

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES

July 24, 2008  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
City Council Conference Room 1E-112

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioners Kiel, Tanaka

STAFF PRESENT: David Cieri, Kristi Oosterveen, Eric Miller, Jenn Benn,  
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 Chair Northey who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

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

3. STAFF REPORTS

Transportation CIP Construction Manager Dave Cieri acknowledged the receipt of an email from John Lorge regarding a proposed Factoria area project. He also shared with the Commissioners copies of items sent out to the public regarding BROTS and West Lake Sammamish Parkway. Mr. Cieri also requested the commission members consider switching the order of items A & B on the agenda.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCILS,  
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Councilmember Balducci announced that Commissioner Wendle has agreed to extend his term through the end of the year, which will avoid the necessity of putting someone new into the deep end of the pool.

Councilmember Balducci reported that she will be gone August, September and possibly October and that she would ask the Mayor to appoint an interim liaison to the Transportation

Commission during that time. She said she would recommend Councilmember Noble.

5. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. John Lorge, a Factoria property owner, said a portion of TFP-120, the double left-hand turn proposed several years ago but still not budgeted, is not needed. The renovations made at Newport High school have successfully spun off a lot of the traffic on the back side of 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE. The traditional backup caused by students leaving the school attempting to make a left-hand turn from Factoria Boulevard onto Newport Way has been relieved. The second portion of TFP-120 is still needed, which addresses the intersection to the north where Newport High School has a signal and where a new entrance and exit for St. Margaret's Church is planned.

Ms. Betty Spieth spoke on behalf of Overlake Hospital Medical Center, 1035 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, submitted to the Commission a letter from the President and CEO in support of funding certain transportation projects.

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

It was agreed to reverse the order of agenda items 8-A and 8-B.

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

8. STUDY SESSION

B. 2009-2020 Transportation Facility Plan Project List Recommendation to Council

Implementation Planning Manager Eric Miller informed the Commission that once a vote is taken to recommend the roadway and intersection project list for inclusion in the TFP, staff will almost immediately take the list and begin the modeling and forecasting work that will serve as the basis for the Environmental Impact Statement.

Mr. Miller noted that the staff memo contained a detailed revenue projection for the TFP years beyond the CIP. He said the transportation staff worked closely with the budget office and the finance department to develop the projection. He reviewed the revenue projections with the Commissioners.

Commissioner Simas observed that each of the line items in the revenue projection spreadsheet are based on current or expanding usage, with the exception of the impact fees, which clearly is based on a projected increase. He allowed that the Council will make the final determination

with regard to the impact fee rate. There will be many, however, who will see the projected numbers and reach the conclusion that raising the impact fee rates is a done deal. Mr. Miller said it is not the normal process to assume increases. What staff did in putting together the projections, however, was to carry forward the Council's high-priority CIP project list and the corresponding revenue package needed to fund the project list. While the funding picture has not been finalized, the high-priority project list has been established and staff is seeking ways to fund the projects on it, including an increase in impact fees. The Council is also discussing the possibility of using local improvement districts, but income from that source has not been shown as a revenue projection because they would be used to fund specific projects and will not be an ongoing revenue source.

Chair Northey suggested the impact fee assumptions are aggressive in that they represent a tenfold increase. They should not be assumed absent Council direction. Mr. Miller stressed that no commitments have been made relative to the amount, there has been Council nodding to the corresponding set of revenue sources, including an impact fee assumption of \$5000 per trip. The total amount of revenue required will need to be generated, though there may be some tweaking among the various line items.

Commissioner Glass suggested that to some extent the cart is before the horse in that dollars are being spent before anyone knows how many of them there will be. If there is a foregone conclusion that the impact fee will be raised as shown, the public process will be of little value.

Commissioner Simas allowed that while the Commission may not be able to control the process, it certainly has influence over the process. The discussion undoubtedly will continue with constant course corrections. He said he is less concerned about the revenue projections and more concerned about choosing the right projects. In the long run, if the right projects are chosen, the revenue sources will be there. It is all supposed to be a negotiated process; making predeterminations will raise hackles unnecessarily.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested the revenue projection document is valuable information in that it gives some realistic projections for what the impact fees could be. It should be clear, however, that nothing is set in stone and everything is still up for debate.

Chair Northey said one option for the Commission would be to present the project list with markings showing the cutoff lines for the conservative estimate and the more aggressive estimate. It would be irresponsible for the Commission not to acknowledge the potential for a lot less revenue.

Commissioner Glass stressed the importance of having a list of priority projects, but noted that the projected TFP revenues only exist on paper. Everything will be reevaluated before being included in the CIP, which is the time when the dollars are real. Until then, the funding line will change numerous times.

Mr. Miller said the TFP has been considered to be a financially constrained document since its

inception in the early 1990s. The reason for that has primarily been tied to impact fees, which are calculated based on capacity projects in the 12-year TFP. The projects in the plan can reasonably assumed to be funded by the city in the covered time period.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested that while it might be reasonable to assume funding, the fact is there is a corresponding uncertainty level.

Mr. Miller said legally the city can charge the full cost of a project, even if the city projects it will not have the money to fund the project in the 12-year period. That is why placeholders end up on staff-recommended funding allocations. Drawing the funding line above the \$111 million mark will not necessarily mean impact fees cannot be calculated based on \$111 million or on a much higher number.

Chair Northey observed that there are six or seven projects on the list that may ultimately be implemented by private development, and those projects tally up to as much as \$30 million. That would more than offset an overaggressive impact fee number.

Commissioner Glass asked how the TFP amounts drive the impact fee rate. Mr. Miller explained that only projects on the TFP list can be used for calculating impact fees. The estimate determined when the plan is finalized is not necessarily the specific dollar amount that will go into the impact fee calculation. The final project list must be consistent with a revenue projection that is reasonable. The capacity projects in the TFP provide the basis for the impact fee calculations. Project cost is one variable, and land use projection is the other. Growth is translated into vehicle trips that pass through the various projects.

Chair Northey said in determining the impact fees, the Commission has the option of assuming ten percent of project cost or 100 percent of project cost. What is in the TFP will not be relevant to that discussion. On the land use side, the number of projects could be relevant because of the number of trips generated. With more trips comes more need for transportation projects, which could drive the rates up.

Commissioner Glass said \$500 per trip is expensive, and \$5000 per trip is overwhelming. He said the matrix comparing the impact fee rates in Bellevue to the rates charged by area jurisdiction was helpful, but suggested it would be even more helpful to know how Bellevue stacks up against Seattle and Tacoma, both of which are cities that downtowns, are mostly developed, and have larger populations.

Commissioner Simas suggested that while the \$5000 figure is disconcerting, it is likely closer to reality than the \$500 number. He said he would be willing to accept the higher figure initially on the understanding that it will change based on whatever the City Council decides in the future.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Larrivee, Mr. Miller pointed out that many of the projects on the list that have a staff-recommended allocation are already placeholders.

They include the Northup Way and NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street projects.

Chair Northey said she would like to see a greater allocation to the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project and the ped/bike placeholder. That, of course, would mean something else would receive a smaller allocation. The discussion will become even more pointed if the revenues are less than expected.

Commissioner Glass asked why the estimated cost of ongoing programs is shown as static for all the years of the TFP. Mr. Miller explained that all of the figures associated with revenues and project costs are shown in 2008 values. When the funds are actually programmed in the CIP, they are shown as inflated over time.

Chair Northey asked staff to explain where the items in Section A can be found in the Section B list. Mr. Miller said the projects in Section A are those identified by the Council as high priority. The projects total some \$271 million. To reach that level on the funding side will require specific Council actions on a number of fronts, including impact fees. The Section A projects represent the new transportation investments in the CIP. The projects are listed in order of priority as established by the Council.

Mr. Miller explained that project BRC-5, 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE/NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, has been broken into two pieces, though in terms of the Bel-Red recommendation it is shown as one project with two implementation phases. The Council has determined the highest priority segment is from NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street to the proposed NE 15th Street/NE 16th Street alignment. The rest of the project is shown on the TFP list. Two other projects are split between the two lists: 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street.

Mr. Miller called attention to the 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE at NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street project and said the project is partially funded in the CIP. The Bel-Red process developed some enhanced recommendations for the intersection which would cost \$6.7 million more than the \$3.778 earmarked in the CIP. The project falls on the city limit line between Bellevue and Redmond and staff is recommending retaining the current CIP budget and scope as a placeholder. Staff understands that the scope may be modified based on further analysis and coordination with the City of Redmond.

Commissioner Larrivee asked how placeholder amounts are arrived at for projects that do not have an estimated total cost. Mr. Miller said there is no hard and fast rule used. In many cases staff elects to just include a round dollar amount.

Commissioner Larrivee called attention to project BRC-7 and observed the staff note indicates a recommendation to create a \$500,000 early implementation placeholder, but no recommended funding allocation is shown. Mr. Miller said the indication should be for \$1 million rather than \$500,000.

Capital Programming Coordinator Kristi Oosterveen pointed out project 20, the second phase

of NE 15th Street/NE 16th Street, and said the staff note should indicate a placeholder amount of \$1.5 million rather than \$500,000.

Commissioner Simas asked if staff had a recommendation regarding the request made by Mr. Lorge. Mr. Miller said staff has talked a lot about the project and has taken into account the input provided by Mr. Lorge. The recommendation of staff, however, is to keep the project on the TFP list as it will be necessary in the future. The project is aimed primarily at the southbound dual left turns to eastbound Newport Way. One benefit is that the project moves the driveway to St. Margaret's Church to align with the intersection serving Newport High School. Over time there will be additional analysis of traffic in the area.

Commissioner Glass said he would be inclined to support the project if there were a current need for it. He said he would be far less inclined to support it if the thinking is that someday perhaps the project might be needed if there is more traffic in the area. It was agreed some additional clarification would be in order.

Commissioner Simas noted that utility undergrounding is included in the project description for 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE/Northup Way and asked if the practice is generally included as the norm. Mr. Miller said he did not know the specifics for why utility undergrounding had been included in the project description, but pointed out that staff was recommending removing the project from the TFP. Other projects on the TFP list include utility undergrounding in the project description; paying for such projects usually involves property owner contributions. Undergrounding certainly adds to project costs.

Chair Northey focused on the \$15 million placeholder for the ped/bike projects and asked staff for comment on possibly increasing that amount. Mr. Miller said the Council set aside \$15 million for ped/bike projects in the CIP, and noted that staff was recommending an additional \$21 million for the remaining five years of the 12-year TFP period. Mr. Miller said the Council-recommended priority project costs, rounded up, total \$300 million. The \$15 million represents five percent of that figure. In addition, many roadway and intersection projects have ped/bike components that are not counted as part of the \$15 million, so it cannot be said that only five percent is earmarked for ped/bike facilities.

Commissioner Glass suggested that as a round number, 15 percent of the total should be for ped/bike projects. Additionally, the total should be the \$271 million plus the \$111 million, which would be roughly \$45 million total. With \$15 million earmarked for the first half, the second half total should be \$30 million.

Motion to increase the placeholder for ped/bike from \$21 million to \$30 million was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Chair Northey.

Commissioner Larrivee said at the arbitrary level he could support the 15 percent figure but asked what that would gain for the ped/bike project list. Mr. Miller said staff would need some time to do the calculations.

Chair Northey commented that staff had previously indicated most ped/bike projects in the neighborhoods average \$1 million each. If that is the case, the additional funding would address another nine neighborhood projects. Mr. Miller pointed out that the neighborhood sidewalk projects are not necessarily in line with the recommendation of the Commission concerning the priority corridors and other types of ped/bike projects.

Commissioner Simas suggested that 15 percent is an interesting number, but said he would be hesitant to apply an arbitrary number that may or may not be of real benefit. He said he would prefer to work through the projects on the list and see what the dollars look like after making cuts and moving things around.

Commissioner Larrivee commented that ped/bike projects are integral to the overall system. The number or percentage selected should be sufficient to make a reasonable statement about the importance of the projects.

Chair Northey said the way the process has been structured has kept the Commission from knowing more about the ped/bike projects up front. Previously the Commission has not had to take a shot in the dark. She added that in years past the Commission has used a set percentage figure for ped/bike projects.

The motion to increase the placeholder for ped/bike projects from \$21 million to \$30 million carried unanimously.

Commissioner Glass proposed increasing the priority and funding level for the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project. He noted that the project plan came about through a great deal of community input. The \$5 million placeholder in the TFP added to the CIP allocation will together only yield about a third of the total project cost. The project should be completed before 2020, not just some segment of it.

Motion to increase the funding for the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project to \$24 million was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Chair Northey.

Mr. Miller commented that the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project was on the Council's radar screen in coming up with their list of priority projects. They elected, however, not to include it with additional funding. The project has money to keep it going, though not enough to complete it. If no additional CIP dollars are allocated to the project in the next seven years, there will still be the last five years of the TFP horizon to program additional revenue to the project.

Chair Northey asked when the Commission will be making a recommendation on the CIP. Mr. Miller said it has been suggested that the role of the Commission in the current round should be to make recommendations to the Council on the balance of the TFP, and on the specific ped/bike projects that make up the \$15 million allocation established by the Council in the CIP

years.

Chair Northey suggested earmarking the entire \$15 million earmarked for ped/bike projects in the CIP for the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project.

Commissioner Larrivee said that would be counter to the whole effort of the Commission to prioritize the ped/bike projects.

The motion to increase the funding for the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project to \$24 million carried 2-1 with Chair Northey and Commissioner Glass voting for, and Commissioner Larrivee voting against; Commissioner Simas abstained from voting.

Commissioner Glass said his recollection with regard to the CPA projects was that they would largely be paid for with developer dollars. He asked why it should be necessary to spend TFP money on them. Mr. Miller said the Washington Square, Wasatch development, and a city CIP project will extend a third westbound lane on NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street to 106<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, but only to that location. The NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street/106<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE CPA project will shift the channelization to the south far enough to accommodate three westbound lanes all the way through to Bellevue Way and save the Sequoia tree. Staff believes developer dollars will be used for the various projects, but part of the incentive to get them to do that will be to allow for a credit on their impact fees for implementing project segments. At the same time, developers throughout the downtown will be charged fees on the value of the projects and will benefit from them once they are implemented.

Chair Northey asked what the impact would be from changing each of the CPA projects from their full project cost to \$500,000 each, with the exception of the two in the Council high-priority list. Staff indicated it would take a few moments to make those calculations.

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

Chair Northey noted that in previous years during the process of prioritizing the TFP, there have been more projects than would fit within the revenue constraints. Accordingly, the discussion has centered on which projects are above the funding line and which are below. She said her understanding regarding the current process is that all of the projects will be on the list and asked what the significance would be to moving the priority projects or tampering the dollar amounts. Mr. Miller said there are nine projects with a zero funding allocation recommendation. He said staff would be recommending that seven of the projects shown as zero and which also do not have an existing CIP allocation be pulled from the list. Beyond that is the issue of the placeholders. For the NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street and I-405 interchange project, he said staff was recommending a \$500,000 placeholder consistent with the current TFP; the project has been estimated to cost \$72 million. Staff does not expect the city to ever pay for the project; it will need to be heavily financed by the state or Sound Transit. That is also true for the ramps to and from SR-520 at 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. For those projects, the staff is recommending a modest placeholder to seed grant requests and state partnerships.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Larrivee, Mr. Miller said staff believes it is important to have projects on the 12-year plan books when a placeholder is recommended. Having them in the system makes them eligible for grants and impact fee charges.

Commissioner Larrivee asked what would be accomplished by the Commission taking action to increase the funding in the TFP for West Lake Sammamish Parkway to \$24 million. Mr. Miller suggested that nothing would be achieved other than the sending of a message that the Commission believes the city should fully fund the project by 2020. Projects do not need to have their full cost shown in the TFP in order to allow the city to seek the money and construct them, though when money is identified, the TFP will need to be updated to include it.

For the benefit of Commissioner Simas, Mr. Miller stressed that the TFP is a financially constrained document, which means it must be balanced between costs and revenues. Commissioner Simas suggested the budget could be balanced quite easily by simply putting in the allocations that make sense and which add up to the available revenues. He proposed that as such that aspect is not a top priority and asked what should be the top priority. Mr. Miller said the top priority was determining which projects should be on the list.

Chair Northey said one of the reasons for the exercise is to establish a policy basis so that when the CIP is adopted there is some continuity in the planning. The TFP offers a big picture view and helps to lay out priorities to be addressed if extra money shows up. She suggested that the relative priority of the projects on the list is more important than the funding amounts shown. Mr. Miller said it all comes back to capacity projects and impact fees and whether or not it will all be left up to a policy decision to assume fully funded projects for purposes of impact fee calculations but to use only a placeholder in the TFP. The real message is that the city will not have the money to put projects on the ground by 2020, which ties into the EIS phase of the TFP; the only way to reasonably assume a project will be on the ground by 2020 will be to show it with full funding. The city can legally charge impact fees for projects that will not be completed within the TFP horizon, though by policy choice the city has not done that in the past. The political issue is whether or not the city should model projects, do an environmental analysis on them, indicate to the development community that the project will be on the ground by 2020, when in fact the city does not actually think it will be able to afford it for another ten years beyond the TFP horizon.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested the Commission should first look at all of the projects that have no staff-recommended funding and that do not have any CIP funding and then make a determination as to which should be on or off the TFP list.

Mr. Miller said development in Bellevue relies on the EIS the city prepares for the TFP project list. The clear indication is that the projects will be on the ground by the end of the TFP horizon, so each developer is able to determine whether or not the impacts of their developments will be accommodated by the planned transportation network, and they can know that their impact fee contribution will be used to make it all happen. For instance, the

NE 15th Street/NE 16th Street Phase I is on the Council's priority list at \$82 million. Phase II has an additional cost of \$181 million, and the city does not project having that much money by 2020. If Phase II were included in the 2020 network and shown as being there, the network development would benefit from would be changed substantially.

Commissioner Simas asked if fully funding the Phase II project in the TFP would generate more impact fees and so forth than the staff-recommended \$1.5 million. Mr. Miller explained that the \$1.5 million puts the project on the list as a priority for the city. It is not an indication that the project will be constructed by 2020. The EIS will look at a 2020 growth projection and a 2020 network, and the project will not be included in that network. That is not to say the city will not be able to base the impact fee calculation on the full \$181 million project cost. Projects in the TFP that are shown as fully funded will be included in the EIS.

Answering a question asked by Chair Northey, Mr. Berg said the message that will be sent to the development community by paring down the CPA projects to \$500,000 each will be that the city does not envision implementation of those projects within the 2020 timeframe. With funding at that level, they will not be included in the EIS analysis. A developer could implement a project as part of their development, but unless it is in the TFP they would not be able to take a credit for it against their impact fees.

The Commission focused on the projects recommended for deletion from the TFP list, beginning with BRC-17, 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE/NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street. Mr. Miller said the project came out of the Bel-Red process and falls into the category of needing further analysis. There will need to be coordination with the city of Redmond based on the location of the project, which may change the project. Phase I is already funded in the CIP.

The Commissioners agreed with the recommendation of staff.

Mr. Miller noted that the 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE/Northup Way project is the only BROTS project in the adopted CIP for which staff was recommending no funding.

There were no objections to removing the project from the list.

With regard to 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE/SE 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Mr. Miller said the original CBD plan recommended five lanes all the way from SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street to NE 12<sup>th</sup> Street on 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. That has been almost entirely implemented, with the exception of at SE 4<sup>th</sup> Street, and SE 6<sup>th</sup> Street.

There were no objections to removing the project from the list.

Related to project BRO-3, Mr. Miller said the traffic staff do not have any really good ideas for how to improve the channelization on 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE at SR-520 project. There was agreement to remove the project from the list.

With regard to 131<sup>st</sup> Avenue SE/132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue SE between SE 36<sup>th</sup> Street and SE 38<sup>th</sup> Street, Mr. Miller said staff went back and reviewed the Factoria Area Transportation Study update to determine if there were specific business and community support for the project and found there really was not. Ms. Oosterveen pointed out that the project had been a candidate for the 2006-2017 TFP but the Commission chose not to include it. The project was added to the candidate list again because it exists on the larger plan.

Chair Northey observed that the project was ranked fairly high in the scoring exercise and noted that it is not a very expensive project. She asked who would benefit from it and Ms. Oosterveen allowed that the benefits would not be widely enjoyed by the area. Chair Northey felt the project should be retained on the list.

Commissioner Larrivee agreed with the suggestion of staff to not include the project from the list. Commissioners Simas and Glass concurred.

Mr. Miller explained that the 124th Avenue NE/NE 8th Street project in the south end of the Bel-Red corridor is not justified given the current lack of demand for the turning movement. There was agreement not to include the project on the list.

Mr. Berg explained that the project to make striping modifications to the snow routes is intended to make it possible for the city to use snow plows with steel blades. The city currently has plows with rubber edges and they do not do as good a job of clearing the streets of ice.

Commissioner Glass asked if the project could be handled as part of the pavement overlay program. Mr. Berg said it would go above and beyond the scope of that program in that the striping modifications would require grinding grooves to embed the street markers.

There was agreement not to include the project in the TFP project list.

Chair Northey asked if the Commission should discuss and possibly modify the relative priority of the projects, or the funding amount for each project. Mr. Miller suggested projects that have a funding recommendation from the Commission will move into the environmental review process, so their relative priority on the list will not be important. The relative funding amount for each project, however, will be the indicator as to whether or not the city believes the project will be on the ground by 2020.

Commissioner Simas asked if changing all projects back to their original funding numbers and ending up finally at the \$111,370,000 mark if staff would consider the work of the Commission relative to the TFP completed. Mr. Miller said if the Commission then also voted to recommend the list to the City Council, the work of the Commission would be done.

Commissioner Larrivee asked if showing the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project as not fully funded would mean it would not be included in the EIS. Mr. Miller said there is a

difference between inclusion in the EIS for capacity and non-capacity projects. While there are impacts to be analyzed for such projects, they are much more focused on aesthetics and general circulation.

Commissioner Larrivee agreed that showing West Lake Sammamish Parkway funded at \$24 million would send a strong message about how the Commission feels with regard to the project.

Chair Northey suggested the ped/bike price tag will establish the baseline for how much the city will have to spend when the ped/bike projects list is prioritized.

Commissioner Simas said he would have no problem keeping the ped/bike component at \$30 million and making reductions to some of the other projects to balance out. Commissioner Glass said he could go along with doing that in the interest of getting things done. He said at the very least, the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project should be moved up in priority to become either number one or number two. Moving up ped/bike would be good as well.

Commissioner Simas asked if there would be any adverse impact to dropping NE 2nd Street/Bellevue Way to 112th Avenue NE (CIP Plan No. PW-R-150) to \$15 million. Mr. Miller said the amount shown is the full funding amount. He said it could be argued that some of the costs of the project will go for components other than specific roadway improvements that are yet to be determined and specifically costed out. Commissioner Simas suggested the NE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street project is not a high priority in the short term for a variety of reasons, so reducing the allocated amount would help to balance the budget without creating big problems. Mr. Miller said that would once again raise the question of whether or not the city is saying the project will be on the ground by 2020 or not.

Commissioner Larrivee proposed focusing first on all projects that have a placeholder amount and have staff explain why the specific amount was chosen before reviewing the projects for which staff has recommended full funding.

Mr. Miller allowed that for purposes of the TFP, it could be argued that a placeholder of \$500,000 instead of \$1 million would serve the same purpose in that it would get a project on the list. The \$5 million placeholder for 116th Avenue NE/NE 12th Street to 1600 block is different, however, in that it is intended to be a magnitude estimate for a project whose cost has yet to be fully determined. As the costs are determined, staff may adjust the recommendation to be the actual cost estimate.

Commissioner Glass called attention to 129th Place SE/SE 38th Street to Newport Way and suggested the project will only serve to promote cut-through traffic through a residential neighborhood. He suggested either recommending only a placeholder amount or taking the project off the list. He recommended doing the same for project FES-6, Factoria Blvd. at Newport Way.

Motion to reduce the allocation for the 129th Place SE/SE 38th Street to Newport Way and Factoria Blvd. at Newport Way projects to \$500,000 each as a placeholder amount was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Larrivee.

Mr. Miller said the first of those two projects was a recommendation of FATS-1 and FATS-2. He said there are three parcels left where the roadway has not been improved. The city owns the right-of-way for one of the three but not the other two. There are development applications in the door that will be required to locate their utilities and infrastructure improvements outside the proposed alignment. The city is very limited in what it can require the developers to do absent having the project on the TFP.

The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Miller suggested that an additional \$3 million could be found by reducing all of the projects with a placeholder amount of \$1 million to a half million each. He said those projects were 4a, 8a, 20, 29 and 48.

Motion to reduce projects 4a, 8a, 20, 29 and 48 to \$500,000 each was made by Chair Northey. Second was by Commissioner Glass and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion to balance the books by reducing the allocation for West Lake Sammamish Parkway, project 22, by \$11,290,000 was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Simas and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion to raise the priority ranking of the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project from 22 to 2 was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Chair Northey and the motion carried unanimously.

Motion to raise the priority ranking of the TFP ped/bike project placeholder to become the first line item in Section B was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Simas.

Chair Northey pointed out that when the document is transmitted, the ped/bike project will be contained in a separate category. For that reason, moving it up on the list will not make much of a difference. She agreed that it should not be lost sight of.

Commissioner Glass withdrew his motion and Commissioner Simas his second.

Motion to adopt the TFP as amended was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Larrivee and the motion carried unanimously.

#### A. Commission Representative at September 2 Council Meeting

Mr. Miller asked the Commission to deliberate who should share the recommendation to the

City Council, when it should be made, and what should be said. He noted that the Council will have a regular session meeting on August 4 and again on September 2 and said the Commission could make the presentation at either of those meetings.

Chair Northey suggested that if the presentation were not made until September 2, there would be time for staff to draft a memo and have all of the Commissioners review it.

Commissioner Glass suggested the presentation should include mention of the fact that the Commission based the TFP on an impact fee that is yet to be adopted but which is preliminarily shown at ten times the rate of the amount of the current impact fee. Commissioner Simas agreed and said he would not want the Council to get the impression that the Commission has endorsed the higher impact fee.

Chair Northey suggested the desire of the Commission to raise the priority of the TFP ped/bike projects and West Lake Sammamish Parkway should be emphasized.

It was agreed that something should be said about the CPA projects and why they were not recommended to be fully funded.

Chair Northey agreed to make the presentation to the Council on behalf of the Commission.

Staff agreed to return to the 'special' July 31 Commission meeting with a draft of the Commission's City Council preliminary TFP transmittal memo.

9. OLD BUSINESS – None
10. NEW BUSINESS – None
11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None
12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
  - A. June 12, 2008

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

13. REVIEW CALENDAR
  - A. Commission Calendar and Agenda

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

- B. Public Involvement Calendar

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Northey adjourned the meeting at 10:12 p.m.

---

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

---

Date

---

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

---

Date