

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES

November 13, 2008  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioners Kiel, Tanaka, Wendle

STAFF PRESENT: David Cieri, Goran Sparrman, Franz Loewenherz, Drew Redman, Mike Ingram, Kristi Oosterveen, Eric Miller, Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:36 p.m. by Chair Northey who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioners Kiel, Tanaka and Wendle, all of whom were excused.

3. STAFF REPORTS

Department of Transportation Director Goran Sparrman told the Commissioners that the City Council is working to develop the biannual budget for the city. He reminded them that there are two parts to the budget: the operating budget and the Capital Improvement Program. On the operating side, the only issue under consideration that will affect the transportation program is the conversion of a limited-term position to a full-time position in the signal shop. There are some 8000 street lights in the city, half of which are maintained by Puget Sound Energy and half of which are owned and maintained by the city.

The Council held a long and significant discussion on November 10 focused on the CIP, of which the transportation CIP makes up a significant part. One item discussed was an electric service reliability study. The Council wants the \$200,000 study included in the CIP, with the initial focus on the Downtown and Bel-Red areas; the study will need to be done in close partnership with Puget Sound Energy. Questions were asked about whether or not \$200,000 would be enough, and there were questions asked about looking at the entire system, which would cost significantly more.

Chair Northey asked why the study should be included in the transportation CIP. Mr. Sparrman explained that the city does not have an energy department or energy office, which large cities typically do. The closest fit in the current structure is transportation. The study will need to rely heavily on consultants.

Mr. Sparrman said another significant transportation CIP budget item is the proposed upgrade to the traffic computer system. The current system is very old, utilizes 80s technology, and is not expected to remain operational for very much longer. Staff has recommended an ambitious program that will bring in 21<sup>st</sup> Century technology. The program is both expensive and complex. There is community support for the effort. The Council expressed concerns regarding the total program cost of about \$5 million, primarily because it involves adding staff. Without taking on additional staff, the department will not be in a position to take on the project.

An additional \$2 million has been requested for additional intelligent transportation system applications. The basic investment will permit full communications between the traffic control center and the field locations, allowing for better traffic management. The additional funding will allow for the development of a weather station that would provide real-time weather information through sensors in the roadways; the public would have access to that information via the internet. The additional funding will also allow for streaming real-time traffic information to the public.

Mr. Sparrman said if the Council elects not to allocate the \$5 million, he will recommend against including the additional \$2 million, because the additional components require having the base system up and running.

With regard to the pedestrian/bicycle system program, Mr. Sparrman said the city receives a fair number of citizen comments, concerns and complaints about operational issues and how things fit together as a system. The department simply does not have the staffing necessary to deal with those kinds of things, and as a result staff is pulled off other projects to address acute issues. Issues that are not acute are put on a list which is getting fairly long. The budget request includes an additional FTE and some capital funds to focus on the non-motorized transportation system and making sure it is safe. The Council sees the benefit but is concerned about adding staff resources during difficult financial times.

Mr. Sparrman said some additional transportation demand management funding is also being requested. A state contribution is used to pay for most of the city's TDM program but the funding level is frozen. The Council has been asked for additional funding to allow the basic program to keep up with inflation. The request includes an additional \$150,000 to expand the TDM program citywide, setting the stage for future expansion of the program.

Returning to the statement that the current traffic computer system could crash, Commissioner Larrivee what would happen should that occur. Mr. Sparrman explained that in the event the central computer system were to lose control, all intersections would default to independent operation. All coordination efforts would be lost, and that would mean the loss of much of the theoretical capacity, especially during the peak periods when it is needed most. Staff does not anticipate the imminent demise of the current system, but is cognizant of the need to work toward replacement. The money available in hand is sufficient to replace the computers, but is not sufficient to add the potential benefits the additional upgrades can bring about.

Mr. Sparrman said the margin by which the voters approved Proposition 1 was unexpectedly large. By an equally large margin, the voters rejected Initiative 985 which would have opened the HOV lanes to all traffic during certain time periods. The votes on those two issues set the stage for how things will move forward in the future both regionally and locally. The work of the light rail best practices committee will be brought into play.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Sound Transit Phase II will likely be released toward the end of 2008. The comment period has been extended to allow for additional public input. The information in the document will be the basis for drawing conclusions about alignments and a myriad of other issues.

Mr. Sparrman said the Bel-Red study highlighted the need for the city to craft a financial strategy that shows how over time the city can implement the necessary transportation infrastructure. There is a lot of work under way to balance the transportation needs of the Bel-Red area with the rest of the city. As currently envisioned, the Bel-Red projects in the package total about \$260 million. The Council is continuing to review the projects on the list as well as all potential revenue sources. No decisions have been made, but the possibility of instigating a property tax increase is on the table for discussion. The Council has stated it wants to preserve the ability to have a supplemental CIP for other transportation projects.

Senior transportation planner Franz Loewenherz reminded the Commission that it took action on the ped-bike plan, which included the policy framework, the project lists, the network maps, and the project maps. On October 6 Commissioner Larrivee joined staff at the City Council meeting where the Planning Commission was directed to move forward with the Comprehensive Plan amendment process that will integrate the various elements into the overarching Comprehensive Plan document. Based on discussions with the Planning Commission on October 22, a number of minor editorial refinements were made to make the amendment language more consistent.

In addition to the minor edits, the Planning Commission raised two substantive issues: project prioritization, and the 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE corridor project. The Planning Commission expressed an interest in getting a better handle on the thought process that went into the deliberations that resulted in the prioritized project list. In response to that, staff prepared a report outlining the GIS-based methodology approach and the subsequent consideration of the CIP-adopted projects, the bike priority corridors, and the Neighborhood Sidewalk Program. Staff is proposing to retain the high, medium and low ranking column in the Comprehensive Plan and to make reference to the supporting documentation to be housed in the functional plan document. There was talk at the Planning Commission about possibly eliminating the priority ranking altogether from the Comprehensive Plan and retaining it only in the functional plan, which is not what staff is recommending.

With regard to the 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE project, Mr. Loewenherz said there was public testimony before the Planning Commission and an interest on the part of the Planning Commissioners to receive additional information in the form of a field packet prior to the November 19 public hearing. Staff has generated that information and provided it to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission wanted to see some additional flexibility in the language of the project description. Staff has not proposed any amendments to the language, but recognizes that by eliminating the specific reference to a five-foot-wide bike lane the final construction could entail a four-foot-wide bike lane, which in the specific environment would be consistent with ASHTO guidance.

Answering a question asked by Chair Northey, Mr. Loewenherz said in the 1993 and 1999 ped-bike plans the project prioritizations were reflected in the Comprehensive Plan itself.

Commissioner Larrivee asked why the Planning Commission wanted to break with tradition and include the project prioritization only in the functional plan. Mr. Loewenherz explained that at the time the Planning Commission did not have a firm handle on the lengthy process

undertaken by the Transportation Commission to prioritize the project list. The process was described in general, and the report subsequently forwarded to them goes into much more detail. The Planning Commission did conclude that had they been involved in the process they would have ended up with different priorities. Staff wants to see the prioritization remain in both documents.

Chair Northey said in her opinion the Planning Commission has not been charged with prioritizing the project list. Mr. Loewenherz said the Planning Commission is the official keeper of the Comprehensive Plan and has a strong interest in fully understanding what goes into the mix before they put their recommendation on it. Hopefully the document provided them subsequent to their discussion will give them the foundation they need to understand the work of the Transportation Commission.

Commissioner Glass pointed out that the Transportation Commission spent a fair amount of time on the prioritization process and in developing a recommendation. He said he could see no reason to break with tradition and house the prioritization in the functional plan only and not in the Comprehensive Plan.

It was agreed that Chair Northey and Commissioners Larrivee and Simas would attend the November 19 public hearing before the Planning Commission. It was also agreed that Chair Northey should make direct contact with Commissioner Orrico of the Planning Commission to explain the position of the Transportation Commission prior to the public hearing.

With regard to the 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE project, Chair Northey said it was unclear to her what role the Planning Commission has in establishing a project description for a transportation project. She said it was her understanding all along that the matter would be going to the City Council for resolution. The recommendation of the Transportation Commission should go directly to the Council along with the caveat that there is a community controversy regarding the project.

Commissioner Larrivee said he would concur with the effort to add flexibility to the language that would allow for a design that would achieve the desired goal without being proscriptive. He voiced concern, however, with the language addressing north/south bicycle mobility along the corridor, calling it too weak and vague. He said the desire of the Transportation Commission is to actively support achieving bicycle mobility in the corridor. Language that better captures the intent should be found.

Mr. Loewenherz explained that the language was drafted by staff in response to the sentiment that there is a need to provide for additional flexibility. He added that the Planning Commission has absolute authority when it comes to the Comprehensive Plan amendment process, and the ped-bike plan is a part of the Comprehensive Plan. He allowed, however, that he was not aware of the Planning Commission in the past acting to modify project description language.

Commissioner Simas said he would like to have the Planning Commission's authority to change the language of transportation project descriptions more fully explained. Mr. Cieri agreed to get back to the Commission on that issue.

Commissioner Glass agreed that that the language was somewhat watered down. He said he thought the plan included wording that talked about being context sensitive to the neighborhoods and the fact that all projects would go through a stakeholder process. Neither Commission is ultimately charged with designing projects. He said he did not disagree with

the language but felt it could be expanded. In some respects, a process of elimination was used to come up with the recommendation for 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Mr. Loewenherz said that information was shared with the Planning Commission.

Chair Northey asked staff to modify the speaking points to better reflect the position of the Transportation Commission.

Commissioner Larrivee asked what the Planning Commission had to say about policy PB-2. Mr. Loewenherz said they directed staff to refine the language of the introduction section to allow for additional flexibility and to acknowledge the ambitious nature of the goal. The Planning Commission wanted it clear that the city would not be setting itself up for sanctions in the event the goal is not achieved. Some of the dates reflected in the policy were also modified to acknowledge that currently the city does not have a ped-bike count methodology in place. Both the Council on October 6 and the Planning Commission thought it would be a good idea to include targets, however.

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

5. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Larrivee said he attended the November 12 SR-520 public meeting focused on the issue of tolls. He commented that a lot of good information and updates can be found on the website [build520.org](http://build520.org).

6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Steve Nolan, with Transportation Solutions, Inc, 8250 165<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Redmond, spoke on behalf of Wright Runstad. He said his firm has been monitoring and participating in the transportation management plan process. During the workshop questions were raised about the lack of a direct connection between the trip impact reductions and what developers would receive in terms of credits toward the calculation of concurrency and impact fees. He recommended making a direct connection between TMP's and the expected trip impact reductions, and the actual impact that is modeled for concurrency, and the impact fees developers must pay. That would change the focus from a burden placed on a building owner, for which they have received no credit, to something where they would have a real financial incentive to be successful in reducing impacts. There would essentially be an agreement between the developers and the city under which if the reductions are not achieved there would be a monetary payment required.

Mr. Norm Hansen, a resident of Bridle Trails, pointed out that part of the NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street walkway project has been accomplished. The community originally requested the project in 1993. In 2006 the project was made part of the Neighborhood Enhancement Program and it received a substantial portion of the available funding. When it came time to construct the project, however, costs had increased and the NEP funding was insufficient. He asked the Commission to make the project a higher priority in the CIP. The walkway will serve Bridle Trails State Park and nearby residential developments and will improve safety. The speed limit along NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street is 35 miles per hour, which makes the roadway unsafe for jogging and walking.

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion to add a discussion of the Commission retreat under Old Business and to approve the agenda as amended was made by Commissioner Larrivee. Second was by Commissioner Simas and the motion carried unanimously.

## 8. STUDY SESSION

### A. Transportation Management Program (TDM) Code Update

Senior Transportation Planner Mike Ingram explained that the Transportation Demand Management Program involves increasing the efficiency of the transportation system by shifting a portion of travel away from drive-alone modes and peak hours when the system is under the most stress. The program focuses heavily on commute trips because they occur day in and day out and often at peak hours.

There are three areas of focus for the TDM program. The first is the Commute Trip Reduction program, which takes a regulatory approach and impacts large work places. The program is a state requirement that applies to Bellevue and other urban areas. Of 140,000 employees in Bellevue, about 30,000 work at sites affected by the CTR legislation.

The second program is specifically focused on the downtown area. The Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center plan looks at ways to encourage trip reduction among the 36,000 workers and 5000 residents in the downtown.

The Transportation Management Program (TMP) is the third TDM program. It is focused on large real estate developments and the conditions attached to their permitting that require them to take certain steps to mitigate the impacts of their developments on the transportation system.

Mr. Ingram noted that observations of current conditions were shared with the Commission in March. Then in September staff returned to the Commission to share the initial structure of alternatives for updating the current regulations relating to transportation management plans. A public workshop was held in October at which input from the development community was received. The next step will be to forward a recommendation to the City Council.

Associate Transportation Planner Drew Redman noted that in 2005 there was a considerable gap between the measured non-drive alone modeshare and the goal for the downtown and Eastgate areas. In the downtown there are 11,000 employees working for small employers in TMP-affected buildings; those are commuters who are not otherwise affected by CTR requirements. There are 43 TMP affected developments currently, but the expectation is there will be 22 additional developments in the next few years that will be affected by the TMP legislation. TMPs are expected to affect in some way a majority of the transportation impacts of those new developments, specifically 72 percent of the vehicle trips and 77 percent of the vehicle miles traveled.

Compliance with TMPs is fairly low at 65 percent. What has been seen to improve those numbers is membership in the transportation management association TransManage, which is a service of the Bellevue Downtown Association. Membership increases the average compliance to 75 percent. Some of the programmatic requirements such as the guaranteed ride home program and transit pass subsidies are difficult for property owners to implement on site. The drive-alone reduction goals have also proven to be difficult to accomplish.

Mr. Redman said presentations have been given to King County Metro, TransManage, the Transportation Commission, and staff in the Planning and Community Development and Development Services Departments. Four alternatives have been developed. A fifth alternative, which envisioned removal of the code, has been scratched from the options list because the comprehensive plan mentions TMPs as a TDM measure and the downtown TDM plan explicitly states the use of TMPs to mitigate traffic impacts.

The first alternative is no action. The current code addresses about half of the currently proposed develop and a majority of the transportation impacts expected with that development.

The second alternative involves a minimal code update to address lessons learned. Instead of having an overlay of additional requirements apply only in the downtown, consistent citywide requirements would be implemented. The current \$15 per month incentive for non drive alone commuters is not tied directly to the actual cost of parking; the suggestion is to change the fee to 20 percent of the cost of the monthly parking rate. The drive alone reduction goal is 35 percent over a ten-year period with no specific incremental targets. The proposal would change that to a 20 percent reduction with specific two-year targets and a good faith clause.

The third alternative includes the minimal updates of the second alternative but adds a number of best practices that have been seen locally and nationally, including a credit towards the performance goal for the TMA membership. Showers and lockers would be required. Buildings that are performing well would not be required to produce biannual reports. Buildings not meeting their goals would have to increase the level of incentives.

The fourth alternative involves a code update and a flexible menu of options incorporating best practices that match site-specific conditions. The property owner would be free to pick and choose from the menu in addition to some base requirements based on a point system.

Mr. Ingram clarified that the thresholds in terms of size of building and the number of points required are based on the current requirements.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Larrivee, Mr. Redman said the base requirements are those which are deemed to be fundamental to the program. They are in the current code and typically are required across all land use types. The options typically apply only to certain types of buildings, such as office buildings.

Mr. Redman said the alternatives were presented in a couple of workshops and in an online report. There was also some press coverage. The feedback highlighted the disconnect between the trips reduced through TMPs and the transportation impact fees. The problem there is that there is a lack of data linking each element of a TMP requirement to the number of reduced trips. Mr. Ingram added that there has been concern at the staff level that if breaks or reductions in the impact fee were provided at the front end there would need to be a mechanism in place for collecting the fees downstream if the targets are not reached, particularly if a property were to change hands.

Feedback in the workshops included mention of the disconnect between the supply of parking and TMPs and whether or not a parking credit could be applied to reduce the required parking ratios.

Answering a question asked by Chair Northey, Mr. Redman said the alternatives include a financial penalty for building owners who do not demonstrate good faith efforts in attempting

to meet the performance goals. Those who can demonstrate they have in good faith attempted to meet the performance goals could be off the hook for financial penalties. Chair Northey asked if there would be stronger language for monitoring and enforcement for those who do not show good faith, and Mr. Ingram said the language is not the problem. The issue has been determining who in the city is responsible for monitoring and enforcement. The language allows for revising implementation plans where there is a failure to meet the performance goals. Chair Northey said that does not appear to be much of a penalty. The recommendation should include a call for additional staff focus. Mr. Ingram said the proposed reporting processes and tracking mechanisms will facilitate monitoring over time in an efficient manner.

Mr. Redman said the recommendation of staff is for Alternative 4. It provides flexibility for property owners as well as the city to enforce performance; allows flexibility to update the menu of options without requiring a complete code change; and adds consistency to practices both regionally and nationally.

Commissioner Glass asked what the reporting requirements are currently and how they are handled. Mr. Redman said the first reporting was done in the winter of 2007. The requirements for each building were reviewed and outlined in a report, then they were sent to the property managers who were asked to indicate how well the requirements were being fulfilled. That exercise determined the 65 percent compliance figure.

Commissioner Glass suggested that if the city were to provide more of a carrot from the onset it may be possible to do a much better job of reaching the goals. The current approach does little more than encourage getting by through fulfilling the minimum requirements. If a developer could see that by complying he could save a lot of money on impact fees, compliance would be much higher. Mr. Ingram suggested that Alternative 4 allows the flexibility for a property manager or building owner to craft a program that meshes with their vision for their building. If they are not meeting their performance points, the city can ratchet up the number of points to some ultimate maximum; conversely, if they are reaching their performance goals, the number of required points can be scaled back.

Commissioner Glass pointed out that when a developer steps forward with a plan to construct a new building, when they seek a building permit the city will figure out the total number of trips and levy impact fees and the like accordingly. Then when the project is done, the building owner will be slapped with rules requiring them to do certain things to reduce their total number of trips, which they paid for in impact fees. The two efforts do not seem to be joined in any way.

Chair Northey suggested that the parking minimums might be a less complicated way to get there and might raise fewer hackles. She agreed that the city should be providing incentives, allowing the private sector to be creative and reducing the need to legislate.

Commissioner Glass said he was not supportive of the proposed program because there is no real benefit for the property owner. Mr. Redman allowed that while there may not be a direct benefit, the indirect benefit is an improvement to the overall transportation system, which allows customers and clients better access to the buildings.

Commissioner Glass asked what it costs to be a member of the TMA. Mr. Redman said it costs \$14.25 per employee per year.

Commissioner Glass asked how the program currently affects shopping centers such as

Bellevue Square and how it would affect them in the future. Mr. Redman explained that Bellevue Square is not currently affected but voluntarily provides a \$15 transit pass incentive to its employees. The current code asks downtown office buildings to include a line item cost for parking in each tenant lease agreement, and the parking fee is supposed to be greater than the cost of a two-zone Metro pass. However, office buildings are the only land use affected by that provision, and the proposed approach would not change that.

Commissioner Simas asked if an analysis has been done of the buildings that met their targets and the ones that did not to see if there are any differentials. Mr. Redman said the problem is none of the building owners have the same performance goals. Some buildings were conditioned in the 1980s when the primary focus was on preventing parking spillover to adjacent buildings. Other buildings have a designated level of carpooling or vanpooling as their condition. Newer buildings are required to have higher levels of transit use because transit service in the downtown has improved.

Commissioner Simas asked if all downtown buildings could be required to be on the same program with the same conditions. Mr. Redman said there is no legal constraint preventing that approach. He suggested the issue is more one of cost versus benefit and the staff time involved in developing agreements, along with monitoring and enforcement.

Commissioner Simas said his preference would also be for incentives over punishments as the way to achieve the goals.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested that having only four out of thirteen buildings meeting their performance goals is a pretty poor success rate. Furthermore, even those buildings that are having success may only have requirements that are not relevant anymore.

Commissioner Larrivee asked if separate developments can elect to work together to achieve trip reductions, similar to the notion of transferring development rights. He said he appreciated Alternative 4 and the flexibility of having a list of options from which to choose. However, by definition the approach restrains the full spectrum of opportunities; a free market of ideas would allow for more creative solutions. He suggested the comment offered by Mr. Nolan should be considered as an incentive for developers to get creative. He allowed that a lack of enforcement on the part of the city is one reason the program has not been effective, but suggested that is not the only reason.

Commissioner Larrivee also said he was disappointed that the stakeholder involvement has been fairly limited. The actual businesses and employees who will ultimately have to buy into the programs represent the biggest group of stakeholders, but it appears there has not been any input from them.

Capital Programming Implementation Manager Eric Miller informed the Commissioners that there are some adjustments to the fee rates built into the impact fee schedule for different building sizes. The larger the building in terms of square footage, the lower the fee rate, largely because of the prevalence of carpooling and improved transit service. For the downtown, there is also a trip rate reduction applied because they are better served by transit. As the Bel-Red area develops, it will have better transit service, and the trip rates for the impact fee program could be adjusted there accordingly.

Commissioner Glass suggested a fifth alternative could be created by adding to Alternative 4 some developer incentives tied to impact fee reductions. He allowed that the city is creative

enough to think of ways to collect the money. One way would be to require a performance bond in lieu of the total fee which could be refunded after a period of time if the performance measures are met. For older buildings, a different way would need to be found for collecting the money.

Commissioner Simas pointed out that many of the best practices involve one-time actions, such as installing showers or bike racks. Once those things are done, they do not have to be done again, so in essence the requirements make it easier for property owners to meet the standards. The city should encourage developers to include those types of amenities; over time they will be used, though possibly not in the short term to the same degree. Mr. Nolan's proposal to create an incentive should be incorporated. Additionally, to the extent possible the same measurements for all buildings involved in the program should be used.

Chair Northey asked staff to shape the suggestions of the Commissioners into additional alternatives to be considered.

**\*\*BREAK\*\***

#### B. CIP/TFP Pedestrian and Bicycle Project Priorities

Management Policy Analyst Kristi Oosterveen explained the steps taken by staff to prioritize the pedestrian and bicycle projects. In accord with direction received from the Commission, the staff list roughly splits the allocations equally between the priority bicycle corridors and the high priority pedestrian facilities. Staff visited the sites and held roundtable discussions, and the factors used in coming up with a list were feasibility, the potential for combining planned pedestrian and bicycle elements to complete corridor segments, and opportunities for partnering with or leveraging other transportation capital programs. The result was a list of 15 projects.

Ms. Oosterveen said the first staff-recommended project is on SE 16th Street between 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE and 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE. She said it would complete the eastern half of the Lake-to-Lake Trail and would complete the neighborhood sidewalk segment between 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 154th Avenue NE. The project has an estimated cost of \$3.8 million.

The second project is the corridor along 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue from NE 18<sup>th</sup> Street to SE 14<sup>th</sup> Street. The estimated cost for the is \$7.4 million. The project does not have a sidewalk component, but would include intersection improvements at Northup Way and NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street. There is the potential for a sharrow project in 2009 following the review of the pilot project on 161<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE.

Chair Northey voiced concern that widening for bicycle lanes but not sidewalks could be problematic given that it is a main route between the neighborhoods and Crossroads. She said she would not support a bicycle project that would preclude a sidewalk project. One option would be to give up parking on the east side of the street to accommodate a sidewalk.

Mr. Miller said the project was ranked high by staff because it helps to complete the north/south bicycle corridor.

The third project involves 123<sup>rd</sup> Avenue SE from SE 60<sup>th</sup> to SE 64<sup>th</sup> Place in Newport Hills. It includes a curb, gutter and six-foot sidewalk on the west side of the street where there are gaps. A street overlay is planned for 2010 and the sidewalk project could partner with it. The

estimated cost is just less than \$1.1 million.

The fourth project is on 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE from SE 44<sup>th</sup> Street to SE 46<sup>th</sup> Street where there is also a street overlay project planned for 2010. The area is one which receives a lot of NEP requests. The estimated cost is also just less than \$1.1 million.

The fifth project is on 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE between SE 60<sup>th</sup> Street and Newcastle Way where there is yet another street overlay project planned for 2010 along with a potential traffic calming project. The estimated project cost is \$1.3 million.

The sixth project is on 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE from NE 12<sup>th</sup> Street and Main Street. The project would supplement a larger ongoing project in the corridor and would complete a portion of the NS-1 connection in combination with projects 13 and 14 from the staff list. The project also would complete one of the priority bicycle corridors through the downtown area. The estimated cost for the entire project is just over \$6 million, but the bicycle lanes segment is approximately \$1.75 million.

Answering a question asked by Chair Northey, Deputy Director Dave Berg said if a light rail alignment running on the surface along 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is chosen, the proposed project will not interfere.

Continuing, Ms. Oosterveen said project seven is on 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE from south of SR-520 to NE 12<sup>th</sup> Street. She said the project in its original configuration was much larger and ran from the north city limits to NE 6<sup>th</sup> Street, over to 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and then down to SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, and it carried a substantial price tag. The proposed project will complete a segment of NS-2, which is the Lake Washington Loop Trail. The estimated cost of \$3.7 million includes the bicycle lanes, widening the turn pockets at NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street, and a portion of connecting sidewalk on the west side of the road.

The eighth project involves SE 7<sup>th</sup> Place from the Lake Hills Connector to the cul-de-sacs. A street overlay project is planned for 2009. Because of the presence of a floodplain, however, it may be necessary to construct a boardwalk rather than a sidewalk. The estimated cost estimate is \$1.3 million.

Project nine lies along NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street from 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to the 14500 block. It has a cost estimate of \$1.8 million and would include a curb, gutter and sidewalk or meandering path on the north side.

Project ten is along 130<sup>th</sup> Place/Avenue SE from Newport Way to SE 47<sup>th</sup> Place in Factoria. The project would complete the sidewalk on the east side of the street where it is missing. A portion of the project was recently funded through the NEP program, but the portion not yet funded is the more expensive portion. The cost estimate is a little more than \$1.5 million.

Project 11 is on 173<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE from Northup Way to the north city limits. The project has been around in the NEP process for some time. The estimated cost is \$1.36 million.

Project 12 is on Main Street from Bellevue Way to 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. The project is currently in pre-design looking at pedestrian and bicycle facilities along Main Street. The project would complete a good portion of the west side of the Lake-to-Lake Trail and provide an east/west priority bicycle corridor through the downtown. The recommendation of staff is to include some placeholder funding to supplement what comes out of the pre-design process.

Project 13 involves 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE from NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street to NE 12<sup>th</sup> Street. The project is linked with project six and includes a sidewalk and a wide bicycle shoulder on both sides of the street. The project could be a candidate for sharrows following completion of the pilot project. The estimated cost is \$2.35 million.

Project 14 is on NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street from 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. The project would complete the last segment of NS-1 in conjunction with projects six and 13. The project involves constructing a wide bike shoulder on both sides of the street. The estimated project cost is \$1.5 million.

Project 15 runs along 123<sup>rd</sup> Avenue SE from SE 20<sup>th</sup> Street to SE 26<sup>th</sup> Street. A portion of the project ties into a planned street overlay project in 2010. The estimated project cost is \$950,000.

Ms. Oosterveen said not on the list is a project on SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street from 114<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE to the Lake Hills Connector. Staff looked into the project at the direction of the Commission and concluded that there are some constructability issues with the project as proposed in the ped-bike plan. There are issues with rights-of-way and with wetlands. More coordination is needed with other agencies and departments, including Parks and the Washington State Department of Transportation, to gain more understanding of what would need to be done.

Commissioner Larrivee asked what the plans are for the trestle under the plan to convert the BNSF corridor to a trail use. Ms. Oosterveen said there is no concrete plan as yet.

Mr. Miller clarified that the 15 projects, if they are funded at all, will be funded through the supplemental CIP process; whatever does not get funded through that process will be added to the TFP for future discussions.

Commissioner Glass asked if Eastgate has resisted annexation or if the city simply has not gotten around to it. Mr. Miller said some of both has been involved. There are a lot of issues involved, particularly where infrastructure is involved. If the city takes on the area, it will be taking on a lot of issues. Commissioner Glass suggested that project four is a good project but would entail spending Bellevue dollars on an area that is not in the city limits. Mr. Miller said there are only one or two parcel frontages that are outside the city limits which, if not included, would leave a gap; that is why they were included.

Commissioner Glass said the project in the Bridle Trails area that was addressed by Mr. Hanson should be ranked higher for all the reasons mentioned. He added that even though project eight includes a tie to the overlay program, he would rank it somewhat lower as a priority. Projects six, 12 and 13 should be raised in priority. Project seven could be placed lower on the list.

Chair Northey concurred, saying she would rank project seven significantly lower. If widening I-405 will mean several of the projects will not be viable, they should not be shown with such high priority status. She said \$3.7 million is a lot to tie up on a project that might not ever be a full north/south corridor.

With regard to project two, Chair Northey said one option would be to eliminate the on-street parking and provide a sidewalk on the east side. Another would be to transfer the funding from the project to the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project, which is a much more

dangerous place to ride a bike. Those who are willing to ride in the road can do so relatively safely on 164<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE over riding along the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project. A lot could be done to move the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project forward with an infusion of \$7 million. She said she would put the money from project seven into the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project as well.

Commissioner Glass agreed. He noted that the city is continually setting aside relatively small placeholders but never seems to save up enough money to do a section of the West Lake Sammamish Parkway.

Mr. Miller said the total West Lake Sammamish Parkway project cost is \$36 million and said there is just over \$6.5 million in the CIP. Chair Northey pointed out that adding \$15 million from projects two and seven to that would mean over half the project could be funded, possibly more if matching dollars could be found.

Commissioner Larrivee did not agree with the notion of putting the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project at the top of the list and allocating money to it. He pointed out that the Commission in a previous meeting had a discussion about completing a couple of the north/south corridors and concluded that NS-5 presented a very real opportunity to see that done in a fairly short timeframe. He said he could understand the desire to invest in the West Lake Sammamish Parkway, but suggested it will be a while before that can be achieved. To allocate funds to the West Lake Sammamish Parkway would be to backtrack significantly from the earlier decisions. He commended staff in coming up with a their list of projects and said he would support it.

Chair Northey suggested that with a new administration in Washington, D.C., getting the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project done relatively quickly cannot be ruled out, especially if the city chooses to put money into it. There have been years of effort put into building a consensus, and means the project is much further along than the other corridor projects.

Commissioner Glass pointed out that West Lake Sammamish Parkway is also a high priority north/south corridor and said the only way anything will ever get done there will be to start throwing money at it.

Commissioner Larrivee commented that the projects identified by staff offer greater equity in terms of distribution. The projects will serve more constituents across the city. Investing heavily in the West Lake Sammamish Parkway, which is on the margin of the city, will not offer as much return on the overall vision for the city as the staff proposal would.

Commissioner Glass said another option would be to split Project 2 into two projects, allowing the part that is tied to the overlay to take advantage of that timing. Money could also be taken from projects one and seven and added to West Lake Sammamish Parkway. That would still leave some money on the table to use in projects around the city to offer a greater degree of equity.

Chair Northey said she could support that approach, provided Project 2-A, the part associated with the overlay, were structured to eliminate on-street parking on the east side of the roadway. Commissioner Glass agreed.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Larrivee regarding Project 2, Mr. Miller agreed that because of the potential BROTS cost-sharing arrangement with Redmond the \$7.4 million

figure could be lower given all the discussions and negotiations yet to take place. Additionally, the incorporation of sharrows may also reduce the overall project cost. Ms. Oosterveen added that the cost of the intersection improvements at Northup Way and NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street figure heavily into the overall project cost. Eliminating those improvements entirely in favor of just creating a sharrow or bike shoulder would not yield a comfortable riding atmosphere for bicyclists.

Motion to strike Project 2 and put the funding into the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project was made by Chair Northey. Second was by Commissioner Simas.

Mr. Miller pointed out that it would be helpful to have Project 2 on the TFP list when it comes time to negotiate with Redmond.

Commissioner Glass said his preference would be to keep Project 2 on the list, but in the number ten position.

Chair Northey agreed to revise the motion to show West Lake Sammamish Parkway as Project 2 on the list at \$7.4 million, and to move the original Project 2 down to the number ten position and to show it also at \$7.4 million.

The motion as amended carried 3-1, with Commissioner Larrivee voting no.

Motion to swap the relative positions of Projects 7 and 9 was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Chair Northey and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion to approve the list of projects as amended was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Chair Northey.

Chair Northey asked Commissioner Glass to consider as a friendly amendment specifying \$1 million as a placeholder for the Main Street project. Commissioner Glass said he would be willing to earmark enough for the design but not more; he suggested \$500,000. He agreed to amend the motion accordingly.

Motion to amend the motion to reduce the funding for Project 2 to \$500,000 to fund a design study only was made by Chair Northey. Second was by Commissioner Simas. The motion failed 2-2 with Chair Northey and Commissioner Simas voting yes, and Commissioners Glass and Larrivee voting no.

Motion to amend the motion by removing Project 8 from the list was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Chair Northey. The motion failed 2-2 with Chair Northey and Commissioner Simas voting yes, and Commissioners Glass and Larrivee voting no.

The main motion carried 3-0. Commissioner Larrivee abstained from voting.

Mr. Miller pointed out that the next meeting of the Commission on December 11 is after the last meeting of the Council. He said it was too late to include anything in the Council packet for their November 17 meeting. The Council has regular sessions scheduled for December 1 and December 8. A transmittal memo from the Commission should be forwarded to the Council for inclusion in one of those meetings. The Council is not likely to act on the list until early in 2009.

It was agreed the transmittal should be in the December 8 Council packet.

C. Sharrow Pilot Project – Memo Only

9. OLD BUSINESS

Chair Northey reminded the Commissioners that she would be meeting with Mayor Degginger on November 14.

Commissioner Larrivee said one thing the Mayor could be asked is what the Commission's potential role will be in light of the passage of Proposition 1. There has been a consensus that some attention needs to be paid to transportation issues outside the downtown and the Bel-Red corridor, and the Commission's role in that should be clarified as well.

Commissioner Glass suggested there could be a better citywide transit plan or overall transportation plan, similar to the overall ped-bike plan.

Commissioner Larrivee agreed, adding that there should be some focus on more localized transit opportunities as well as public/private partnerships. It might be helpful to get guidance as to what the Council believes the Commission's role should be in assisting them in sorting through financing issues. There might also be an opportunity to have educational forums, and the Commission might be tasked with exploring some of the transportation initiatives in place in different communities that might be outside what traditionally has been implemented in Bellevue.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested it would be worthwhile asking the Mayor when the Commission's Council liaison will be back in action.

Commissioner Simas said his question would be what the role of the Transportation Commission will be over the next several years, given that funding for transportation projects will be limited. If the city finds a way to fund all the Bel-Red projects, there will still be a need to find another \$140 million or more for other projects. The Commission can sit around and prioritize projects endlessly, but if all the money is allocated to something else, the exercise will be pointless.

Commissioner Glass suggested mentioning to the Mayor the notion of expanding the model used in developing the light rail best practices to other projects.

10. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Miller asked the Commission to join him in congratulating Ms. Oosterveen on being appointed to management policy analyst. He said she would be focused on the city's emergency preparedness issues, and staff and organizational development for the department.

11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. June 26, 2008

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was

by Commissioner Larrivee and the motion carried unanimously.

B. September 11, 2008

Action to approve the minutes was not taken.

C. September 25, 2008

Action to approve the minutes was not taken.

13. REVIEW CALENDAR

A. Commission Calendar and Agenda

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

B. Public Involvement Calendar

The Commission review public involvement opportunities.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Northey adjourned the meeting at 10:50 p.m.

---

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

---

Date

---

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

---

Date