

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES

September 8, 2011  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioners Glass, Jokinen, Lampe, Larrivee, Simas

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Chair Tanaka, Commissioner Northey

STAFF PRESENT: Paul Krawczyk, Kevin O'Neill, Kevin McDonald, Goran Sparrman, Dave Berg, Nancy LaCombe, Eric Miller, Billy Witherspoon, Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Larrivee, who arrived about 6:45 p.m., and Chair Tanaka and Commissioner Northey, both of whom were excused.

3. STAFF REPORTS

Department of Transportation Director Goran Sparrman informed the Commission that he had resigned his position with the city. He said Dave Berg has been appointed interim director, a position he will fill until a new director can be found. Mr. Sparrman said he has accepted the position of deputy director for the Seattle Department of Transportation effective October 3. He took the opportunity to express his appreciation to the Commission which over the years has played a key role in the city.

Senior Project Manager Paul Krawczyk informed the Commission that a planning workshop for the Eastside Easy Rider Collaborative is in the works. He said he would forward the details to the Commissioners as soon as they become available.

Mr. Krawczyk also told the Commissioners that the Rapid Ride B Line launch event would occur on September 28 at 10:30 a.m.

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

The agenda was approved by consensus.

8. STUDY SESSION

- A. Mobility and Infrastructure Initiative

Commissioner Simas said he and Chair Tanaka met recently with staff to discuss the mobility and infrastructure initiative issues. He allowed that the city is facing a situation where money is the critical factor. The mobility and infrastructure initiative is about the only thing that is going forward. With the economy sitting where it is, it is necessary to take a very hard look at all expenditures. Mothballing some projects might incur costs, but in the long run it could be less costly than moving forward regardless. On the other hand, some projects should move forward because of their overall long-term benefit. He said what the staff was seeking was input and advice from the Commission with regard to the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects, their timing and costs.

Commissioner Simas stressed that the City Council had not specifically sent the issue to the Commission for an in-depth evaluation. They are, however, wanting to hear the opinions and suggestions of as wide a range of groups as possible.

Mr. Sparrman said the Council received an update on the current status of the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects. During their deliberation, there were several Councilmembers who expressed an interest in hearing the opinions of the Transportation Commission. The Council did not, however, directly charge the Commission with reviewing the issues and developing a firm recommendation. It will be up to the Commission to decide how to respond in terms of project priorities and project implementation issues.

Mr. Sparrman allowed that the Council has expressed concerns over how the current CIP is doing financially, whether or not it is balanced, and what should be done if it is determined to not be balanced. The key driver for their concern has been the fact that the first Wilburton LID was voted down, leading to the loss of an anticipated \$10 million for the CIP. The issue of the potential memorandum of understanding with Sound Transit to help pay for a downtown tunnel is part of the broad capital challenge the Council is facing.

In 2007 and 2008 there was a list of high-priority projects the Council looked at. Their work on those projects eventually led to the mobility and infrastructure initiative plan, which had

financing attached to it. Some of the projects were subsequently adopted into the 2011-2017 CIP, including the extension of NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street, and the first and second phases of the 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE project, all of which are fully funded.

The financing plan attached to the mobility and infrastructure initiative was complex in that it attempted to identify the relative benefits and spread the costs of the benefits among the various beneficiaries. The package included LIDs, impact fees, general property tax increases and grant funding. The projects were identified as necessary to allow the Bel-Red land use vision to be realized. The projects on the list address congestion and delay, support projects on the land use side, but also are focused on a true multimodal system, including light rail serving and adding capacity to the area.

As the projects were reviewed for inclusion in the CIP, one key benefit identified was that they would help to relieve the congestion on the NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street corridor. NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street between 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and between 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, are heavily loaded already and will see extensive additional loads in the future. Additionally, the intersection of NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street and 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE is a key access point for two hospitals, and will need to provide access for a third in the near future, as well as to a number of medical offices. The extension of NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street and the two phases of the 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE project are projected to reduce the volumes on NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street by nearly a thousand trips during the evening peak. Among other things, the Council would like to hear the Commission's opinion as to whether or not, given the current state of the economy, the project offers a valuable solution.

When the mobility and infrastructure initiative was adopted, the projects it contained totaled an estimated \$299 million. Of that amount, only \$75.3 million was included in the current CIP. The expenses were intended to be offset by specific revenue sources, including net new taxes generated from development in the Bel-Red corridor, right-of-way dedication in exchange for development credits, a stormwater rate increase, incentive zoning, grants, local revitalization funding, impact fees, an LID, and a property tax increase.

Mr. Sparrman said things have changed in the year since the Council adopted the current CIP. The city is facing an overall revenue shortfall of \$35 million, including \$10 million attributable to the failed LID, and \$25 million attributable to revenues coming in lower than expected. The fact that the economy has not recovered has had a local impact both on the city's capital program and operating budget. On the CIP side, the anticipated shortfall is \$25 million. In addition, the Sound Transit board has approved a resolution, which has been signed by the city, which will serve as the basis for negotiating a full binding Memorandum of Understanding that potentially commit the city to coming up with \$160 million to help pay for the tunnel.

The NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street project is at the 60 percent design completion stage, and the estimated cost is \$5 million lower than originally anticipated. Stage 1 of the 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE project is at full design and nearly all of the necessary right-of-way has been secured; the project is close to being fully funded. Stage 2 is at the 60 percent design completion level; the project is funded through the assumption that impact fees will be received. Stage 3 is funded to bring the design work to the 60 percent level; the project is funded to the 90 percent level only. The NE 6<sup>th</sup>

Street extension project is estimated to cost around \$68 million. The pre-design work has been nearly completed and will stop there while waiting for the Washington State Department of Transportation to deal with the future implementation of the project. There has been a great deal of Council discussion regarding the NE 15th Street/NE 16th Street project. It is funded for pre-design for the first segment that runs from 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE to 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. That work is close to being completed. The Council funded the acquisition of one piece of right-of-way, a property that belonged to Children's Hospital. The second segment is funded only for very conceptual design work, which has largely been completed. The design work just got under way for the 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE project; the funding will take it to the 60 percent design completion stage.

The original projected funding gap of \$10.2 million has been reduced to \$5.2 million thanks to the cost reduction on the right-of-way side of the NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street project. Project Manager Nancy LaCombe allowed that the updated estimates are not final because the right-of-way acquisition has not been completed.

Mr. Sparrman said the current plan is to bring to the Council a full capital project discussion, probably in October, to deal with the regular CIP, the separate mobility and infrastructure initiative, and the potential Sound Transit Memorandum of Understanding. The Council will need to review the existing revenues and decide how they want to change the existing CIP and the mobility and infrastructure initiative, and also decide whether or not they will be able to fund the Memorandum of Understanding. Input from the Commission relative to the mobility and infrastructure initiative will be very helpful to the Council.

Mr. Sparrman allowed that there are both pros and cons to continuing with the mobility and infrastructure initiative project. One key negative consequence of not continuing on the current timeline could be the loss of most if not all of the federal and state grant funds tied to NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street and 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. The city could elect to give back the funds it has already received and ask for them again at a later date, but it is unlikely that there will be much federal transportation discretionary money available in the future. There are a number of reasons that favor continuing with the projects. The bid climate is very favorable and a fair amount of money could be saved.

Commissioner Simas asked if the bond funds would come in all at once or in installments over the life of the mobility and infrastructure initiative. Mr. Sparrman said when the Council approved the initiative, they wanted all of the projects to be delivered in ten years. The expectation was that \$105 million in debt financing would come in. The general CIP is always front loaded, so the city utilizes a short-term line of credit. The problem is that short-term line of credit, which is \$28 million, is no longer adequate. Increasing that amount to cover the shortfall brings the total up to \$45 million which would then have to be repaid in the next five years. That would require shifting revenues from the outer years of the CIP to cover the first few years, which would have a direct consequence on what could be done in the future. The Council has essentially three options: cancel or delay projects, borrow more money, or raise more money.

Capital Programming Implementation Manager Eric Miller said the ten-year finance plan for the mobility and infrastructure initiative included a property tax increase of three percent per year for ten consecutive years. The tax increase was imposed the first year only and has not raised the tax at all since then. Had the property tax increases continued as first planned, the funding gap would be considerably less.

Commissioner Lampe said the rub in trying to come up with a reasoned approach to prioritizing projects is that everything is intertwined with the financial situation. It will be very difficult to put the two together.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Glass, Ms. LaCombe explained that the current \$5.2 million shortfall in funding for the 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street projects is sufficient to complete the projects.

Commissioner Lampe asked if the city believes the impact fee revenues will come through as projected. Mr. Sparrman said the impact fees are based on what the Council has currently adopted as policy. Some Councilmembers have, however, voiced concerns about the impact fees given the sluggishness of the economy. It is fair to say there are varying opinions about the appropriateness of the impact fees, but how that will play out is anyone's guess. Mr. Miller added that impact fees are dependent on development happening, which in turn is dependent on the economy. If the impact fee rates are not changed and development happens, the projected revenues will come in; if the Council lowers the fees, or if the development does not happen, the revenue stream will be reduced. The impact revenues are projected the ramp up over a period of years on the assumption that the economy will improve over the course of the seven-year CIP.

Commissioner Larrivee said he would personally approach the issue of whether or not the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects are the right projects would be relative to other things. While the initiative projects are relative to the Bel-Red vision and as such should be brought online, the extent to which they are priorities outside of the transportation realm is less clear. Mr. Sparrman said the Commission is free to offer broader observations about the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects in the context of the overall CIP.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Larrivee, Mr. Sparrman allowed that there has not been any analysis done relative to the economic impacts associated with not moving ahead with the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects. He noted that the same question has been raised in staff conversations, particularly an analysis of the value of doing the projects sooner rather than later. What staff has done in a qualitative way is attempt to capture the different factors that would influence such a cost analysis. He reiterated that in the current climate it costs significantly less for right-of-way and construction contracts, though determining actual dollar amounts would involve a great deal of speculation. The savings, however, would have to be compared against the cost of borrowing more money for the short term and thus assuming a greater debt load in a time of uncertainty. The fact that interest rates are very low could lead some to conclude that the projects should be done in the short term, but at the same time there are other big issues hanging over the city.

When the Downtown Implementation Plan was adopted several years ago, it was known that it would be difficult to identify a transportation system that would adequately serve the projected travel demand for 2020. It took a great deal of creative planning, but the goal was accomplished without the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects. Going from 2020 to 2030, however, there will be even more travel demand and will require new infrastructure. The Bel-Red transportation analysis confirmed that by 2030 the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects will be absolutely needed from a capacity perspective. The collapse of the economy has thrown a wrench in the works, and the picture relative to what the true travel demand to be accommodated by 2030 will be is a bit fuzzy. Mr. Sparrman said it was his personal conclusion that the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects will at some point in time have exactly the kind of values that were identified four years ago; what has shifted is the timeline for when they will be needed.

Commissioner Glass asked if any of the developers of the projects that would generate the large impact fees have come in for pre-design meetings with the city. Mr. Sparrman said some of the developers, including the Spring District project, delayed their development activities when the economy collapsed. What the Spring District developer has been saying, however, is that they plan to initiate their master planning effort and seek early permits. Other property owners have expressed interest in moving forward with aggressive high-density developments once the economic time is right.

Mr. Miller said he recently reviewed a staff report relative to design review on a project in the downtown, specifically Lincoln Square 2. Applying the amount of square footage to the adopted impact fee schedule indicates the magnitude of the development is on the order of \$3 million in impact fees. Those fees are not paid until the building permit is issued. The current impact fee schedule ramps up the fees over time, so if the project is delayed the fees for the project will be even higher.

Commissioner Simas commented that the infrastructure needs should be looked at absent the monetary issues. In that light, the starting point question should be whether or not the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects are necessary, and if they are, do they have to be built right away or can they be deferred. The financial issues should be addressed separately. He said it was his belief that the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects represent a significant piece of the city's needed infrastructure; there is a vision behind the projects and a purpose for them that will facilitate traffic moving more efficiently into and out of the downtown as well as through the city, which will in turn will facilitate expanding business in the city, which in turn will increase tax revenues. In short, the projects will position the city to accommodate growth.

Commissioner Lampe commented that the projected 43-second improvement at 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street is significant. While completing the projects may require closing a \$10.2 million gap, not completing the projects risks losing more than \$11 million in federal dollars. That would not be a bad bet to take, even if it requires more borrowing. However, the impact fees component of \$22 million has quite a lot of uncertainty associated with it. He agreed with Mr. Sparrman that the likelihood of getting back any federal monies lost is very low.

Mr. Sparrman explained that the federal grants all require adhering to specific obligation dates, all of which can be met if the project is moved ahead on its current schedule. By definition, obligation entails securing all necessary rights-of-way, completing all design work, and being ready to move to construction award. The timelines are somewhat more relaxed for state grants. He added that the city is in the running for additional state money currently; delaying the project would likely put it out of the mix for state dollars.

Commissioner Simas said his recommendation would be to continue moving forward on a timeline to the extent necessary to utilize the matching funds.

Commissioner Jokinen noted his support for the projects on the list. He said he liked the fact that the city has received grant dollars for the projects. The projects will have a favorable impact on traffic flow. If the impact fee revenues come in short of the projection, they will need to be made up somewhere else, possibly by taking money from other projects.

Commissioner Glass agreed that the cost of not proceeding with the projects that have grants tied to them is high, but said he wondered about moving forward with the projects that are not as far along and which do not have grant dollars. Commissioner Simas agreed that deferring those projects might make sense, at least until the city can see which way the economy is going to go.

Mr. Sparrman said the NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street, 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE Stage 1 and 2 projects are the ones that have grant dollars associated with them. The projects that have no grants dollars associated with them are NE 15th Street/NE 16th Street and 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Commissioner Simas suggested the Commissioners should digest the issues and come back on September 22 with a more clear-cut idea of what to communicate to the Council. Mr. Sparrman said the Council is likely to begin having broad CIP discussions on September 12 and September 19. They are not, however, expected to get into any detailed discussions about the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects until October.

Commissioner Lampe said it appeared to him there is consensus with regard to funding for the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects. Determining reasonable tradeoffs with regard to other projects in the CIP will require more deliberation.

Commissioner Larrivee said it would be helpful to have a better sense of the potential economic impacts on downtown vitality that could flow from delaying the mobility and infrastructure initiative projects significantly.

There was general consensus in favor of focusing on the projects that have federal and state dollars associated with them to avoid losing those revenue streams, while seriously considering deferring the other projects.

## B. Downtown Transportation Plan Update

Transportation Planning Manager Kevin O'Neill took a moment to introduce Department of Planning and Community Development director Chris Salomone.

Senior Planner Kevin McDonald introduced intern Billy Witherspoon, a graduate student in civil engineering at the University of Washington, who explained the layout and content of the briefing book for the Downtown Transportation Plan Update. Mr. Witherspoon said the information in the book was a combination of the existing conditions reports, plans and projects for Downtown. He stressed that the briefing book is not itself an existing conditions report, rather it provides an introduction to the Plan update and summarizes previous work done in relation to Downtown. As the study progresses, the book will also serve as a repository of materials and a means for keeping them organized. Materials will also be posted electronically on the Plan update website.

Mr. McDonald said downtown Bellevue exists within a number of different policy and planning frameworks. The largest is the Growth Management Act, but additionally the Puget Sound Regional Council provides guidance, as does King County under the Countywide Planning Policies and the city's Comprehensive Plan.

Vision 2040 from the Puget Sound Regional Council is a plan to manage growth within the four-county central Puget Sound area and attempts to structure land use in a way to accommodate the anticipated growth in a sustainable manner. The document considers Bellevue to be a metropolitan city; the document allocated resources towards those areas that are intended to accommodate most of the growth, thus protecting the rural and resource lands that surround the Puget Sound area. Transportation 2040 is the Puget Sound Regional Council's recently adopted transportation plan. The intent of the document is to ensure that transportation infrastructure will keep up with land use growth. A large part of the plan's strategy is to connect regional growth centers.

Under the Growth Management Act the county is authorized to conduct countywide planning, and the 34 jurisdictions in the county have guidance to develop their own planning. The objectives of the county are not dissimilar from those under which the Puget Sound Regional Council operates relative to encouraging growth in urban areas while protecting rural and resource lands. The King County planning policies emphasize the efficiencies involved with providing services to urban areas as opposed to rural areas. The county is actively trying to ensure that urban services are provided by cities rather than the county.

Downtown Bellevue is considered an urban center under the Countywide Planning Policies. It has an especially high concentration of employment and housing served by high-capacity transit. The mix of land uses in the downtown serve to reduce the need for using automobiles for day-to-day trips. Certain criteria must be met in order to qualify as an urban center. The criteria relate to the number of jobs supported by transit, the number of employees, and the mix of housing. Bellevue meets all of the criteria.

Mr. O'Neill pointed out that while there are criteria for urban centers in both the Countywide

Planning Policies and the Puget Sound Regional Council Vision 2040 plans, the county policies are more stringent. Downtown Bellevue is one of only a handful of centers that currently meet the criteria based on existing land use.

Mr. McDonald said the planning documents all marry land use and transportation. King County talks about transportation in a very multimodal way that incorporates high-capacity transit, HOV systems, and non-motorized travel options, with regional centers linked with both on-street and off-street facilities.

The city's Comprehensive Plan contains general elements, including the Transportation Element which provides policy guidance but does not include a specific project list. The subarea plan for the downtown is specifically related to the 410 acres defined as the downtown subarea; it includes a comprehensive list of policies covering urban design, land use, environmental issues and economic development, in addition to transportation. The downtown plan does include a list of transportation projects. The Transportation Element is citywide in its focus and endeavors to ensure mobility for residents and business activity. The plan supports the Land Use Plan. Alternative modes of travel are actively promoted, while single occupant commute trips into the downtown are discouraged. The policies seek to protect the environment and encourage engaging with regional partners, including the Washington State Department of Transportation, King County Metro and Sound Transit, in providing transportation facilities to serve the city.

The Downtown Subarea Plan is a visionary document. The current plan has a 2020 horizon, and when the transportation portion is updated the horizon year will be moved out ten years. The plan envisions a high-density urban center with a mix of uses that create vibrancy and economic competitiveness. Downtown Bellevue is seen as the cultural and economic center of the Eastside. The zoning is designed to enable the land use vision and allows for the tallest and highest intensity uses to be located in the center of the downtown and calls for density to taper off toward the edges, particularly where residential abuts the downtown area on the south, west and north.

The downtown is divided by zoning and by distinct districts, each with an existing or intended character and flavor. They are all designed to be walkable, and the design guidelines for each district aim to make each district unique.

The subarea plan also gives specific direction with regard to the types of streets in the downtown. The plan calls for shopping streets, an entertainment avenue along 106<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and a commercial avenue along 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. The urban design framework for the downtown includes pedestrian connections through the superblocks and midblock crossings. The non-motorized components are intended to improve pedestrian mobility in the downtown.

The downtown is intended to be a great place. In order to be viable it must have a critical mass of things going on. In addition to being viable, the downtown must be a livable place with a quality environment that makes residential life enjoyable. Great places are also memorable; they have a vision or experience that visitors can take away with them and never forget.

Mr. McDonald said the transportation policies within the downtown subarea plan are focused both on multimodal travel and the need for the mobility concepts to be implemented in concert with projects that will improve local and regional access. The transportation circulation section of the downtown subarea plan will be given the most focus during the update process.

Progress is being made toward completing the projects included in the Downtown Subarea Plan. The work to update the transportation component of the plan will not need to start from scratch given that the list of projects contained in the plan is quite extensive. However, it will be necessary to review the projects, determine if they should be kept as they are, modified or eliminated. The plan recognizes that mobility within the downtown is heavily dependent on access to and from the downtown, so it includes references to the major arterials that serve the downtown. A number of projects on the list have been completed, some are only partially completed, others are in the works, and at least one has been archived, namely the notion of creating a one-way couplet using 106<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Mr. O'Neill pointed out that the Bellevue Downtown Association is understandably interested in seeing the downtown plan updated. They were provided with a status update earlier in the year, as was the Council as part of its CIP/mobility and infrastructure initiative discussions.

Mr. McDonald said the update work will include a review of the best national and international transportation planning relative to downtown settings that could be applied to downtown Bellevue. One way to know whether a best practice is applicable to Bellevue will be by developing and applying a set of effectiveness measures. The measures will be both qualitative and quantitative and they will be developed by the Commission based on recommendations from staff and the consultants.

One of the first things the study will take on will be a review of existing conditions relative to traffic flow, how many lanes of traffic there are, how the right-of-way is allocated, and how the various facilities operate together. The capacity of the existing roadway system will be reviewed, how the roadways are operating at different times of the day, and new roadway projects may be identified. New on-street parking and loading zones may be identified as well. The study will include a review of the regional facilities, including the freeways, to see if there are any projects that might have a particular benefit to the downtown.

Mr. O'Neill pointed out that regional projects have typically been the purview of the City Council. That will likely be reflected in the principles the Council will hand to the Commission. However, the downtown is dependent on and directly related to the regional transportation system, so to the extent the Commission is thinking about downtown mobility it will be fair for the Commission to weigh in relative to regional projects that relate to downtown mobility.

Mr. McDonald said the transit center in the downtown serves as a hub. It can often be crowded with both buses and people. In the future as light rail comes to the downtown, the operations of the transit center may need to be revised. A different distribution of the transit service may

be needed to relieve congestion at the transit center and to provide better coverage for the downtown. Particular attention will be paid to places in the region that might have an unmet demand for transit service to and from the downtown. The city does not provide transit services but does control the rights-of-way the transit service operates on. Things like speed and reliability improvements, therefore, are to some extent under the control of the city.

The current Downtown Subarea Plan and the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan both address non-motorized mobility in the downtown. The projects those plans include will be reviewed and be retained, modified or replaced as needed relative to both pedestrian and bicycle facilities and routes.

An implementation strategy will be essential to ensuring long-term mobility and to making sure that the measures of effectiveness are applied to the projects. The consultant will assist by providing project sketches and cost estimates and with a phasing and prioritization strategy. Particular attention will be given to threshold metrics, or the conditions necessary to trigger the design and development of a project. Projects that will achieve multiple benefits will be sought; such projects are more likely to succeed in receiving grant dollars.

Mr. McDonald said the Commission will develop and submit to the City Council a final report. The report will include project recommendations, recommendations for amending existing transportation policies or adding new ones, and will document the robust public involvement process that will be included as part of the study. The public involvement aspect will include traditional items such as Commission meetings and open house events, and somewhat less traditional approaches such as individual outreach efforts to stakeholders in the business community and the residents living in and around the downtown. There will be some field work involving the public. A website will be established and some surveys will be conducted, all with an eye on making sure the final recommendation reflects the opinion of the public.

The Council has approved a contract with DKS Associates to serve as the prime consultant to the process. The team members all are experts in transportation-related niches ranging from transit planning, greenhouse gas emissions, bicycle transportation planning, project graphics and cost estimates, and on-street parking management strategies.

One Transportation Commission meeting per month will be dedicated to the project, possibly more depending on the Commission's overall work load. The expectation is that the final report will be transmitted to the Council during the first quarter of 2013.

Mr. O'Neill said one of the things that hopefully will come out of the public meeting that is tentatively slated for November 1 will be an understanding of the scope of issues the public is interested in seeing addressed.

9. OLD BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Patrick Bannon with the Bellevue Downtown Association said he intended to be a regular participant as the work to update the downtown transportation plan moves ahead. He said he was glad to see the support of the Council for the update work and noted that to date staff has done an excellent job in reaching out to stakeholder groups, including the Bellevue Downtown Association and the Chamber of Commerce.

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

13. REVIEW COMMISSION CALENDAR AND AGENDA

The Commission took a few moments to discuss its calendar and agenda of upcoming events.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Simas adjourned the meeting at 8:37 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Secretary to the Transportation Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date