CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

May 8, 2014 | Bellevue City Hall
6:30 p.m. | City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Chair Simas, Commissioners Bishop, Jokinen, Lampe, Zahn
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	Commissioners Larrivee, Tanaka
STAFF PRESENT:	Kevin McDonald, Jen Benn, Franz Loewenherz Department of Transportation
OTHERS PRESENT:	None
RECORDING SECRETARY:	Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Zahn, who arrived at 6:35 p.m., and Commissioners Larrivee and Tanaka, both of whom were excused.

3. STAFF REPORTS

A. ADA Transition Plan

Grants Coordinator Jen Benn said she is working with a team of staff from all departments given that the transition plan is a citywide plan. She said plans are being made to launch a two-month public outreach effort to highlight the plan. The draft plan will be released in June and feedback on it will be sought from the Commission in July after the public has opportunity to weigh in.

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

5. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Lampe said he and several other Commissioners attended the diversity outreach session on May 7. He said there was a lot of interesting discussion about the ongoing demographic changes in the city.

Commissioner Zahn said she attended the training session as well and appreciated the open discussion that occurred after the panel presentation. The city's various boards and commissions were well represented.

Commissioner Zahn called attention to an upcoming workshop. She said the Eastside Community Network, using grant dollars from the Puget Sound Regional Council, will host a workshop focused on vulnerable families and the struggles they face in terms of basic services, transportation, hunger and homelessness. The workshop is scheduled for Monday, May 12, from 2:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m. In light of the fact that King County Metro Proposition 1 failed, there will be some dialog around what the resulting challenges might be.

Commissioner Zahn reported that she recently returned from Boston where she attended a conference sponsored by the Construction Management Association of America. She said many of the discussions during the event were with transit agencies. The conference theme was alternative project delivery methods and the discussions centered on using design/build for procuring roadway projects, as well as on using public/private partnerships to bring projects online, including an elementary school in Washington, D.C. where the developer was able to construct condominium units and the school district got a new school as a result of the partnership.

Councilmember Lee said public/private partnerships can serve as innovative methods for achieving good for all concerned. There have been some discussions regarding getting the legislature to approve new approaches that might benefit the I-405 project. Certainly things can be learned from the way other states have done things.

Commissioner Zahn said one of the keynote speakers at the Boston conference was the assistant transportation secretary. In his address he talked about transportation plans nationally and one of the ideas he raised was the notion of tolling interstate highways. Councilmember Lee said the funding and construction of public projects by private parties is nothing new worldwide. Even in the United States, some states, notably Indiana, have essentially sold roadway projects to private entities. Under the agreements, the state gets dollars upfront and the developer gets proceeds from tolling the roads.

6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Lampe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bishop and it carried unanimously.

8. DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

A. Draft Transit Capital Vision Report and Draft Transit Master Plan

Senior transportation planner Franz Loewenherz noted that the process to update the Transit Master Plan began in July 2012 with Council approval of the project principles and scope of work. The first major milestone was the approval by Council of the market-driven strategies oriented around service. That action directly informed the work of the Commission in finalizing a service vision, which was accomplished in October, and which set the stage for kicking off discussion of the capital-oriented strategies. He said a public hearing is slated for June 26 ahead of adoption of the document by the Council in July.

Mr. Loewenherz said a SEDA Determination of Nonsignificance was issued earlier in the day. He also noted that a letter received from Bellevue College indicates their interest in being actively involved, both at the table and in bringing money to the table.

The original Capital Element background report was released in November. A series of meetings followed culminating in approval by the Commission the Transit Speed and Reliability Report that focused on the running way projects. Those projects were then incorporated into the Capital Vision Report along with a number of other means by which the city can be involved in making transit perform better. Once adopted, the plans will represent visionary documents. The city will embark on corridor studies to clarify what the ultimate build is to look like.

The Council was briefed on the draft Capital Vision Report by four Commissioners, and the Councilmembers were impressed with the way questions were fielded.

In response to a question asked previously by Councilmember Lee about how the service vision aligns with the capital vision, specifically how the various pieces connect from neighborhoods to activity centers and between activity centers in the region, Mr. Loewenherz shared with the Commission a graphic showing the various connections, including the future Eastgate transit-oriented development, the Bellevue College connection, and the Frequent Transit Network, along with areas of transfer opportunity. It was noted that the system also references with the non-motorized network.

Councilmember Lee said he had opportunity to meet with the president of Bellevue College who reiterated his strong support for connecting north with south and east with west and for including the college in the mix.

Mr. Loewenherz said he met earlier in the day with Commissioner Bishop and discussed a number of different issues relating to the Draft Capital Vision Report and the Draft Transit Master Plan. Commissioner Bishop's observations added value to the product in terms of cohesion. There were differences of opinion on areas where the Commission, other boards and commissions, or the Council had previously placed a stamp of approval.

Mr. Loewenherz reviewed with the Commission the issues around which he and Commissioner Bishop agreed. With regard to the second paragraph on page 4, he said he had agreed to delete the phrase "and measures that discourage driving, such as limited parking." Commissioner

Bishop said his rationale was that the document does a good job of extolling the virtues of transit but in a few places still contains language depicting the automobile as evil and something to be shunned. The phrase in question is one of those instances. The city should be in the business of encouraging transit but should not be in the business of discouraging driving. There was agreement to delete the phrase.

Calling attention to page 13, Mr. Loewenherz noted that the legend should incorporate an indicator of what the blue colored areas represent, which is a quarter-mile radius around stops. There was agreement to make that change.

There was agreement to change "local streets" to "arterial streets" in Figure 14, and in the first sentence under "Bus Stop Amenities" on page 14; to replace "demand is approximately 200 percent greater than constrained demand" in the first paragraph on page 16 with "demand is approximately double constrained demand;" to take the chart from page 89 and move it to page 17 instead; to change "local streets" to "arterial streets" in the chart and narrative on page 70; to replace "demand is approximately 200 percent greater than constrained demand" with "demand is approximately double constrained demand" in the last paragraph on page 76; to strike from the paragraph 4 narrative for project L13 on page 153 "and its conversion of a general purpose travel lane could be controversial, even though all modes realize time savings; to include on page A230 a larger image of the map; and to doublecheck the person trips for transit for item 12 on page A242.

Commissioner Bishop called attention to items 2 and 3 in Figure 6 on page 6. He said the first sentence of item 2 is a world view he does not believe to be true. To include the sentence would not be appropriate in a document that is promoting transit. With regard to item 3, he suggested use of the phrase "deserves a higher priority" could lead to making choices down the line relative to transit deserving a higher priority. He suggested items 2 and 3 should be deleted.

Commissioner Zahn pointed out that the items in Figure 6 are themes that were drawn from the capital and policy workshop and it is not the Commission's responsibility to sensor them.

Chair Simas asked Commissioner Bishop if his concern relative to item 3 was with the wording of the sentence or the philosophy it carries. Commissioner Bishop said he objected to the philosophy.

Commenting on item 3, Commissioner Lampe said it made sense to him to give priority to high ridership over low-occupant vehicle travel. With regard to item 2, he said it was his understanding that the actual percentage demand for single-occupant vehicles has gone down. Mr. Loewenherz said item 2 is a quote from the Comprehensive Plan. When shared with those attending the workshop, in the aggregate the people generally agreed with the statement. Had the group been strongly opposed to the statement, it would not have found its way into the summary of themes.

Chair Simas said he was troubled by the comment about the ever-accelerating demand for single-occupant vehicles. He said the public likely is opposed to putting more pavement on the ground and in favor of using what is already in place more efficiently. Mr. Loewenherz explained that 70 percent of the participants at the workshop agreed with the Comprehensive Plan language; he made it clear that the staff did not participate in the vote.

Commissioner Bishop pointed out that the process included staff and a consultant leading the way at the workshop. Several of the statements are little more than gratuitous with very little associated information or background.

Mr. Loewenherz suggested item 2 could be deleted in its entirety, which would defeat the workshop process, or retain it and address the issue when it comes time to amending the Comprehensive Plan. The fact that a majority at a workshop agreed with the statement does not dictate what the Comprehensive Plan language will ultimately be.

Senior Planner Kevin McDonald said the item 2 quote is narrative language in the Comprehensive Plan. While it is not policy language, it is adopted as part of the Transportation Element and it sets the context for some of the policies. The language, which was adopted ten years ago, can certainly be updated when the Comprehensive Plan is updated.

Commissioner Zahn asked if Figure 6 could be moved to an appendix and removed from the body of the report. Mr. Loewenherz said the Commission could choose to do that.

Commissioner Jokinen said the converse of item 2 would be that it is both possible and desirable to build enough roadway improvements to keep pace with the ever-accelerating demand for travel in single-occupant vehicles. Clearly the statement is not true in that format. He said he had no problem keeping item 2 as proposed.

A motion to move Figure 6 to an appendix was made by Commissioner Bishop. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe and it carried with Commissioners Bishop, Lampe and Zahn voting yes, and Commissioner Jokinen voting no. Chair Simas did not vote.

Commissioner Bishop called attention to project L11, the HOV lane on Main Street between Bellevue Way and 112th Avenue NE. He noted that on the map on page 23 the project is identified as medium priority. The project would convert an existing curb lane to an HOV lane that would also allow for right turns. He said the project was given a high priority ranking in the priority array process, but because of the VISSIM analysis the Commission agreed to reduce the high ranking to medium. During the presentation to Council, Councilmember Robinson asked why the project should be medium rather than low priority. In the report on page A311 there is a five-page list of levels of service which show that with the HOV lane on Main Street eastbound, two of the five intersections degrade from LOS D to LOS F, two improve from LOS F to something better, and one does not change. To avoid an issue with the Council, the Commission should say that while the project came out with a medium priority, the Commission recommended that it be given a low priority.

A motion to list project L11 as low priority was made by Commissioner Bishop. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe.

Mr. Loewenherz said the analysis referred to by Commissioner Bishop was Dynameq and was run for all of the intersections at the same time. A more detailed VISSIM analysis was undertaken for the intersection of Main Street and 112th Avenue NE, the results of which are described on page A262. There was an overall reduction in vehicle delay and person delay at the intersection. In a follow-up discussion, Councilmember Robinson clarified that her question had more to do with whether or not the project would impact the non-motorized vision for the corridor, which is part of the Lake-to-Lake Trail. In the pedestrian/bicycle plan there is the idea of the corridor providing an off-street path on the south side of the street, and there was concern that the HOV lane conversion would actually compromise the feasibility of doing that. That is not, however, the case. Through the Downtown Transportation Plan there is a budget ask to undertake a series of corridor studies and to do implementation, and one of those corridors is Main Street. Regardless of the priority placed on the HOV project, the reality is the corridor study likely will happen in the next couple of years.

The question having been called, Commissioners Bishop and Lampe voted yes, and Commissioner Jokinen and Zahn voted no. To break the tie, Chair Simas voted no and the motion failed.

A motion to approve the Transit Capital Vision Report as amended was made by Commissioner Lampe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Zahn and it carried unanimously.

Turning to the draft Transit Master Plan, Mr. Loewenherz said the document includes an executive summary; a background section that documents the data upon which the report is built; a policy element that provides the vision and goal frameworks; a service element that contains the service vision, various funding scenarios, and proposed networks; a capital element that lists specific projects; and various appendices.

Mr. Loewenherz offered a number of edits to the draft document, beginning with the first sentence of page 4 of the executive summary where he proposed changing "meets the travel needs" to "meets the transit needs."

Referring to the Community Benefits paragraph on page 11 of the executive summary, Commissioner Bishop said the statement is gratuitous, denigrates the automobile , and props up transit. The statement that transit requires less energy is simply wrong according to data from the Department of Energy. Additionally, it is not cheaper to meet mobility needs using transit. He suggested the entire paragraph should be rewritten.

Mr. Loewenherz pointed out that the Commission previously approved the paragraph language.

Chair Simas directed Commissioner Bishop to rework the paragraph to his satisfaction and to submit his proposal to the Commission for review at a future meeting.

Mr. Loewenherz said the Council schedule currently calls for a briefing on the document on May 19, but that may slip to June 2. A public hearing before the Commission is set for June 26, followed by a study session to finalize the language, approve the document and draft the transmittal memo.

Commissioner Zahn noted that the Commission spent a lot of time at its last meeting making edits to the document. She agreed that anything factually incorrect should be fixed, but said she wanted to avoid chasing the details for a long time, which could very well happen. The process should not be dragged out. She and Commissioner Jokinen said they would not object to leaving the language as drafted.

A motion to evaluate alternative language to the Community Benefits paragraph was made by Commissioner Bishop. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe and it carried without dissent; Chair Simas did not vote.

There was agreement to have Commissioner Bishop develop alternative language for the Commission to review and act on during the meeting.

Mr. Loewenherz called attention to page 25 and the report and said the reference "see PAGE ## in the TMP Forum section will be corrected when the actual page number is known.

Mr. Loewenherz noted that on page 27 the themes listed are those that were identified at the workshop and shown in the Capital Vision Report, which the Commission previously discussed and moved to an appendix.

Commissioner Bishop said he was more concerned about having the themes in the Transit Master Plan because it is the document the Council will actually adopt by resolution. Mr. Loewenherz agreed but pointed out that the paragraphs simply document the feedback received from the capital and policy workshop, and he noted that the feedback received from the transit network design workshop and the TMP forum were shown on the previous two pages in the report. Following each of the board and commission workshops a report document was sent out summarizing all of the themes, and no edits were ever proposed by any board or commission member.

Commissioner Zahn commented that the section of the report in question is focused on community outreach. As such all of the data should be included as drafted. The only other alternative would be to put all of the community outreach data into an appendix, and she said she would not support doing that.

Chair Simas said he keeps coming back to the fact that the information is indeed factual. Whether or not the wording used to describe the various themes is accurate can be argued, but

the philosophies espoused are accurate. Adoption of the document by the Council will not turn the statements into policy, but it will acknowledge the results of the survey that occurred as part of the process.

Commissioner Bishop agreed the themes were identified in the workshop, but the ones listed in the report were not the only things talked about. He said he objected to two of the themes the staff selected to include in the report. Chair Simas said the fact is that the two themes in question had enjoyed a majority support in the surveys. He asked if it would help to include in the report a statement that the themes included had majority support. Commissioner Bishop suggested that it would provide clarity.

There was agreement to make the change to the Transit Master Plan. Mr. Loewenherz asked if the same approach should be taken relative to the Capital Vision Report rather than to move the themes into an appendix as previously voted.

Commissioner Jokinen said his preference would be to include what was in fact input from the public in both documents. It should not be buried in the back of the report in an appendix.

Commissioner Bishop said he and several others at the workshops voiced dissent with the process and their viewpoint has since been set aside or buried. What is left is only what the majority had to say.

Chair Simas asked Commissioner Bishop if he would be amenable to putting the themes back into the Capital Vision Report on page 6 if the same disclaimer were added indicating the themes were survey results from workshop participants. Commissioner Bishop said he would prefer to leave the Capital Vision Report as voted by the Commission, with the information included in an appendix.

There was agreement not to go back and change the Capital Vision Report to be consistent with the Transit Master Plan Report.

Mr. Loewenherz called attention to the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 31 and said he needs to confirm the numbers. He noted that there is a discrepancy between the 728,000 number and the 740,880 number on page 56; the correct number will be reflected in the report. He also noted that he would be revising the last part of the last sentence to read "hours operated with at least one stop in the city of Bellevue in 2012."

With regard to the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 36, Mr. Loewenherz said he was willing to accept the suggestion of Commissioner Bishop to reword it to read "Although the Seattle market is smaller than the close-in suburban markets in terms of total trips, due to the more transit supportive land uses in Seattle, transit ridership between Bellevue and Seattle remains larger than any other regional transit market."

Mr. Loewenherz called attention to the bottom of page 38 and commented that for the sake of expediency, when crafting the East Link light rail section data was leveraged from the existing future conditions report, which was based on an earlier BKR model run that referenced the 2010 East Link bus/rail integration plan rather than the growing resources network depicted in the Service Vision Report. He said while Footnote 12 makes that clear, Commissioner Bishop made the suggestion that the model should be rerun for the transfer rates at the park and rides to conform with the updated growing resources network. He said he is looking into that option but allowed that timing may be iffy because of staffing issues. As drafted, the paragraph references 136,000 average weekday boardings and alightings, which is less than the 140,880 reflected in the growing resources network. Changing the lower number to the higher number will trigger the need to then verify the percentages shown in the paragraph.

Commissioner Bishop said his concern is that the report is based on the BKR model, which has a real transit network in it, except that the paragraph in question goes back to the back-of-the-envelope network Sound Transit and the city came up with for the preliminary Environmental Impact Statement work. That is moving in the wrong direction. Mr. Loewenherz said he did not disagree, the only issue is finding the staff time necessary to make the clarifications ahead of going to Council with the document.

Mr. Loewenherz said the action taken previously to remove language that discourages driving will apply to (i) in the second paragraph on page 42 as well.

Mr. Loewenherz said a lead-in will be added ahead of the vision statement on page 44 reading "The TMP is organized around an overall vision statement and six goals. Ten market-driven strategies summarize how the goals will be achieved." He also noted that a new paragraph will be added between the first and second paragraphs on page 45 that will read "These market-driven strategies arose from a collaborative design process involving Bellevue's boards and commissions, transit agency officials and other stakeholders. These discussions were challenging because they involved choosing where to invest limited resources in the transit system. After carefully evaluating these trade-offs, the market-driven strategies formulated in the TMP guide additional transit service and capital investments to/from Bellevue's major activity centers where transit demand is high and expected to increase in the future. We recognize that this approach of maximizing the return on investment of limited resources consequently has an impact on coverage routes in Bellevue's lower-density residential areas where service is less productive."

Calling attention to the last sentence of the last paragraph on page 49, Mr. Loewenherz said Commissioner Bishop proposed rephrasing it to read "Transit's role is to provide an alternative to cars so it must focus on faster services that are worth walking or bicycling to."

With regard to the last sentence of item 7 on page 50, Mr. Loewenherz said Commissioner Bishop took issue with the reference to the city interfacing with the Puget Sound Regional Council on transit overlay ordinance language. Mr. Loewenherz said the city has participated

in the endeavor in the past and remains actively involved in it and said he would not be comfortable amending the language.

Commissioner Bishop said his concern centered on the issue of developing model transit overlay ordinance language. He said it all comes down to a land use issue, and land use issues are local. To have model language put out by the Puget Sound Regional Council, which is really coming from the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development and the federal Department of Transportation, smacks of higher leadership doing local land use planning. The paragraph should not imply that the city will work with the Puget Sound Regional Council to come up with model language that will be dominated by Seattle and the federal government for the city to adopt.

Answering a question asked by Chair Simas, Mr. Loewenherz said the city is working with the Puget Sound Regional Council, but that does not necessarily mean the city will be adopting anything. Chair Simas suggested the section should indicate the expansion will be coordinated internally in cooperation with the Puget Sound Regional Council.

Commissioner Bishop asked if the Puget Sound Regional Council is actively engaged in developing model transit overlay ordinance language. Mr. Loewenherz said they have been doing that work as part of the growing transit communities initiative. The city is participating in the regional effort.

Commissioner Zahn proposed amending the last sentence of item 7 to read "This expansion is being coordinated…."

Turning to page 54, Mr. Loewenherz noted his intent to revise the lead-in to the Metro Services Reductions paragraph to read "On April 22, 2014, voters rejected the King County Transportation District's proposal…."

Mr. Loewenherz said Commissioner Bishop expressed a desire to see the graphics on page 108, which reflect the annualized revenue hours per hour by funding scenario, moved to page 58.

Mr. Loewenherz said an illustrative graphic likely will be added to page 78 depicting planning, design, construction, operating and maintenance, along with some disclaimer language to the effect that the document outlines the long-range vision that might change as it evolves through the development process. He also indicated that the amendments made to the Capital Vision Report will be carried over into the Transit Master Plan Report. In Appendix 3, page 107, will in the next version include examples of the Capital Vision Report that informed the process. The acknowledgements page will be completely redone to more accurately reflect those involved in the process.

Commissioner Zahn suggested every effort should be made to make sure the text of the document will be large enough to be easily read.

Mr. Loewenherz said the next step in the process will be the Council briefing either on May 19 or June 2. The public hearing before the Commission will occur on June 26, and on July 7 the document will be presented to the Council for adoption by resolution.

Commissioner Zahn indicated her support for the proposed language regarding leased lots relative to allowing the use outright as a permitted use and the quarter mile radius. She said she would prefer to leave open the notion of requiring a different permitting approach for lots of less than 50 stalls and lots with more than 50 stalls, particularly while East Link is being constructed.

Chair Simas concurred. He said he would prefer to see if there is a problem before identifying a solution.

Mr. Loewenherz allowed that he has fielded a number of calls already from citizens concerned about how leased lots may impact traffic in the neighborhoods. The Enatai neighborhood is particularly concerned given that a church there is currently being used as layover space for taxis, which is generating a lot of in and out traffic.

BREAK

Commissioner Bishop suggested replacing the "Community Benefits" paragraph on page 11 with "An effective transit system may reduce parking demand, limit commute times, make more efficient use of right-of-way, and concentrate development near transit stops and employment centers."

Commissioner Zahn said she would prefer to see the phrase "…reduce parking demand, limit commute times…" replaced with "…reduce parking demand and improve commute times…."

Mr. McDonald suggested using the word "supports" rather than "concentrate" and "activity centers" rather than " employment centers."

Chair Simas suggested it would read better if worded "…and support development in activity centers near transit stops."

A motion to approve the substitute paragraph as worded in both the Transit Master Plan and the Benefits of Transit Report was made by Commissioner Bishop. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe and it carried unanimously.

B. Comprehensive Plan Update: Transportation Element

Mr. McDonald said the edits proposed by the Commission previously to the light rail best practices policies have been incorporated into the draft. He said he had taken to heart the

recommendation of the Commission to be aggressive in looking at opportunities to consolidate policies wherever possible, and to avoid redundancy across multiple policies.

Commissioner Bishop called attention to policy TR-54 and said it appeared to him the policy was edited rather than repealed as the draft indicates. Mr. McDonald agreed.

Commissioner Bishop referred to policy TR-58 and said he preferred Option A over Option B. There was consensus among the Commissioners in favor of Option A.

With regard to policy TR-60, Commissioner Bishop said the recommendation to repeal it is based on the performance metrics approved by King County Metro, but that does not cover Sound Transit. The idea of securing a share of regional transit system facilities and service priorities for Bellevue residents proportional to the city's contributed share of regional transit revenues should not be lost. He proposed retaining the policy. Mr. McDonald said the recommendation to repeal the policy was based on the fact that a decision has been made on the regional level for how to distribute transit service. The distribution model is built on the contributed share of revenues as well as land use patterns and how to more effectively serve activity centers. Commissioner Bishop said the distribution model applies to King County Metro but not Sound Transit.

Mr. McDonald said if the policy is retained, a companion policy should be included that would reward Bellevue for the land use decisions it is making. Commissioner Bishop said that might be helpful. The problem is that currently for every dollar Bellevue contributes to King County Metro it receives back only fifty cents. If Bellevue were to receive one dollar of service for every dollar contributed, the resulting network would far exceed the Growing Resources Network.

There was agreement to revise policy TR-60 to make the language current and to retain the policy.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Bishop regarding policy TR-61, Mr. McDonald said the word "goals" may ultimately be changed to "targets" or "forecasts." There is language elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan that will refer to the move toward multimodal metrics, analysis and standards, but the city is not there yet.

Commissioner Zahn asked if the notion of supporting the city's land use and mode share goals encapsulates the needs of the community. Mr. McDonald said the phrase better represents a density or intensity of use rather than a type of use. Commissioner Zahn said she would like to see the notion more explicitly stated. He said he would take a stab at having the wording at least consider the needs of the transit dependent and community service providers.

Commissioner Bishop called attention to policy TR-62 and asked why single-occupant vehicles are specifically called out, suggesting that the policy should simply refer to intersecting trips closer to the trip origins. Mr. McDonald allowed that nothing would be lost by doing that.

Commissioner Bishop called attention to recommended new policy TR-A and the reference to supporting a transit system that has frequent all-day service, but said he could not find any policy language that mentions a transit system that supports home to work trips in any specialized way. He proposed wording the policy to read "Support a transit network in Bellevue that provides peak period work-based service and frequent all-day service…."

Commissioner Zahn said it appeared to her that recommended new policies TR-A and TR-C are duplicates. The latter actually talks about employment centers and reliable all-day service. She suggested TR-C should be edited to include the proposal of Commissioner Bishop and then delete TR-A. Mr. McDonald said he saw that as a good solution.

Commissioner Zahn commented that regardless of whether or not recommended new policy TR-F will be moved to the Finance section, it is a duplicate of policy TR-103. Mr. McDonald said TR-F is specific about getting transit service and capital facilities, whereas TR-103 is more about general service across all modes to meet the mobility targets without being specific about how to accomplish that goal. He agreed to review the language of the policies with an eye on refining them.

Addressing a comment made by Commissioner Zahn, Mr. McDonald agreed to strike the word "balanced" from policy TR-103.

Commissioner Bishop suggested adding the Transportation Improvement Board to the list of local authorities in policy TR-104.

With regard to policy TR-108, Commissioner Bishop noted that cities are required to have a land use plan that will accept the population and employment projections set out by the state, and a set of level of service standards, and a funding plan for projects that will achieve the standards. He suggested item 3 in the policy just confuses the issue. The implication is that the mobility options will somehow help the city meet its level of service standards. He suggested wording item 3 to read "Adjust the city's allocation of capital investments to ensure the transportation system operates within the adopted levels of service." Mr. McDonald noted that the proposed language is very specific but essentially says the same thing as the draft policy language. He said he would be happy to use more specific language talking about the allocation of capital resources to accomplish greater capacity in the system.

Commissioner Zahn said if the only solution is the allocation of capital, the policy should simply make that clear. If it can be construed as other solutions that would accelerate effort, the more generic language should be used. Mr. McDonald said the other options relate to demand management strategies.

Chair Simas suggested a number of options could be considered, including the one used in London under which the city levies a tax on any car wanting to enter the downtown. The effect

is a generation of revenues and limiting the overall number of vehicles, thus reducing congestion in the downtown area and maintaining level of service.

Commissioner Zahn voiced support for leaving item 3 in the policy as proposed by staff. Chair Simas agreed, adding that he prefers subtlety over the hammer approach. The generic approach leaves the door open for the Council to consider what options there might be aside from investing in capital projects.

Mr. McDonald reminded the Commissioners that the narrative paragraphs that will be associated with the policies have not yet been drafted. The narratives help to set the context and provide some notion of what the outcomes might be.

With regard to item 2 in policy TR-108, Commissioner Bishop suggested it would be clearer to have it read "Review and adjust the level of service standards to accept lower standards."

9. OLD BUSINESS - None

10. NEW BUSINESS - None

11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS - None

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. April 10, 2014

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Lampe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Zahn and it carried unanimously.

13. REVIEW COMMISSION CALENDAR AND AGENDA

Mr. McDonald noted that there would be two regular Commission meetings in June and one in July. Mr. McDonald said July 17 has been tentatively marked as the date for the Commission's annual retreat. There was agreement to investigate starting the retreat at 4:30 p.m.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Simas adjourned the meeting at 9:23 p.m.

_____ _____

Secretary to the Transportation Commission Date

_____ _____

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission Date