

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

April 24, 2008
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Vice Chair Northey, Commissioners Glass, Kiel, Larrivee

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Tanaka, Van Valkenburgh, Wendle

STAFF PRESENT: David Cieri, Goran Sparrman, Kevin O'Neill, Kevin McDonald, Franz Loewenherz, Jen Benn, Kristi Oosterveen, Eric Miller, Karen Gonzalez, Dave Berg, Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m. by Vice Chair Northey who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

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

3. STAFF REPORTS

Transportation CIP Construction Manager Dave Cieri welcomed new Commissioner Francois Larrivee.

Mr. Cieri reviewed the materials in the Commission desk packets.

Mr. Cieri informed the Commission that two major consultant contracts were approved by the City Council on April 21: one for the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project, and one for the 145th Place SE project.

Implementation Planning Manager Eric Miller reported that on April 14 the planning, transportation, parks and utilities departments briefed the Council on the Bel-Red finance plan. As part of the package of financing alternatives, impact fees was mentioned as probably a significant component. On April 28 the Council will be briefed with regard to impact fees as

they relate to the Bel-Red plan and as they relate to citywide funding strategies. The Council will be asked for direction on a couple of key questions, including whether or not staff should proceed with the development of a new simplified impact fee program, and whether or not staff should initiate a stakeholder engagement process associated with the impact fee program.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS – None
5. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS – None
6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Patrick McGrath with the Cascade Bicycle Club, 7400 Sandpoint Way NE, Seattle, said the group has about 9000 members, 500 of whom live in Bellevue. He thanked the Commission for the decision to include 140th Avenue NE north of NE 85th Street in the ped-bike plan. He said the young and the elderly are two underserved groups that use the transportation system. In places where it is difficult to walk and bike, those groups lose independence and have fewer options for improving their health. The 140th Avenue NE project does a fantastic job of serving those two groups; it will link with Ogle Middle School, Sammamish High School, Bellevue Community College, Stevenson Elementary and Rose Hill Elementary and Junior High.

Ms. Loretta Lopez, 13419 NE 33rd Lane, spoke as co-president of the Bridle Trails Community Club. She said the Club was surprised to see the proposal of the Commission to put bike lanes on both sides of 140th Avenue NE. The group has spent hours organizing and commenting on the ped-bike plan, beginning in September 2007. The 140th Avenue NE proposal was not in the original ped-bike plan, thus the citizens have not had an opportunity to comment on it. The Club had many meetings, organized a steering committee, and reviewed all of the ped-bike plan projects located within the Bridle Trails area. In order to build bike lanes on both sides of the roadway it will be necessary to destroy the walking path and a lot of vegetation, including trees. The community should be given the opportunity to comment on the new plan, particularly the major change to 140th Avenue NE. The Club does not believe 140th Avenue NE is a high priority, even using the city's criteria. The current multipurpose path has served the community well by providing a safe place for walking and children on their bicycles. The Club has a general meeting scheduled for May 22 and hopes it will have an official position and recommendation by the end of May. It would be a good idea for Commissioners to meet with members of the Club who live along 140th Avenue NE to gain a better understanding of the roadway and how well it works in its current configuration.

Ms. Claire Petersky, 1418 175th Place, offered her applause, affirmation and appreciation to the Commission for its decision to put bike lanes on both sides of 140th Avenue NE north of NE 85th Street. The intelligent move will help complete the bicycle grid in the city. The project will benefit the neighborhood as a whole. According to the Urban Land Institute, one of the best ways to increase property values is to have good bicycle facilities. The popsicle index is a

rating of how likely parents are to send their ten-year-olds to the corner store to buy a popsicle. Some neighborhoods score very low on that index because of concerns about crime. Bellevue has neighborhoods with low popsicle index scores, but the concern is about traffic safety. Every neighborhood in the city should have a high popsicle index, and the proposed 140th Avenue NE project will do that for Bridle Trails.

Mr. Jim Binder, 3010 142nd Place NE, said he is co-president of the Winchester Estates Homeowners Association, one of the largest organizations in the city. He asked the city to reevaluate its position to include bike lanes on both sides of 140th Avenue NE. There are 65 homes in the Winchester Estates development, each of which is on a shy-acre lot. The street as it is configured is very useful, and the residents like it. The multipurpose path is used frequently. Any change to the nature of 140th Avenue NE will make the roadway a magnet for more cut-through traffic. There are no through streets on either side of 140th Avenue NE to relieve any of the pressure.

Mr. Norm Hansen, 3851 136th Avenue NE, said the issue of preserving trees is very important to the Bridle Trails community. He noted that the overall goal of the Bridle Trails subarea plan is to protect and preserve the rural, equestrian and residential character of Bridle Trails. Rural areas do not have streets that look like those in urban areas, and that uniqueness should be preserved. In 1991 the city wanted to install a pathway right on the edge of the road, but the neighborhood held out for having a separation. The path works very well for the community and is very safe. Policy S-BT-35 calls for maintaining and improving the rural, tree-lined character of the through streets, including the arterials and collector arterials, by discourage the cutting of significant trees. The 140th Avenue NE project as outlined will change the character of the neighborhood, making it just like the higher density neighborhoods to the north. The Commission was asked to reconsider the project and allow time for the Bridle Trails Community Club to think it over and provide additional comment.

Mr. Dennis Neuzil, 2307 94th Avenue NE, Clyde Hill, said he has served for many years on the ped-bike committee of the Puget Sound Regional Council. He noted that the Puget Sound Regional Council is gearing up to revise the 2030 Destination Transportation Plan. He said he is also a member of the group preparing the Washington state ped-bike plan, which will be extensive. In both of the efforts it has become apparent that the suburbs is where the action is in terms of challenges and constraints. Those are the places where it is still possible to retrofit and do things for pedestrians and bicyclists before development makes it very difficult. The question most frequently asked is how many bicycles are using the systems that exist, but of course the same question could have been asked about trains crossing the plains before the tracks were built. The fact is facilities must be constructed before there will be a large demand. He praised the city for having the courage to develop an aggressive plan.

Commissioner Northey pointed out that because the 140th Avenue NE project was acted on by the Commission by vote, only someone who voted in favor of the motion can move to reconsider. She also noted that the schedule does not have the Commission adopting the final ped-bike plan until June 12, which should give the Bridle Trails Community Club sufficient

time to provide additional comments to the Commission.

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. Commission Attendance at Council Meetings

Commissioner Northey suggested the need to develop guidelines for Commission visits before the City Council, especially when called to testify on short notice.

Commissioner Glass said Commissioners should portray a unified message to the degree possible. Whenever the Commission knows in advance that a Commissioner has been asked to attend a Council meeting, the Commission should take a few minutes to solidify what should be said.

Commissioner Northey allowed that for the most part the Commission has taken that approach in the past. The Commission will benefit from having as much advance notice as possible.

Commissioner Northey agreed to give the Commission liaison Councilmember Balducci a call to express a desire to have advance notice.

Commissioner Glass pointed out that short-notice calls to appear before the Council do not occur often. Commissioner Larrivee suggested that when that happens the Commissioner should let the Council know that the Commission has not had a chance to meet and formulate a proper response.

B. Ongoing CIP Programs Overview Follow-Up

For the benefit of the new Commissioners, Mr. Miller explained that the ongoing CIP programs represent a significant component of the Transportation CIP; he said they total over \$9 million per year, which is more than 40 percent of the annual capital budget.

Mr. Miller said each program has been recently reviewed with the program managers. As a result of those reviews, 13 out of 16 of the programs will not include a recommendation for a change to their scope or budget. He noted that the Commission packets included a memo from Traffic Engineering Manager Mark Poch explaining the similarities and differences in the scope and intent of three programs: the Minor Capital Traffic Operations Program, known as M-2; the Signal Warrant Safety Program, known as I-84; and the Intelligent Transportation System Implementation Program, known as R-156.

Each of the programs is funded with an annual allocation of local capital dollars. However, the city often holds up the programs as appropriate for outside funding opportunities such as state and federal grants or partnerships with outside agencies. Over the past five years, nine of the 16 ongoing programs have garnered outside financial support totaling more than \$5.5 million.

Commissioner Glass asked what R-136 buys for the city by way of traffic safety technologies. Neighborhood Programs Manager Karen Gonzalez said the program looks at any type of new technologies available on the market to try and enhance traffic safety. In the last few years the program has been used to install flashing beacons in school zones that coordinate with the school start and dismissal times to make enforcement better. The program has also been used to install a number of stationary radar signs.

Commissioner Northey asked staff to provide information showing the historic funding levels for the various programs over the past ten years, and information with regard to which if any of the programs consistently under spend or over spend their annual budget allocations.

Capital Programming Coordinator Kristi Oosterveen said three enhancements to ongoing programs are contemplated, including W/B-56, the Pedestrian Access Improvement Program, for which the proposal is to increase the annual allocation by \$100,000, or \$700,000 over the seven-year CIP period. The Transportation Demand Management Program, R-87, is seeking an increase of \$730,000 over the seven-year CIP period. Finally, the Wheelchair Ramps Program is seeking a substantive change to the program description.

Senior Planner Kevin McDonald, administrator of the W/B-56 program, explained that the program enables the city to provide minor construction projects aimed at improving safety and mobility throughout the city. The program primarily builds sidewalks and trails on city property and easements. The program makes it possible to provide for better connections to schools, between neighborhoods, to transit, employment areas, and parks in segments that are too small to compete well against larger CIP projects. The program has proved successful at leveraging outside grant funding. The program works in partnership with the Neighborhood Enhancement Program, the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program, and with other departments, particularly Utilities and Parks. Costs are going up, which makes it necessary to seek an increase in funding allocation for the program.

Mr. McDonald explained that in the last few years the program has installed 42 bike racks on downtown sidewalks; has installed a comprehensive wayfinding system on the I-90 trail; and installed one block of rubber sidewalk on NE 10th Street to the west of Bellevue Way. Examples of leveraging and partnerships include 497 feet of new and improved sidewalk on 104th Avenue NE to the south of Bellevue Way in conjunction with utilities and the Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program; and 492 feet of sidewalk on SE 42nd Street in Factoria in response to a sight-impaired resident of that area. The program also partnered with Parks and Utilities in replacing a culvert in Newcastle, and with Sound Transit at the new Eastgate park and ride lot to gain 375 feet of new sidewalk.

Program Manager Jen Benn explained that the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program, PW-R-87, is a toolbox of strategies aimed at encouraging people to reduce the number of drive-alone trips, both commuting and personal. She noted the successes in the downtown indicate a need to broaden the program. The Commute Trip Reduction Act of 2006 brought with it a higher standard for the city to meet. The city has only four years to create a ten percent reduction in trips, but the state has held jurisdiction level funding for CTR constant. For Bellevue, where there is a great deal of growth in the number of CTR-affected businesses, the net result is de facto reduction of about 15 percent available to spend per site. Part of the proposed increase of PW-R-87 is intended to keep the CTR program whole.

Continuing, Ms. Benn said the focus of the TDM program has traditionally been on the downtown. However, as growth in other areas and the current planning efforts for the Bel-Red corridor continue, the TDM strategies that have proved successful in the downtown need to be expanded to other areas. The desire of staff is to produce in 2009 a ten-year rollout plan for a citywide approach. TDM work is time intensive for staff, so to go citywide the program will need an additional staff person. Enhancing the TDM program will result in congestion relief and mitigation, cleaner air, and community building.

Commissioner Glass asked if there are statistics showing the success of the program and justifying the additional expense. Ms. Benn said staff has tried a number of different ways to assess whether or not a specific programmatic element has been responsible for changing trip behaviors. However, all that can be shown is an overall reduction in commute trips as indicated by survey data.

Commissioner Northey observed that the recent update provided to the Commission regarding the transportation management programs showed a fair amount of noncompliance. She suggested it might be worthwhile to put some resources into getting the institutions that are already obligated to do what they said they would do. Ms. Benn said the Commission will have the opportunity to affect whether or not the same program will be pursued into the future. Staff is not sure what direction the program will go, so did not think it should be held up for additional funding.

Mr. Miller said the request regarding the wheelchair program does not include a request for additional funding. The program builds new or reconstructs existing wheelchair ramps to make them consistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act guidelines and standards. Staff understands that there are a lot of needs in the community but with limited funds must prioritize requests as they come in and address the most critical needs first.

The proposal is to change the name of the program from Wheelchair Ramps to Pedestrian Facilities Compliance, and to revised the scope of the program to address a broader range of ADA compliance issues. The allocation within the CIP can be adjusted by year as needed.

Commissioner Northey commented that ongoing programs have a tendency to grow over time even though they are not indexed by inflation. Even though the individual program budgets

are relatively small, added together they make up a significant percentage of the overall CIP, which means there is less money available for other projects. Some of the same issues addressed by the Pedestrian Facilities Compliance program are already being addressed in the M-2 program. In any given year already it is not easy to make a decision about appropriate funding levels.

Mr. Miller reiterated that the program serves primarily as a means for responding to citizen requests for compliance issues. The city does not keep a file of issues to be addressed, but as staff or the public sees needs the program is the source for funding.

Ms. Oosterveen added that a couple of years ago a citywide inventory of wheelchair ramps was conducted, and those found to be deficient were put on a list and addressed. It took a couple of years worth of funding to work through the entire list. Ms. Benn pointed out that the segway project that staff is working is a citywide inventory of ADA barriers that will be prioritized, and that active component is happening outside the Pedestrian Facilities Compliance program.

Ms. Gonzalez said the city's Neighborhood Traffic Calming Program has been in existence for some 20 years. It is focused on the local street system that have 6,500 vehicles per day or less. The program has been very successful and continues to be very popular with residents. Over the last couple of years with changes in the amount of development going on and the number of new plans coming forward, the desire of the neighborhoods has turned to neighborhood arterials carrying between 6,500 and 15,000 vehicles per day.

The proposed Neighborhood Arterial Calming program would compliment the existing Traffic Calming Program. Additional funding and staffing resources would be needed. The objectives of the program would be to minimize cut-through traffic, reduce vehicle speeds, encourage safe driving practices, and enhance neighborhood identity.

A consultant has been hired to conduct national and international research for existing programs and treatments being used by other agencies for neighborhood arterial streets. Steps are being taken to put together a toolkit with a group of stakeholders representing fire, police, parks, utilities and transportation. The hope is that when the toolkit is finished, the focus will turn to the type of public processes for implementation as well as a prioritization of streets around the city.

Commissioner Larrivee asked in what way the program will enhance neighborhood identity. Ms. Gonzalez said the identity issue would be addressed through gateway treatments, including signage and landscaping.

****BREAK****

C. 2008 Pedestrian & Bicycle Transportation Plan Update
– *Prioritization Framework*

Senior transportation planner Franz Loewenherz reviewed the work of the Commission to date and asked them to focus on the prioritization framework. He said staff was seeking direction that can be used to prioritize the myriad of projects before the next Commission meeting. The intent is to hold off on going to Council with the prioritized project list until June 23 to allow time to work through the prioritization process.

Mr. Loewenherz said prioritization is necessary because the needs are plentiful and the resources are limited. He said the framework should be evidence based, simple to use, consistent and fair, and aligned with existing priorities.

The need to be aligned with existing priorities is borne out by policy TR-79. The broad categories are corridor conditions, social justice, and the destination network. The indicators in each category are weighted and roll up to the total point values. The most significant point values is for corridor conditions. The social justice category is important for a variety of reasons, not the least of which is the federal Title VI civil rights requirement to reach all of the various user groups. People use sidewalks and facilities most often when they are in close proximity to a destination, which is why that category is important.

The prioritization categories will all inform the GIS-based system that will be used for evaluating the process. The beauty of GIS is that it is easy to use once the work of coding all the line work is completed. Updates to the plan in the future will be considerably easier. Once all of that is in place, it will all come down to a matter of overlapping priorities that when added together make up a potential 100-point value.

Mr. Loewenherz noted that the corridor conditions category has four indicators: collisions, roadway arterial classification proximity, system linkage, and bus stop level ridership. The collisions indicator looks at where pedestrians and bicycles have collided with auto vehicles. The total possible point value for the indicator is 15, which can only be achieved by having in excess of a 1.0 average for a given area where a sidewalk or bicycle facility is planned.

The roadway arterial classification proximity indicator takes into account the fact that pedestrian and bicycle facilities are needed more along corridors where there are higher vehicle volumes and speeds. The total possible point value for the indicator is ten.

The system linkage indicator is factor that was raised extensively in the public outreach process. The total possible point value is 15. Locations with multiple connections to existing facilities will score the highest.

The Bus Stop Level Ridership indicator has a total possible point value of ten. All transit riders begin and end their trips as pedestrians or cyclists, so clearly the variable is important. Ridership data at the stop level has been tracked by the city for many years. Projects located near areas that have a high incidence of ridership will score higher.

Commissioner Northey observed that because the city does not have the transit system in place that it would like to have, the prioritization approach could potentially penalize locations that do not yet have routes and thus do not have high ridership numbers. Mr. Loewenherz said transit coverage in the city is fairly extensive, but the services are not necessarily offered very frequently consistent with an urban area. He agreed that if there was more service, there would be more boardings. Once the numbers are run, it may be recognized that a different approach should be taken.

The vehicle ownership indicator in the social justice category is predicated on the fact that in the areas of the city where there is not a high percentage of vehicle ownership the residents will choose to walk to get around, walk to the bus stop, or cycle. The indicator has a total weight value of five.

Similarly, areas which have residents below the poverty level are important from a standpoint of walking and cycling. The weight value given the indicator is five.

The age indicator takes into account that those under the age of 18 and those over the age of 65 walk or bike more, and the point value is also five.

Mr. Loewenherz said the park proximity indicator of the destination network category has a total point value of five. The indicators proximity to schools, proximity to community centers, libraries and social services, proximity to retail services, and proximity to major employment centers each had point value of five. The housing density indicator, however, was given a value of ten on the thinking that such developments foster walking and biking.

Commissioner Glass expressed some concern that the indicators as proposed could prove to be more limiting than not. He said it is unlikely that an area could be located close to a park, a school, a community center and retail services, so most projects will get low scores. Mr. Loewenherz pointed out that some of the project sections are very long and the GIS system will tally all of the points for the various indicators along the full length and will normalize that for the number of squares that make up the length.

Mr. Loewenherz stressed that the prioritization process does not equate to project phasing. It is intended only to serve as a first-level screening, a planning study that evaluates particulars using a GIS machine. It will not factor in a number of important considerations, but it will provide an unbiased starting point.

Among the other considerations that should be considered is early implementation. The plan is being formalized at a time when there are already a number of projects in design or in construction, and mid-course corrections will not be made for those funded CIP projects. Additionally, the overlay program in the CIP represents a prime opportunity to implement some of the bicycle facility striping. Ease of implementation is another factor that should be considered, along with the objective-based policies adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan policy framework which includes the bicycle priority corridor system.

Mr. Loewenherz proposed bringing to the next Commission meeting with all of the projects scored, and another document that looks at which of the high priority projects are already in the CIP queue, which are potentially in the queue based on the overlay program, and which are on the corridors that could be implemented expeditiously for not a lot of money. He said he hopes to have cost estimates for all of the pedestrian projects by the next meeting and how many of them could realistically be implemented during the CIP time period; he stressed the figures will be planning numbers only.

Commissioner Northey voiced concern over mixing apples and oranges. She suggested adding the north/south and east/west bicycle routes, including those in the downtown, to the GIS scoring table. She noted that under corridor conditions and system linkage there are descriptions for how to get up to 15 points for sidewalk connectivity and suggested that a similar scoring could be made for bicycle projects. That would make the scoring criteria more consistent with the policy direction established by the Commission. Mr. Loewenherz allowed that there is a relationship between the two but pointed out that there are instances where bicycle facilities are between two existing bicycle facilities that are not on the priority corridor. Commissioner Northey said what the Commission has said is that its priority is to build the corridors first, not fill in missing links for some other system, particularly for the bicycle system.

Commissioner Glass concurred that the north/south and east/west corridors are a priority, but held that the missing links are also vitally important. He said nothing is more frustrating than biking along and finding the lane suddenly disappear, leaving nowhere to ride but with the traffic.

Commissioner Larrivee said he did not see anything like a connectivity index indicating which projects do the most to enhance the overall connectivity of the network. Mr. Loewenherz said that factor shows up in the system linkage indicator of the corridor conditions category. The north/south and east/west system should be seen as an important screening tool, but not all of the linkages are on the priority corridors. He suggested running the GIS prioritization first and then make a secondary assessment for each project based on where they are on the corridor.

Commissioner Kiel suggested using the GIS as the first overview and using the Commission goals and policies as the second. Under that approach the priority corridors will actually be given more weight.

Commissioner Northey said the notion of the north/south and east/west corridors is a very important policy consideration; it was established by the Commission. The Commission has not, however, set as a policy seeking projects that represent low hanging fruit. If the approach is to do the scoring system first followed by a secondary screening, issues of low hanging fruit should not be confused with issues of being on a priority corridor. Mr. Loewenherz reiterated that his proposal was to run the GIS numbers first, then pull out of the projects that are on the north/south and east/west corridors and show their point values from the GIS, then share

spreadsheets showing projects that would be easy to implement, what is already being done through the CIP, and then determine what makes sense from a phasing standpoint.

Commissioner Glass questioned the validity of the collisions indicator of the corridor conditions category. He suggested that accidents are not always the result of bad engineering or the lack of a facility. He said the weighting suggested seems quite high. Mr. Loewenherz said collisions between vehicles and bicycles or pedestrians seem to get the most press. Commissioner Glass said he is all for safety but questioned whether the weighting will yield valuable results.

Motion to change the value of the collisions indicator of the corridor conditions category from 15 points to ten points, and increase the system linkage indicator by five points, was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Northey.

Commissioner Kiel said if points are taken away from the collisions indicator they should be given to the north/south and east/west corridor indicator.

Commissioner Larrivee asked how the point value of 15 was derived for the collisions indicator. Mr. Loewenherz said traditionally safety has been given a high rating. Commissioner Larrivee suggested that most members of the community would concur with the approach of rating safety high against other criteria.

Commissioner Northey agreed that safety should be the top priority. She suggested the debate is over how to define what will achieve a safe system.

Mr. Berg explained that staff goes through a regular analysis of accidents in the city, both vehicular and non-motorized. Typically, if something jumps out a fix is crafted and addressed through one of the ongoing CIP programs, or by larger safety projects as part of the overall CIP. All non-motorized accidents are carefully scrutinized to see if there is anything the city could do immediately to address deficient conditions. Often such accidents occur in areas where non-motorized facilities already exist.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested the argument could be made that by having better linkages, the safety of the overall system is improved.

The motion carried unanimously.

9. OLD BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Loretta Lopez, 13419 NE 33rd Lane, spoke as co-president of the Bridle Trails Community

Club. She asked if there was a formal motion voted on by the Commission on April 3 regarding the 140th Avenue NE project. She suggested that if the staff are planning to provide a memo to the City Council on May 19 setting forth the status of the ped-bike plan, the memo should reflect that the 140th Avenue NE bike lane proposal was not part of the original ped-bike plan and that the Commission adopted it on April 3. The Bridle Trails community does not want the City Council to think the community simply did not comment on the project. With respect to prioritization, little has been said about neighborhood livability or support for particular improvements. Neighborhoods are the soul of any city, and those who live in them should have a say about projects that will go through them.

Mr. Norm Hansen, 3851 136th Avenue NE, asked the Commission if 140th Avenue NE is included as one of the north/south priority corridors. Several years ago the Transportation Commission considered 116th Avenue NE to be a major north/south route, so dedicated bike lanes were constructed on that road through the Bridle Trails neighborhood at a considerable cost. That option should be considered a strong alternative; it has less traffic, it connects to a park and ride facility, and it connects to the downtown.

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. March 13, 2008

Commissioner Larrivee pointed out that the minutes should reflect the meeting was called to order and presided over by Vice Chair Northey rather than Chair Young. He also noted that in the third sentence from the bottom of the fourth page the word “bothe” should be corrected to read “both.”

Commissioner Northey called attention to the sixth paragraph on page five and suggested the sentence “For light rail to be successful once it is built, TDM is the type of program that will help to train behaviors” should be changed to read “For light rail to be successful once it is built, TDM is the type of program that will help to influence behaviors.”

It was agreed to hold off on approving the corrected minutes until the next meeting.

13. REVIEW CALENDAR

A. Commission Calendar and Agenda

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

Commissioner Northey said she would like to know if a Commissioner will be expected to be present for the May 19 Council meeting to discuss the status of the ped-bike plan. Mr. Berg said staff will be presenting the Council with a management brief only that evening; no verbal presentation is anticipated.

Mr. Berg agreed to consider the clarification language requested by Ms. Lopez and to keep Ms. Lopez informed.

B. Public Involvement Calendar

14. ADJOURNMENT

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

Date