WB-49 had its description and title changed to allow for addressing more than just curb ramps; the \$50,000 per year program now includes compliance on pedestrian rights-of-way related to citizen requests and other issues. TATADA does not believe a separate program should be instituted, though WB-49 could have its funding level bumped up. One option would be to ask for \$1 million per year specifically to address stand-alone ADA projects in order to make a real dent in the list. The recommendation, however, is to seek an increase in

the budget for WB-49. At the \$150,000 level the program would have enough to address citizen requests and to leverage other projects.

Ms. Benn reminded the Commission that the streets maintenance group in Utilities does the actual work for a lot of the ADA improvements. Increasing WB-49 would not address their resource needs.

Commissioner Northey commented that an increase of \$100,000 for WB-49 would not represent an increase sufficient to make much of a dent in the overall ADA list. Ms. Benn pointed out that the program is not the only one that addresses ADA fixes.

Commissioner Simas said his choice would be not to make any program changes given the current economic climate. The city is struggling to find money for all manner of worthy undertakings. ADA certainly is an important issue, but it is being addressed with the same dispatch that everything else is being addressed. When the city's revenue picture improves, more money could be put into ADA projects.

Chair Tanaka agreed. He said by definition ADA compliance is integrated into the design of all CIP projects. The current financial crisis will pass at some point, at which time more money could be put into ADA compliance. In the meantime holding the current line makes the most sense.

Mr. Miller observed that any recommendation to increase the WB-49 program would typically involve the Commission.

Finally, Ms. Benn addressed the issue of setting a financial target for ADA compliance. She noted that since the law requires a finance plan associated with the transition plan, having no financial target is not really an option. The city is working toward ADA compliance as part of the overlay program, and improvements are made as part of CIP projects; taken together, the city spends about \$1 million per year on ADA improvements. TATADA sees that as the base level bookend. Using the 20 percent of the CIP as a target along with what is reasonable and feasible, TATADA recommended a base-plus approach, or \$1 million plus the CIP project enhances to address ADA projects, plus an increase to the budget through WB-49.

Commissioner Simas said he could support taking that approach. Commissioner Glass concurred as well.

9. OLD BUSINESS – None
10. NEW BUSINESS – None
11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None
12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. July 9, 2009

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Simas and the motion carried without dissent; Commissioner Northey abstained from voting.

B. September 10, 2009

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

C. October 8, 2009

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 and AGENDA

The Commission reviewed the items scheduled for discussion at upcoming meetings.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Tanaka adjourned the meeting at 8:54 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

Date