

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
RETREAT  
MINUTES

June 23, 2010  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
City Council Conference Room 2E-106

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Paul Krawczyk, Goran Sparrman, Dave Berg,  
Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: Deputy Mayor Lee, Councilmember Balducci, City  
Manager Sarkozy

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Tanaka who presided.

ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present.

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS BY DEPUTY MAYOR LEE, CITY MANAGER  
SARKOZY, AND DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR SPARRMAN

Chair Tanaka said the retreat was intended to serve as an opportunity for members of the Commission to talk to Councilmembers and senior staff about issues the Commission will have on its plate in the near future, and issues that may arise in the future.

Councilmember Lee noted that he has served as liaison to the Commission for the past year. He said he learned from his stint on the Commission that the group has always done a yeoman's job. The Council is always interested in knowing what issues the Commission is dealing with, and in knowing in what direction the Commission is interested in heading. Transportation issues are becoming more and more regional by their very nature, though at the same time there are strictly local transportation issues to be dealt with, such as neighborhood mobility.

Councilmember Lee stressed the need for the Commission to continue to be connected to the City Council and moving in the same direction. Both groups need to work together in a collaborative manner. The retreat format offers an excellent format for brainstorming ideas.

Councilmember Balducci said ever since she began her involvement in city politics there has been talk about what the role of the Commission should be and how the Commission can be the most value to the city. The Commission is a group of knowledgeable, thoughtful and diverse individuals and as such has a great deal to offer to the city. There have been three main areas in which the Commission has been involved: major local land use/transportation planning, recommending projects for the CIP budget, and representing the view of the public.

Councilmember Balducci said along the way, there have been things happen that have caused the traditional way of doing business to be questioned. First, there has been a continually declining pool of funds for transportation projects. That trend has been clearly recognized by the Commission over the years, and the Commission has on several occasions warned the Council that certain steps would need to be taken. In many ways the Council chose to avoid the issue, and now the problem is acute. Second, the new zero-based budget process is scrutinizing every city expenditure and seeking justification for everything. That approach has disrupted the way the Commission normally does business. Third, over the last few years the city has moved in the direction of having big packaged transportation plans.

Councilmember Balducci suggested that once the first Budget One process is completed, everyone will look back on it and realize that it was both useful and necessary for a number of reasons. One thing it may result in is a realization that involvement from the public and Commission may need to come about in a different way. When Redmond moved to a priorities of government budgeting approach, they included local citizens on their results teams.

City Manager Sarkozy allowed that the budget cuts being looked at are significant, about 33 percent on the capital improvement side. One nuance of that is that the priorities of projects are being reconsidered across the spectrum. That is adding a complex dynamic to the mix that the Council has yet to address. For a number of years the bulk of the CIP dollars have been spent on transportation projects, and that approach has never really been questioned. The recession has necessitated a whole new way of looking at priorities.

Mr. Sarkozy said the Council will also be looking at how responsive a seven-year CIP planning process is given that when some issues arise they must be addressed sooner rather than later. At the same time, there is a desire on the part of the Council to remain competitive in the regional market. As a result, every look at new revenue sources triggers the need to know how they compare to other cities and what the revenues will do to the bottom line of business development.

Department of Transportation Director Sparrman agreed that the Budget One process has

fundamentally changed the way the city sets its overall budget, including for transportation projects. The process is by its very nature iterative and will require several cycles to perfect, but at each stage opportunities will be highlighted that will strengthen the process, including ways to get broader input from bodies like the city's boards and commissions. The world has changed and there are some fundamental challenges to delivering projects.

#### OPEN DISCUSSION BETWEEN COUNCIL, CITY MANAGER AND DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR

Commissioner Northey said she has disagreed with the Council's position on not raising property taxes over the last seven years. That has directly contributed to where the city stands currently relative to being able to pay for transportation and other infrastructure projects. The fact is the citizens of Bellevue do not feel as though they are overtaxed. People live in Bellevue because they want to enjoy a higher quality of life, a higher standard of living, which results from amenities and a higher level of investment in infrastructure. She said she is also concerned about what appears to be a trending down of public process, how planning is done, how projects are identified, and how feedback is obtained. There is a significant outreach to the downtown business community, but far less to the residential communities; at some point that approach will backfire. The reason for having a seven-year CIP is because of the lead time necessary to get projects designed and constructed; the planning and design processes take time. If projects are allowed to be added to the mix along the way because they look interesting, projects that have been in the pipeline will be delayed, and that will result in additional costs. Seizing the moment is valuable on occasion, but what is most needed is a systematic and balanced prioritization process that looks at all of the different interests the city's transportation system must serve.

Continuing, Commissioner Northey suggested the city is risking the loss of some of the balance Bellevue has been widely known for in terms of weighing the needs of the business community, the development community, and the residential community. The Transportation Commission was formed in the first place as a result of a revolt on the part of citizens who held the view that the residential community was not being listened to; their concerns are once again rising. The Council should put out a statement of interest relative to transportation. Above all, the needs of the greater community must be kept in view. Conclusions should not be reached based on assumptions of what citizens are asking for without actually asking them.

Councilmember Balducci asked what the plan is for bringing the findings of the results teams before the Commission for review. She pointed out that the Council discussed the need for the Commission to have a vetting role to play. Assistant Director Dave Berg said the Commission has been briefed with regard to what its role will be. He allowed that the role will be different from how things have been done in the past. The project list that will come out of the first round of the results team ranking work will be brought to the Commission for input; that will be in the middle part of July. The Commission will be free to make whatever recommendation it wants to, and its recommendation will be handed directly to the Council.

Councilmember Balducci asked what served as the starting point for the list of projects being ranked by the results teams. Mr. Berg said all of the projects in the CIP and TFP, as well as projects identified as safety needs and the like, formed the base list.

Mr. Sarkozy said one significant policy question to be addressed is whether or not the city should focus on maintaining what it has or building new projects. The pavement overlay program has a very large budget, which makes it a target when funds are needed for something, but robbing that account can have long-term impacts. Those who work in downtown Seattle understand that. He said he intends to fight to continue the city's policy of maintaining what it has to a reasonably high level, but with finite pools of money that approach will further limit the ability of the city to expand the system.

Commissioner Larrivee commented that while on the surface the Commission knows what its role is supposed to be, the fact is because the process is so new no one really knows what their role is. Everything is happening quickly and it is not clear yet just what it means to be part of the review process. To a large degree staff has been put in the position of making up the process as they move ahead. If Budget One represents the future of how the city will be setting its budgets, it will be necessary to determine exactly what the Commission's role is supposed to be.

Councilmember Lee agreed that no one really knows yet how the new approach will play out. There are many questions yet to be answered given the completely new experiment. He said he has already gone on record wanting to know how the public and the boards and commissions will be involved. The list of projects that are serving as the base was in fact developed by the Commission.

Commissioner Northey disagreed, pointing out that the current CIP was not recommended by the Commission. The Commission was not asked to weigh in on the mobility initiative. Councilmember Lee said his intent is to have the boards and commissions fully involved.

Commissioner Simas suggested the process does include opportunity for the Commission to weigh in on how the various projects were prioritized by the results teams. The Commission will be afforded the chance to say whether or not the projects are prioritized as they should be, and the recommendation of the Commission will go directly to the Council, not the results teams. The interesting thing is there is absolutely no money attached to anything yet, so no one can say for sure how much money will be available for transportation projects. In trying to prioritize projects, the amount of money available is a significant contributing factor; not knowing how big the pool is will make it very difficult to provide good advice to the Council.

Commissioner Larrivee asked if a similar process will be used in the future to establish the outcomes, allowing for stability, while also allowing the outcomes to be tweaked over time. Councilmember Balducci said it would be foolish to make predictions along those lines; the

Council may in fact decide the whole process is not worth repeating.

Mr. Sarkozy said the focus is on resetting the city's budget both on the operating and CIP sides. Everyone recognizes that the economy is undergoing a long-term correction, not a temporary blip which will be only a memory in a couple of years. Very slow growth is projected for the next five or six years at least. He said he presumed that the Commission will have many questions after getting a look at the initial CIP. The Council will carefully review the issues raised by the Commission after its review, along with the issues raised by all of the other boards and commissions. The Council may conclude that the whole approach should be rethought and remand issues back to the various boards and commissions. It is unlikely that everything will work out right in the first cycle. Once the first cycle of the new budgeting approach is completed, the next cycle will be easier.

Councilmember Lee agreed that everything is pretty much speculation given where the process is. There are seven Councilmembers, and none of them know yet if they will be happy with the outcome.

Councilmember Balducci said in the end the Councilmember may throw out the whole process, but only if it does not work. Priorities of government is likely a new way of life, however. She agreed that the first round will be the most difficult, because every department has had to scramble to justify every little thing they do. Undoubtedly there will be discussions down the line about how to get the commissions more involved, including with determining what the results should be. No one has all the answers yet. At its retreat, the Council struggled with providing guidance relative to revenue policies, including what should be assumed in terms of static revenues and new revenues. The Council resisted even though it knew it was putting itself in the position of not knowing what the cutoffs will be.

With regard to the mobility and infrastructure plan, Councilmember Balducci said it enabled the Council as a group to raise the property tax. The plan allowed the Council to show exactly what projects would be delivered and when, and to match up the projects to specific resources. That brought the individual Councilmembers to the point of being able to support an increase in the property tax.

Commissioner Simas said he fundamentally agrees with the mobility initiative and the list of projects included; he said they are all important elements of building for the future. The concern for the Commission continues to be that it was not allowed to be part of the discussion. The projects were brought to the Commission to be reviewed and discussed, but even so the Commission really was not part of the process; all of the decisions were in fact made at the Council level.

Councilmember Lee said he is generally averse to increasing taxes but pushed for the mobility infrastructure initiative to be approved. The initiative is a long-term vision that has specific resources attached to it. The city will be facing all kinds of needs in the future, and those needs

must be identified and understood before everyone can be on the same page in discussing how to address those needs and the streams of cash that will be required. In some cases, the Council will want the Commission to develop the recommendation, but in other cases the Council will want to discuss the particulars and reach a conclusion on its own. For example, the Council does not want to be involved in deciding what public art should be purchased and where it should be cited; those decisions are best made by the Arts Commission. In other instances the Council already knows what it wants to do, and if it is not necessary to gain the input of the Commission, the Council may elect to move forward alone.

Commissioner Glass asked if there will be limits both in terms of dollars and staff relative to producing projects. Mr. Sarkozy allowed that there will be. He said there are three major policy thresholds. First is the traditional ranking of transportation projects. Second is balancing transportation projects against parks and maintenance and operations projects. The third threshold issue is ranking the maintenance and operations offset against capital needs. One longstanding city policy has been that whatever gets built must be maintained at a high level. Accordingly, when the Council approves a CIP project, there is a corresponding amount of maintenance that is allocated toward the project; the presumption is that maintenance will be given priority above operating. The maintenance dollars come from the CIP. The logical extension of that policy is that over time maintenance needs gradually eat away at the CIP dollars available for new projects. Currently, the maintenance and operations offset amounts to \$8 million of the CIP. The Council will take up and discuss that policy soon.

Commissioner Glass used as an example the extension of NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street. He noted that city staff will be working on the design and the hiring of the contractors, and he asked if those costs will be part of the capital cost or the operating cost. Mr. Sparrman said there is a specific operating budget proposal before the results teams that contains all of the staff support needed to deliver the transportation CIP projects. As the CIP budget gets refined over time before its final approval, the level of staff support needed will be refined as well. The actual dollars needed to pay for the staff costs will come from the CIP.

Councilmember Balducci said the issue is not a simple one. Whatever touches capital is capital, and whatever does not is operating. The more the Council digs into it, the more complicated the system seems to get. There are very strong feelings on the Council about the issue. When the city committed to constructing the South Bellevue Community Center, it also committed to opening the doors, paying the utilities, maintaining it, and staffing it. The commitment to operating the facility does not go away over time in order to free up money for more projects. One can as a matter of accounting show the true operating costs on the operating ledger, but that will not free up a single dollar more for new CIP projects. Reducing maintenance and operating costs is a very worthwhile objective, but it is a very different question from moving the costs from one budget to another.

Mr. Sparrman said from his perspective one of the biggest benefits of the new budget system is transparency. The focus will be removed from the question of deciding from which bucket the

dollars should come and placed instead on the bigger question of what the priorities are and how much should be spent on them.

Councilmember Lee said the Council wants to get a handle on controlling costs within the city budget, but until it is clear where the money is coming from and where it is going, that will not be possible.

Before leaving the meeting, Councilmember Balducci thanked the Commissioners for inviting her to attend the retreat. She said she would welcome being asked to join in additional future conversations.

Commissioner Simas noted that the immediate future includes a number of transportation projects, including NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street, 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, NE 15th Street/NE 16th Street, and NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, many of which will be very expensive. Doing them all will soak up all of the available money for a long period of time. He asked what role the Commission should play given that the future of transportation projects is already laid out. Mr. Sarkozy said he did not know the answer to the question. He said the city has matured and is largely built out, and as such there are fewer and fewer long-term road projects. However, will still be a need for new projects, the breadth and depth of which will be far more complex. Pedestrian and bicycle projects will continue to be significant. The regional system will not build out as fast as any local jurisdiction will want it to, and the city may be forced to look at paying for some of the regional system, and identifying the dollars to do so. The role of the Commission likely will move away from prioritizing and may become more complex by including a focus on the types of allocations between competing categories of transportation projects.

Commissioner Northey said she is not one who believes the car is obsolete. The city will absolutely need to continue to facilitate automobile traffic. However, there are areas in which the focus needs to move toward an emphasis on transit; downtown Bellevue is one of those places. The downtown looks a lot different than it did 20 years ago, and that raises the question of why so much is being spent on getting cars into and out of the area. Mr. Sarkozy said the Microsoft connector continues to serve as a good example of how to move people around in a congested area. There have been talks about creating an Eastside regional public transit system, possibly broadening the service currently offered by Microsoft and making it available to the general public; Microsoft has been involved with those talks. Naturally, some type of funding source would be required that goes beyond Bellevue and includes much of the Eastside. Bellevue's budget in the past has been very much growth oriented, but congestion of the type projected in the 2030 plan will not promote the economic growth the city has relied on in the past for new resources.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested that to some extent the Commission-aligned outcomes make more sense than the department specifics. Part of the challenge is weighing projects in one category against projects in another. It comes down to the notion of holistic planning versus silo planning. The Commission has traditionally been siloed, and that raised the question of

whether or not the Commission's current structure is in fact outdated. The holistic approach was well demonstrated by the light rail best practices committee and the Bel-Red work; the approach was shown to be both more effective and the new reality. Mr. Sarkozy suggested there may be less value in meeting jointly with the Parks Board on some issue than in meeting jointly with the transportation commission counterparts in Redmond, Kirkland and Issaquah. Such subregional discussions could yield a transportation project roadmap that would benefit the entire Eastside.

Chair Tanaka pointed out that the Council has always reserved for itself all intergovernmental interactions, and the Commission has respected that boundary. Mr. Sarkozy said he would urge the Commission not to go in that direction absent the express endorsement of the Council to do so. He added that there are a number of intergovernmental issues facing the city that are fundamental to the question of how to deal with transportation. BROTS is a prime example. The agreement was first hammered out as a means of permitting both jurisdictions to grow. Bellevue wants to revisit the agreement in light of the fact that continued buildout on the Redmond side of Overlake will come at a cost for Bellevue in terms of capacity on 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. Taking a parochial approach to regional transportation systems results in individual systems breaking down, but there is currently no mechanism in place to collaborate on the broader set of transportation issues. The congestion problems at the interchange of I-90 and 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE largely are attributable to Microsoft, but Redmond's response has been the problem belongs to Bellevue, yet Redmond is receiving financial benefit from having Microsoft within its jurisdiction. Microsoft has to some degree realized the problem and has determined that the regional infrastructure for transportation better serves downtown Bellevue than it does Overlake, and that conclusion led them to expand in the downtown Bellevue area. Microsoft has its eye on continued expansion, and transportation issues likely will be contributing factors in determining where that expansion should occur. Part of the reason the city did the Bel-Red area planning when it did was that Microsoft indicated an interest in the Spring District as a place to expand for the long term.

With regard to transportation projects becoming more regional in nature, Commissioner Lampe asked who coordinates grants for such things as interjurisdictional ped-bike facilities as they become available. Mr. Sarkozy said receiving grants requires being opportunistic and taking steps to line up local interests and priorities with federal funds. Some federal dollars flow to individual jurisdictions through the county or through agencies such as King County Metro, Sound Transit and the Washington State Department of Transportation. The availability of outside funds often skews local priorities as a result.

Mr. Sparrman said there are a myriad of different granting agencies, each with its own rules and timelines. It takes constant research to stay on top of what grants are available. It is always helpful to advance project designs, something that helps to make projects more competitive. It is all about trying to be ready, but that requires the spending of some money.

Councilmember Lee said it is possible the city will come to the place where it will no longer

need to construct new roadway facilities. However, there will always be improvements that can be made to the existing system. As such the Commission will continue to have a role to play.

Commissioner Jokinen asked if the Council sets an annual work plan for itself outlining topics to be tackled, including transportation issues. He said he has felt like the Commission is rudderless and only addresses topics as they arise rather than having a clearly established work plan. If the Council has a work plan that includes transportation projects, the Commission should be on board. At the end of the year, it should be possible to see concrete accomplishments beyond mere strongly worded advisory memos. Councilmember Lee said where there are transportation issues that are important enough, the Council will often form a special committee or direct the Transportation Commission to conduct a study and develop a recommendation. The staff are charged with working the list of adopted and proposed long-term and short-term transportation projects, and where they feel they need input in preparing a recommendation for the Council to consider, they will seek that input from the Commission. The Council does not at its annual retreat establish a work plan that includes specific transportation projects.

Mr. Sarkozy said every department develops and follows an annual work plan. The current year, however, things are a bit different and everyone is engaged in triage with regard to the budget. The work is focused on reprioritizing given the new capacities.

Mr. Sparrman said the work plan for the Department of Transportation covers everything done in the department. He agreed that the focus of late has been on the changing budget process and the changing role of the Commission. He stressed that the work of the Commission relative to updating the Transportation Improvement Program and the Transportation Facilities Plan are not anticipated to change at all.

Mr. Sarkozy left the meeting.

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

#### PRIORITIES AND WORK PROGRAM FOR 2010-2011

Chair Tanaka commented that clearly the role of the Commission is in flux. No one can say for sure what job the Commission should be performing, especially in light of the Budget One process.

Commissioner Larrivee said he appreciated the point made by Mr. Sarkozy regarding partnering with the transportation commission counterparts in other municipalities. He said he did not know to what end such partnerships would be aimed, but exploring the possibilities should be at least considered. It is true that transportation issues are becoming more and more regional by nature.

Commissioner Lampe concurred. He added that often by just sitting in and listening ideas can be picked up that would be applicable locally. It certainly could not hurt to get to know people from other jurisdictions.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested reaching out to other jurisdictions should extend to beyond just Redmond. The focus should be on identifying opportunities for synergies and partnerships, and as such it should be broad.

Chair Tanaka asked Senior Project Manager Paul Krawczyk to explore what process the Commission would have to go through and report back.

Councilmember Lee pointed out that if the Commission seeks to form a formal arrangement with any other jurisdiction, the Council will want to know why and for what purpose.

Mr. Sparrman agreed that discussions with surrounding cities could prove to be very positive. He said the city enjoys very good staff-to-staff relations with all of the nearby jurisdictions. Much of their work focuses on competing policies, and good relations at the Commission level could help to smooth the waters.

Commissioner Larrivee commented that because of the new realities facing the city, it would be wise for the Commission to constantly be looking back and determining if what it has been doing is the right thing or if there are other approaches that should be tried. Mr. Sparrman said the whole issue of how to deal with every city function will be key in the near future, and the city's boards and commissions are in a position to be able to provide some very valuable input and insights.

Commissioner Northey noted that the Commission has in the past talked about looking at how the transit system in Bellevue might be modified in light of the planned light rail investments. The Commission also at one time talked about a citywide transportation study, including a poll of residents relative to which transportation projects are seen as being the most urgent.

Commissioner Simas said the role of the Commission for a long time has been looking at projects, deciding which are the most important, and then taking the city's money and allocating it to various projects. He suggested that the philosophy of the Commission should be to make movement more efficient, whether by car, train, bus, bike or foot. The Commission should be more forward looking and even a bit more renegade in its thinking, not to subvert the Council but to think strategically about the city, its place on the Eastside, and how the various transportation systems can be integrated. Within the city, the focus should be on improvements that could be made that would facilitate the movement of people from place to place more efficiently. The Commission should not wait to react but should take the initiative by asking provocative questions of those who are doing the work. There are some big projects on the horizon, but maybe some of them would not be needed if a different mindset were

employed. The Commission should constantly be on the lookout for ideas to be considered, and should constantly be thinking outside the box.

Commissioner Jokinen said he would like to see the Commission take on specific projects, advocate for them, and follow them through to completion. Councilmember Lee said he did not believe the Council would look favorably on having the Commission champion specific projects. That would be advocating very narrowly. The job of the Commission is to keep its focus on the bigger citywide picture. The exception would be advocating for a project that has been deemed to be high priority and reflects the desire of the community as a whole.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested the Commission could do a better job of reaching out the individual neighborhoods about process and how projects get prioritized. Regular Commission meeting time could be used to attend neighborhood meetings or host community conversations.

Chair Tanaka agreed with the need to educate the community. He stressed, however, that in the current economic climate the Commission would not be able to make promises relative to specific projects. Community conversations can bring with them the danger of unreasonably raising expectations. Commissioner Larrivee concurred and said in any outreach effort the focus should be on process and the big picture. The more the public understands what is trying to be achieved the better they can engage in the process.

Commissioner Larrivee left the meeting.

Commissioner Northey said she has always held the view that providing businesses with tax incentives to reduce employee vehicle use would be a more cost effective investment than building more roads. Where there is a financial incentive to reach a certain modeshare, they will do it much faster than if they are asked to voluntarily cooperate.

Commissioner Simas suggested that outreach efforts could be extended to include talking to landlords about what kinds of things would incent them to reduce the number of trips to and from their buildings.

Mr. Sparrman said there was a concerted effort launched in 2009 to work jointly with the Bellevue Downtown Association in reaching out to businesses in the downtown to inform them about changes to the transportation demand management programs. There has not been time since to bring the proposed code changes before the Council.

Commissioner Glass said he would be curious to know what could be accomplished with the dollars sent by Eastside jurisdictions to King County Metro if they were pooled and allocated instead to an Eastside transit program. Commissioner Northey pointed out that King County Metro recovers in fares only twenty-five cents for every dollar it spends, meaning transit is subsidized with taxpayer dollars to the tune of 75 percent. Because the Eastside is far less dense, the recovery rate would be closer to only fifteen cents on the dollar. It would require a

very large amount of public money to initiate and operate a transit system for the Eastside alone. It will particularly not be in Bellevue's best interest to move in that direction because the city is in a far better position to negotiate more service hours.

Mr. Sparrman said the degree to which transit can recover its investment through the fare box varies by subarea; the more dense an area, the higher the ridership numbers and the higher the rate of fare box recovery. King County Metro recently created a task force to look at the issue, and the action was driven by the financial crisis it is facing. Councilmember Degginger is serving on the task force representing the city of Bellevue. On the staff side there is cautious optimism based on the fact that Bellevue is a metropolitan center and can demonstrate ridership gains.

Chair Tanaka suggested the Commission could benefit from having a report on the findings of the task force once they complete their work. Mr. Sparrman said the group is meeting bi-weekly for four hours. Their target end date was the fall of 2010, but some speculate it will be a challenge to be finished by then. He agreed to keep the Commission updated.

Commissioner Simas said he would welcome the opportunity to reach out to building owners, asking them to forget all the rules and regulations that are on the books and asking them what kind of a system they would design that would motivate them to reduce trips.

Mr. Sparrman shared that one of the proposals on the operating budget side submitted as part of the Budget One process seeks to build on all the East Link work and actually create a true 2030 transportation plan. The planning horizon for the Bel-Red plan was 2030. The East Link model is also based on 2030 but seeks an answer only to the question of the differences in operation between an at-grade system and a grade-separated system. The East Link plan points out that by 2030, with light rail in place, the city will only be able to serve roughly 80 percent of the vehicle demand during the evening peak. If the proposal to do the work in search of an answer is approved, and if okayed by the Council, the Commission could have a role to play.

Councilmember Lee reiterated his call for the Commission to be as creative as possible and to think outside the box. He suggested the Commission should have as a regular part of its agenda discussing innovative ideas, even if they seem crazy on the surface. Hong Kong and Singapore both have underground tunnel and skybridge systems that connect all of the major buildings, and people are able to go from place to place without ever having to use a taxi or a bus or a train.

Commissioner Glass commented that when the Commission was working on the ped-bike plan one of the things discussed was bike safety and a program aimed at increasing the awareness of motorists about the rules. He suggested that the safer bicycling can be made, the more people who will chose that mode of travel. The first step should be to check with staff to see just what came of the Commission's suggestions.

FUTURE ISSUES, MISCELLANEOUS, AND WRAP-UP

Mr. Krawczyk said staff would provide a short recap of the retreat at the July 8 Commission meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Tanaka adjourned the meeting at 9:07 p.m.

---

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

---

Date

---

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

---

Date