

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES

November 29, 2007  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Yuen, Vice Chair Northey, Commissioners Glass, Tanaka, Van Valkenburgh

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioners Holler and Wendle

STAFF PRESENT: David Cieri, Dave Berg, Franz Loewenherz, Kevin O'Neill, Department of Transportation; Michelle Murphy, City Clerk's Office

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present except for Commissioners Holler and Wendle, who were excused.

3. STAFF REPORTS

Transportation CIP Construction Manager Dave Cieri asked if all Commissioners received copies of the CIP quarterly update in the mail and if there were any questions. He informed the Commission that the RFP for design services for the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project has been released; it will close in mid-December.

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

5. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Chair Yuen said he attended the November 29 Bel-Red open house, and the recent Meydenbauer Bay park steering committee meeting. Both of those issues will involve a lot of work on behalf of the transportation department.

## 6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Susanne Kagen, 36 Bridlewood Circle, Kirkland, spoke as president of the Lake Washington Saddle Club. She said there is no consensus in the equestrian community, much less the larger neighborhood community, about many of the projects being proposed. As the Commission continues its study, however, it should keep in mind the equestrian nature of the community and to continue to provide safe access for equestrians in the area. The addition of bike paths on 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE would make it more difficult for equestrians to access the park safely; the project should be reconsidered. The city should also seek to keep all easements and rights-of-way available. The equestrian community is willing to work with the city to help educate homeowners regarding the need for and the use of easements; the city's help is needed in educating property owners with regard to rights-of-way and opening them voluntarily. King County offers the equestrian community the opportunity to dedicate trail easements, which brings with it indemnity, and a large reduction in the property tax.

Mr. Don Prince, 602 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Kirkland, spoke as president of the Bridle Trails Park Foundation. He called attention to project B-302, the sidewalk on 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE between NE 6<sup>th</sup> and NE 40<sup>th</sup>. He allowed that Senior transportation planner Franz Loewenherz has visited the area to see why the local residents are so concerned about adding more pavement along the edge of the park. He said the Bridle Trails Park trustees want the city to abandon the project. Bicycles, motorized vehicles and skateboards do not mix with horses, which is why the state does not allow them in the park. The park is the cornerstone for the Bridle Trails neighborhood. A few years ago the city did construct a paved pathway on the east side of 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE; it is signed for use by pedestrians and bicyclists. It is not very horse friendly for people trying to come from the east side across the road and into the park, but it exists. Shortly after that went in there was an accident in which a horse and rider were struck; the rider was unhurt but the horse had to be euthanized.

Ms. Betty Lou Capella, 5652 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE, suggested that more homeowners should be informed of the fact that King County will remove the liability risk from homeowners who choose to dedicate a portion of their property for an equestrian path, and that tax credits are available. She praised Mr. Loewenherz for being so easy to work with; she noted that he took her up on her offer to come ride the trail though he had never been on a horse before. The Bridle Trails community is very fortunate to have a 500-acre park for equestrians and pedestrians. She supported the recommendation of Mr. Loewenherz to delete from the list project M-631.

Ms. Loretta Lopez, 13419 NE 33<sup>rd</sup> Lane, spoke as co-president of the Bridle Trails Community Club. She thanked Mr. Loewenherz for both riding and walking the trails in the area, and the Commission for allowing the neighborhood more time to gather community input and develop a recommendation. Hopefully as the process moves forward the neighborhood will continue to be kept in the loop and involved.

Mr. Chris Serrato, 13530 NE 29<sup>th</sup> Place, said his is one of the horse properties to the south of NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street. He said he would like to see access opened where the powerline trail is blocked at NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street, making it difficult for horse owners to access the park without having to go on 134<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.

Ms. Dana Capella, 13336 NE 55<sup>th</sup> Place, she is pro horses and has lived in the neighborhood for a long time. She voiced her support for retaining the equestrian nature of the neighborhood. Over the last 30 years a number of property owners have blocked access to trails on their properties, making it difficult for riders to reach the park. Horses and pavement do not mix because their metal shoes slip on the pavement.

Ms. Jill Sulzberg, 4433 137<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, voiced her support for retaining the equestrian nature of Bridle Trails, and for having trails running throughout the area. She suggested, however, that the term “powerline trail” is being used rather indiscriminately. There are trails that remain open through a series of easements. Project M-361 in the ped-bike plan is actually the powerline trail; it exists because current and previous property owners have granted easements to the predecessor of Puget Sound Energy for the power distribution system. She questioned what authority the city has with respect to those easements. Anyone trying to walk the powerline from NE 24<sup>th</sup> Street to NE 60<sup>th</sup> Street will find it is really not a trail. The existing bridle trail and the powerline easement may in fact overlap in places, but there are two different things.

## 7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Long-Range Planning Manager Kevin O’Neill asked the Commission to consider reversing the order of agenda items 8-B and 8-C. He explained that a great deal of public comment about projects in the ped-bike plan was received on October 25, specifically those in the Bridle Trails neighborhood. In part due to those comments, and in part based on direction by the Commission, staff changed the schedule. Accordingly, the Commission is not scheduled to start considering the draft network plan or any of the projects until February 21. The intent of item 8-B was to update the Commission on the work that has happened since the last meeting and the process by which staff intends to bring potential revisions to the Commission. Item 8-C is a continuation of the discussion started on October 25 about the policy framework of the plan.

Motion to reverse the order of agenda items 8-B and 8-C was made by Commissioner Van Valkenburgh. Second was by Commissioner Glass and the motion carried unanimously.

## 8. STUDY SESSION

### A. Robert’s Rules Training

Michelle Murphy with the City Clerk’s Office explained that parliamentary procedure has a long history; some aspects of it can be traced back to the fifth century A.D. Early English

parliament had an interest in putting down on paper an established parliamentary process. That process, as it had been revised over the years, came to America with the European settlers. In 1876 Henry Robert undertook the process of formalizing the uniform parliamentary process; his work became known as Robert's Rules.

Ms. Murphy said there are a few basic components to parliamentary procedure. The first is the notion that the organization is paramount. All members have equal right to attend meetings, to make motions, to speak in debate, and to vote. All legal meetings require a quorum. Only one subject can be taken up at a time, and only one speaker is allowed the floor at a time. The floor assignment is the responsibility of the chair, and whenever possible it should alternate between opposing views. The chair always calls for the vote, both the positive and the negative. Debate is confined to the merits of the pending question. Silence is interpreted as consent. The principles are aimed at maintaining meeting decorum while permitting everyone to be heard and to act freely in deliberative assembly.

There are different types of deliberative assemblies. The mass meeting is a meeting of an unorganized group that is open to everyone with a common purpose or interest. The assembly of an organized society, such as a club, limits membership to persons recorded on the roll of the society as voting members in good standing. A convention is an assembly of delegates that normally are appointed for a single session to represent their constituents. A board or commission is an administrative, managerial or quasi-judicial body of elected or appointed persons having the character of a deliberative body.

A quorum is necessary for legal meetings and consists of the minimum number of members who must be present. The purpose of a quorum is to protect the body from unrepresented action. In the case of the Transportation Commission, four members constitutes a quorum.

The responsibility of the chair is to determine if a quorum is present prior to opening a meeting. The chair is also charged with enforcing the rules of debate. A secretary is also necessary in order to have a legal meeting; the secretary notices the meeting and records the actions of the assembly. The responsibilities of the Commission members are to arrive on time, participate fully, and follow meeting etiquette.

The rules of order provide for the contracting of business in an orderly manner, establish the duties of the officers, and provide a basis for resolving procedural matters that may arise during a meeting. The Commission's bylaws includes the standard order of business.

At the end of the business, the chair entertains a motion to adjourn. The motion to adjourn must be seconded. A motion to adjourn is not debatable or amendable, requires a majority vote, and cannot be reconsidered. A motion to adjourn is not required; the chair can simply adjourn a meeting at the conclusion of all business.

Ms. Murphy explained that business is brought before the body for discussion and action by a main motion. A member must first be recognized by the chair to gain the floor, and only one

member may have the floor at any one time. Anyone wanting to make a motion simply says “I move that...” The motion maker must then yield the floor and wait for a second. A motion is a formal proposal by a member that the group take certain action. Main motions bring business before the body. The chair must recognize any member who seeks the floor while entitled to have it, which is while no one else is speaking. If two or more members seek the floor, it is standard procedure for the first member to get the attention of the chair be permitted to speak first.

Once a motion has been made and seconded, the chair is to repeat the motion to make certain everyone knows exactly what is being proposed. The chair must first make sure the motion is in order at the time it is made, and must make sure that the motion is clearly phrased. Members may speak twice in debate on any debatable motion for up to ten minutes, or for whatever time limit is set by the rules of the group. A member cannot speak for a second time to any motion if a member who has not yet spoken to the motion wants to speak.

One of the most important rules of debate is that the proposal, not the member, is the subject of the debate. All questions and remarks must be directed to the chair, not individual members. Only the merits of the proposal are to be discussed.

When no one else seeks recognition for debate, the chair will put the question, which means the chair will ask the body if it is ready to vote on the pending motion. The chair must then restate the motion and call for the vote beginning with those who are in favor, then those who are opposed. The chair must judge whether or not the required number of votes are achieved to either carry or fail the motion; the chair then announces the result and moves on to the next item of business. A motion is not resolved until the chair announces the vote. Members who do not specifically vote for or against a motion are counted as having voted for the motion.

During debate there are certain other motions that can be made relating to the main motion. The most common is a motion to amend the main motion. An amendment must be germane to the main motion to which it is applied. As a matter of practicality, amendments should never go more than two deep. The last motion to amend is always considered first, working back toward the main motion. Once amendments to a main motion are resolved, additional amendments to the main motion can be made.

A motion to postpone an action indefinitely essentially kills a motion without a direct vote on it. A motion to commit or refer is generally used to send a pending question to a committee for further study. A motion to postpone a question to a time certain is used to delay action on the question until the specified time. A motion to limit or extend debate exercises special control over debate on a pending question; because such a motion impacts the rights of the membership, it requires a two-thirds majority vote.

Commissioner Northey asked if a motion to extend the limits of debate is used to allow debate to continue past the point where each member has spoken to a motion twice. Ms. Murphy said that is the purpose for such a motion. The motion can also be used to extend the total amount

of time each member can speak to a motion.

A motion to call the previous question is used to close debate and bring the assembly to an immediate vote. Because the action affects the rights of the membership, the motion requires a two-thirds vote.

A motion to lay on the table puts a pending question aside temporarily with no set time for picking the matter up again. Consideration of the question can be resumed at the will of the majority.

A call for the orders of the day requires the assembly to conform to its agenda or order of business. It does not require a second and is not debatable or amendable. Upon a call by one member, the orders of the day must be enforced, except that a two-thirds vote can set them aside.

If a present situation is affecting the right of privilege of an assembly or an individual member, a member can raise a question of privilege to interrupt pending business to address an urgent request or motion.

A motion to recess calls for a short intermission in a meeting. A second is required along with a majority vote. However, the chair can declare a recess with the consent of the body.

Although the chair has the responsibility of enforcing the rules, any member who believes a breach has occurred can raise a point of order requiring the chair to make a ruling on the question involved.

An appeal of the decision of the chair requires a motion, a second and a majority vote.

A motion to suspend the rules is not debatable or amendable and requires a two-thirds majority vote.

If a member feels that discussion or consideration of a question is detrimental to the assembly, the member can move objection to the consideration of a question. Such a motion does not require a second but does require a two-thirds approval.

A motion to divide a question simply divides a pending motion into individual parts.

If a member doubts the accuracy of a vote, a call for a division of the assembly can be called which demands a counted or standing vote.

Motions to bring a question back to allow the assembly to reopen a completed matter during the same meeting, or at the very next meeting, require a second and a majority vote. Motion to rescind or amend something previously adopted also require a two-thirds vote.

Methods of voting include voice, roll call, general consent, a show of hands and a ballot.

Commissioner Tanaka said he has always been somewhat confused regarding the withdrawal of a motion. Ms. Murphy said the maker of a motion has the right to withdraw a motion at any time prior to a vote on the motion.

Chair Yuen commented that while parliamentary procedure is to be carefully followed when issues are to be determined, study sessions that do not require an action by the Commission can be handled on a more informal basis. He reminded the Commissioners that private discussions concerning an issue before the Commission cannot be handled via email; all such conversations must occur in the public eye; the same is true for all informal gatherings. Whenever a quorum of Commission members are gathered in one place and issues pertaining to the Commission are discussed, the meeting must be noticed.

### C. Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan: Update on Policy Framework

Mr. O'Neill reminded the Commission that on October 25 staff began the discussion on the policy framework of the ped-bike plan. He explained that the plan covers a variety of things, though at the heart of it is the network or list of projects. The existing plan also has a policy chapter. The policies contained in that chapter are also part of the citywide Comprehensive Plan; in addition, there are many policies in the general elements of the Comprehensive Plan that relate specifically to the non-motorized system. The Comprehensive Plan itself is split into two distinct volumes, the first being the general elements, and the second being the fourteen subarea plans and the various transportation facilities plans.

Mr. O'Neill said Appendix B of the staff report contains all of the applicable policies. He noted that those beginning with "PB" are specific to the ped-bike plan. The process of developing the matrix underscored for staff the fact that there might be a better way of laying them out and identifying possible gaps and redundancies. One approach would be to have policies that are directed toward specific types of projects. The plan needs to do a better job of articulating the need to have a complete and comprehensive connected system. The three main systems are bicycles, pedestrians and trails, and one approach would be to have a separate set of policies broken out for each of those. The city needs to be open to considering major changes to the existing policy framework if they are needed.

Mr. O'Neill allowed that a better organized set of goals and policies will not necessarily yield a better plan, but it would go a long way in helping staff and the public understand the direction of the plan. He noted that in Attachment A to the staff report a different way of arraying the policies is suggested. The majority of the existing policies focus on how to implement rather than how to create a network plan.

Mr. O'Neill presented the Commission with a draft overall goal statement for consideration, and ideas on benchmark or objective-based policies. He said the organization of the policies in Attachment B is focused on a new approach that pulls the overall goal or vision statements up

to the top layer of the plan, and splitting the system policies into those that relate to creating an overall system, and those around prioritization. There are several policies that talk about how the city should coordinate with regional entities and other jurisdictions, and those are held in a single category. The area centered on accessibility needs to be strengthened. Consideration is also being given to taking all of the implementation policies and housing them in an implementation chapter.

Commissioner Van Valkenburgh observed that the implementation policies mention transit but make no reference to bicycles or pedestrians. Mr. O'Neill said that is because the existing ped-bike plan has a transit section intended to explain how the ped-bike system relates to the transit system.

Commissioner Northey indicated a conflict in her thinking over the notion of essentially creating three different plans. She suggested the vision for a bicycle system would be articulate different from the vision of a pedestrian system. The notion of the city's trail system may be a completely different feature; much of the discussion going on in the Bridle Trails community should be a parks department function and not a transportation department function. The fact is that people are not using horses to get to work; horses are recreational. She urged staff to consider transferring the Bridle Trails equestrian trails issue to the parks department.

Chair Yuen concurred. He noted that bicycles take one route to get from one area to another, whereas pedestrians can choose a variety of ways to get around. Bicyclists are generally looking to travel longer distances.

Commissioner Van Valkenburgh said sometimes bike lanes or sharrows essentially share space with traffic. That is not something that would work safely for pedestrian pathways. From that perspective, it makes sense to consider pedestrian trails separate from bicycle trails.

Commissioner Tanaka agreed that pedestrians and bicyclists have different interests. However, in the larger picture the Comprehensive Plan and the Transportation Element stress alternatives to vehicular transportation. To that end, the pedestrian and bicycle systems are part of the overall network. There could be some loss of that perspective should there be three separate plans instead of one.

Mr. O'Neill allowed that staff debated the same issue internally, specifically whether the current ped-bike plan should be broken apart to yield a pedestrian plan, a bicycle plan and a trails plan. In the draft network plan, the individual projects are in fact divided along those lines. He agreed that many of the trail projects serve primarily a recreational function, though some have a transportation function. If the existing Comprehensive Plan policies were to be split three ways, however, there may in fact be a lot of duplication given that many of the policies refer to both pedestrian and bicycle.

Commissioner Glass observed that the proposed overall goal statement offered by staff

combines the pedestrian and bicycle sides. However, the different bullet headings under the broader goal statements could be drafted to be more specific, effectively making the split within a single plan.

Commissioner Van Valkenburgh commented that in some instances bicycle facilities serve a purely recreational purpose and as such can share with pedestrians. In other instances they serve a different market and should be separated from pedestrians. Mr. O'Neill said in the existing policy framework policy PB-1 talks about coordinating with community organization and working with the community on the design of projects, so that addresses to some extent being consistent with neighborhood character. Policy TR-88 calls for recognizing the importance of walking, jogging, bicycling and equestrian activities as recreational pursuits. There are all manner of functions the various projects can accommodate. Down at the project level is where the specific tradeoffs are determined. The important thing at the policy framework level is to make sure that everything needed to help drive the design of projects is put in the mix.

Commissioner Northey asked staff to bring to the next Commission meeting a recommendation for asking the Parks and Community Services Board to consider discussing the issue of equestrian trails in Bridle Trails. Mr. O'Neill said Mr. Loewenherz has already given the Parks and Community Services Board a briefing on the ped-bike plan update, and transportation staff has been working very closely with parks staff on the project list.

Mr. O'Neill said vision statements can either be very concise or go on for pages. The vision statement in the Comprehensive Plan talks about parks, land use, community development, urban design and transportation. The vision statement for the city of Bellevue, however, is a single sentence. The proposed vision statement for the ped-bike plan was drafted after looking at the current policy framework and considering the public comments received to date; it reads "Bellevue will be a city where all residents regardless of age or physical ability can safely and conveniently walk or bicycle to destinations within the neighborhoods, the city as a whole, and the greater Eastside region." The intent of the wording is to incorporate a number of themes. Staff is suggesting the addition of a broader goal statement, specifically "Bellevue will plan, design and build an integrated comprehensive network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities to achieve the following objectives...." The work of Mr. Loewenherz to develop the draft network plan does a very good job of articulating the benefits of biking and walking; the idea behind the broader goal statement is to capture all of those in a policy statement.

Mr. O'Neill said the Council discussion suggested efforts should be focused on trying to accomplish something in the near term. The current plan does not specify that within X years Bellevue will have a fully constructed and integrated bike route that connects the north-south and east-west city limits; the updated plan could be that specific, which would be consistent with the strategic plan recently developed by the transportation department. Another goal could be that within a certain number of years a certain percentage of trips will be done on foot or by bicycle. Another goal would be to state that within a certain number of years all Bellevue residents will be within a half mile of a completed bicycle route or within a quarter

mile of a completed arterial sidewalk system. Having such objective-based policies would drive the prioritization system.

Commissioner Glass said he likes the objective-based approach but questioned how it would work in reality. He pointed out that the Commission could agree on a plan and forward it to the City Council, who might approve it, but absent a way to pay for it all the plan will languish. Mr. O'Neill said there are two relevant implementation issues. The first is growing the financial pie to implement the ped-bike projects. That will be a big part of the Council's deliberations and should be highlighted in the Commission's recommendation to the Council. The second part involves directing the available financial resources.

Deputy Transportation Director Dave Berg allowed that there are resources available and said one aspect of the Commission's work is to direct those resources to a number of different projects, including ped-bike projects, capacity projects, and safety projects. Having specific policies will help guide those decisions.

Commissioner Northey suggested that with a strong vision statement, goal statement and milestones, there will be no need for pages and pages of policies. With regard to the staff-proposed vision statement, she offered a revision to have it read "Bellevue will be a city where all residents regardless of age or physical ability can walk or bicycle safely and conveniently." The vision of the city should not necessarily be that all residents should be able to bicycle everywhere in the city or throughout the Eastside. Statements that are too sweeping lose their meaning.

Motion to amend the vision statement to read "Bellevue will be a city where all residents regardless of age or physical ability can walk or bicycle safely and conveniently" was made by Commissioner Northey.

Commissioner Glass suggested the meaning of the vision statement would not be changed by the proposed revision.

Commissioner Tanaka asked if the goal is to make Bellevue rider friendly, or if the goal is to get more people riding bicycles. The proposed statement appears to favor making Bellevue rider friendly. He commented that making the system more rider friendly will encourage more people to use it, but added that having the best possible system in place will not necessarily mean it will get used.

Commissioner Van Valkenburgh agreed that the objective needs to be clearly understood and articulated. Clearly, some projects will serve commuters, while others will serve as recreational facilities. Mr. O'Neill said the vision statement and the goal statement are intended to be connected. Clearly the objective is to serve all system users, and the wording of the two statements says the intent is to create a system that can be used recreationally, that will reduce greenhouse gases, and that will enhance neighborhood livability.

Commissioner Northey withdrew her motion, which had not been seconded.

Commissioner Northey proposed wording the vision statement to read “Bellevue is a city that encourages all residents, regardless of age or physical ability, to walk or bicycle to destinations within their neighborhoods, the city as a whole, and the greater Eastside and region.”

Commissioner Glass said that wording would serve to encourage people to use systems that may or may not be provided.

Commissioner Northey suggested combining the vision statement and the goal statement into a single statement reading “Bellevue is a city that plans, designs and builds and maintains an integrated comprehensive network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities to encourage all residents to walk or bicycle to destinations within their neighborhoods, the city as a whole, and the greater Eastside and region.”

Commissioner Tanaka asked if the objective-based policies are achievable and measurable. Mr. O’Neill suggested they are achievable, but allowed it may not be possible to know for sure that they have been achieved. He said when the city of Chicago updated its bicycle plan, which was awarded silver status, they included two broad goals which defined the entire plan. One was to reduce the number of bicycle/vehicle accidents by 50 percent, and the second established that a specific percentage of all trips of less than a five miles would be by bicycle. Their idea was to set the bar higher in a couple of ways. Being able to measure it, however, is a far different process. For Bellevue, it would be easier to focus on a percentage of total trips, or modesplit, which is more measurable than the number of trips under a certain length.

Commissioner Northey suggested staff should seek to translate the goals shown under the broad goal statement into measurable outcomes and specific objectives.

Mr. O’Neill said it is the intension of staff to bring to the January 24 Commission meeting a completed integrated proposal with new language. He said staff may very well recommend getting rid of some policies, particularly where there is duplication.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Van Valkenburgh, Mr. O’Neill explained that going in the direction of having objective-based policies will potentially influence the prioritization process. The existing Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan outlines a prioritization system for the ped-bike plan to serve as the starting point. What Mr. Loewenherz has been working on is an idea for using overlays and data to identify categories to be considered and help bring possible priorities to the surface. For instance, if it is critical to the Commission that within the next ten years there is a completely connected north-south and east-west bicycle network, then that system linkage would be given a very high priority.

Commissioner Northey suggested that there may be a different way of looking at the current implementation section, namely making the transit and maintenance pieces and making them into master policies on a par with the system policies. She suggested that education and

enforcement may also want to be singled out separately.

Commissioner Glass asked where a goal statement aimed at making the downtown bicycle friendly would go. Mr. O'Neill said there is already a policy in the Transportation Element about making the downtown pedestrian friendly. A policy could be added anywhere in the document aimed at making the downtown bicycle friendly. What staff is looking for is policy direction to be included in the plan; it will be up to staff to figure out where it should most logically reside.

Commissioner Van Valkenburgh commented that both Paris and Rome have bicycle sharing programs which require some policy language with respect to the use of curb space and sidewalks. Downtown Bellevue is level for the most part and a bicycle sharing program may work very well there as a means of increasing mobility. Mr. O'Neill allowed that King County is generally interested in bicycle sharing programs and there have been some stakeholders in Bellevue who have expressed an interest in thinking about taking that approach.

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

#### B. Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan: Update on Public Comments

Mr. Loewenherz recognized that the city has a long history of non-motorized planning. A number of projects in the current report date back as far as 1979. He said it is remarkable that so many of the projects are still on the books and said ideally some progress will be made toward getting them done.

Mr. Loewenherz said during the upcoming week he would be working with the City Manager's office on defining dates for going to the City Council. Dates for consideration will be brought before the Commission January. He said Commissioners will be asked to join staff at the Council meeting to field a number of the questions related to the draft network plan, the project list, the policy framework and prioritization.

The process is currently at the evaluation and feedback stage. Staff have been working with the community, reviewing projects in the field, and developing refinements. Ultimately the Commission will provide guidance with respect to policies regarding percentage targets.

Mr. Loewenherz took a moment to acknowledge the hospitality shown him by the Bridle Trails community and their commitment of time. He said it is not often that planners work on projects where there is as much engagement, so it has been both exciting and professionally gratifying.

The interactive map has been one of the cornerstones of the engagement strategy. Bellevue is one of only a handful of jurisdictions nationwide making use of the technology. The approach has proved to be very effective; to date, 352 comments have been received. The vast majority of the comments, 82 percent, have been favorable. Mr. Loewenherz noted that the 28

comments received from the West Lake Sammamish community resulted from his inadvertently allowing a project description to proceed into the network plan; that error has been corrected.

The Bridle Trails community clearly has the most impassioned perspective relative to the project. A total of 167 electronic comments were received from that area alone, not counting letters and emails; of those, 131 of the comments were favorable. Of the 36 comments voicing opposition, 14 are related to the 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE corridor recommendation. The balance primarily address private property issues.

Commissioner Northey questioned how the bulk of the comments from the Bridle Trails community could be positive when the only comments the Commission has received during direct public testimony have been negative. Mr. Loewenherz said the public overwhelmingly wants to see the individual trail connections remain in existence. There is concern over many of the blockages that are taking place along the corridor. There is also concern about what the ultimate surface texture of the trail will be; for those with primarily an equestrian focus, there is no consideration being given to putting asphalt on them. Staff's early impression is that the 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE project should be removed from the list, but that action will not occur until March at the earliest.

Mr. Loewenherz clarified for the Commission that some individuals commented on just one project, while others comments on numerous projects. The numbers on the tally sheet reflect the total number of comments, not the total number of people who offered comments. Where a single person comments on five projects, a total of five comments were tallied. Commissioner Northey suggested that approach does not represent the sense of the community, noting that the tally sheet records more people in favor than opposed. Mr. Loewenherz reiterated that while there are concerns in the Bridle Trails community about the surface treatment of trails and the closure of certain corridors, there is broad support for having the trail system; the community wants the trails to remain in existence and be enhanced. Commissioner Northey argued that at a recent Commission meeting a large number of people from the community were present to voice their opposition to having trails cross their properties. She said what the Commission needs is an accurate reflection of what the community is feeling.

Mr. O'Neill suggested that the vital feedback will become clear during the project-by-project review. Chair Yuen agreed and pointed out that the Bridle Trails community is currently working to put together a recommendation that should help to clarify the picture.

Mr. Loewenherz called attention to project B-303, NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street between 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 148<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. He said the 1999 ped-bike plan included a recommendation to put in wide curb lanes. The 2007 plan continued that plan forward, but on both sides of the street. In conducting the field survey, staff found that on the south side of the road there is an ample shoulder, though it is largely covered by debris. He suggested that it would make sense to clear the shoulder and stencil it for use as a bicycle lane. On the north side of the street there is no compelling need to add anything to what exists. A neighborhood sidewalk project has been

identified for the same corridor, though it did not get funding in the last round.

The Bridle Trails residents staff met with in the field did not appear to be opposed to the project; they were far more concerned about the idea of adjusting the shoulders on either side of the street. The residents believe that any street widening will give drivers a signal that they can drive through the area at elevated speeds. In a letter from Ellen Kerr with the Bridle Trails Community Club, the comment was made that the bike lane on the existing shoulder should be established but that the original proposal to make it 10- to 15-feet wide was out of scale; she proposed the path should be no more than two to six feet wide. Another resident submitted a letter calling for nothing to be done along that roadway. The trail is currently used by a lot of people informally.

Mr. Loewenherz said there has been overwhelming opposition to project B-302 on 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE. He noted that the 1979 plan did envision having a bicycle element to the roadway, but that did not take into consideration the equestrian nature of the corridor. Staff will be proposing elimination of the project.

Referring to 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Mr. Loewenherz allowed that there was opposition to the proposed 10- to 14-foot wide off-street path. He said staff will be suggesting revising the project down to something on the order of a six- to ten-foot wide off-street path similar in character to what was recently constructed on the west side of the street. In the 1999 plan there was a recommendation for bike lanes. Along 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE between NE 40<sup>th</sup> and NE 24<sup>th</sup> there are segments that range from shoulders two-feet wide to eight-feet wide. Staff feels comfortable proposing a bike lane in the southbound direction for that portion of the corridor. On the north side of the same segment there is a six-foot pathway with both asphalt and concrete. Staff is not proposing any modification to what is there already, other than a series of spot improvements and signage to make the stretch safer for bicyclists. It would be very expensive to put in bike lanes as it would entail tearing out the landscaping strip and moving utility poles, none of which would be considering working within the profile as requested by the community.

Mr. Loewenherz allowed that the powerline corridor has a lot of controversy associated with it. The corridor was shown in the 1979 plan. In the 1999 plan it was shown as two different project segments: M-631 and M-632 with the cut-off line at NE 4<sup>th</sup> Street. The 2007 plan proposed merging the two into a single project with an eight- to twelve-foot multiple use gravel trail. Several modifications are being considered to keep the trail in line with the character of the community. The northern terminus should be at the Cantershire trail and not continue north beyond that point where there are some very steep slopes. The Cantershire trail allows access across 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE into Bridle Trails State Park. The other proposed revision is that the trail should be only a two- to six-foot-wide soft surface trail.

Commissioner Tanaka asked if the Cantershire trail utilizes an existing easement. Mr. Loewenherz said there is a lot of history on the plats in the area. There is a mix of public easements and private property. There is a need to survey it and better define the property

rights aspects, but that is the case with each and every one of the 400 projects on the list. That work, however, occurs at the design phase and not at the plan level.

Turning to the West Lake Sammamish proposal, Mr. Loewenherz said the corrected version, consistent with what was developed with the community, is what is now shown on the Virtual Earth interface. There have been no additional comments from the community since the correction was made.

The Coal Creek Parkway project proposal involves a 10- to 14-foot off-street path. The project is intended to resolve a safety issue and provide for a logical connection.

The Northup Way project is currently in design; a five-foot bike lane and eight-foot sidewalk is one of the options under consideration. The project has the support of the public. Kirkland staff have reported receiving comments from their citizens wanting to see the project completed.

Mr. Loewenherz noted that for 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE between Bellevue Way and SE 34<sup>th</sup> Street the proposal is for a five-foot bike lane and a six-foot sidewalk on both sides. The current CIP project W/B-71 is scheduled for implementation in 2009 and will develop a five-foot bike lane on both sides and a six-foot sidewalk on one side. The project in the ped-bike plan will likely be modified to match the CIP project parameters. The comments on the project have been generally favorable.

The original vision for the project on Northup Way between 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and West Lake Sammamish Parkway was for five-foot bike lanes and six-foot sidewalks on both sides of the road. Staff is thinking of breaking the single project into four different projects yielding only a climbing lane on the east side of Northup Way to NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street, with bike lanes and sidewalks on both sides for the rest of the stretch. The feedback has been generally positive.

Staff is also rethinking the Eastgate Way project, based in large part on the community input. The revised proposal will not include sidewalks and bike lanes on both sides of the street, rather only a sidewalk will be on the north side of the street, and only a bike lane will be on the south side of the street.

Mr. Loewenherz said staff has heard a lot from the public about the need for improved bicycle and pedestrian connections in the downtown. He said there are a lot of ideas in play currently as part of the downtown mobility initiative. Mr. O'Neill added that the properties along Main Street are going to redevelop, so having a project defined for when that happens will be critical.

Chair Yuen noted that the public in the vicinity of Meydenbauer Bay park are complaining about the traffic. One proposal is to make the segment of Main Street between 100<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 104<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE a village walkway, or possibly a one-way street.

Mr. Loewenherz said the thinking with regard to Bellevue Way between Northup Way and 103<sup>rd</sup> Avenue NE is to develop sidewalks and bicycle lane facilities. Whether that can be accommodate or not will be up to the design group. The feedback from the public has been favorable for the connection into and out of the downtown.

There has not been an overwhelming level of public support for the project on 156<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE between NE 8<sup>th</sup> Street and Lake Hills Boulevard. The thinking of staff is that facilities should be located on the east side only. Additional field assessment is needed before a final recommendation is made.

Mr. Loewenherz said the comments regarding the Mountains to Sound Greenway have been quite general. The plan will need to characterize the trail as a major east-west regional corridor. The same is true for the SR-520 trail.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Glass, Mr. Loewenherz noted that in the Bridle Trails area there are two separate powerlines. The Pikes Peak powerline trail lies immediately to the south of Bridle Trails State Park. The other powerline runs north and south between 140<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 132<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE and is the location of project M-631, the project from the Bridle Trails area that has received the most public comment. The preponderance of the feedback received, however, have expressed concern about existing trail blockages.

Mr. O'Neill observed that most of the comments made by the Bridle Trails community at the Commission meeting on October 25 were evidence of alarm by a lot of people who thought a couple of planners were drawing lines indiscriminately through their neighborhood, not realizing that the projects go back as far as 30 years. There is more understanding now on the part of the community, but there is clearly no unanimity concerning some of the projects. The Bridle Trails Community Club has been asked to help with the community engagement and they have accepted the task.

Commissioner Glass said it would be helpful for the Commission to have an indication as to which projects do have community consensus and which do not. Mr. Loewenherz said that information is available on the spreadsheet. He offered to come to the next meeting, however, with additional information on each project in the Bridle Trails community. He added that in the opinion of staff there never will be complete consensus on the part of the community.

Commissioner Tanaka suggested that absent community consensus the Commission will need to fall back on the policies and objectives relative to systemwide connectivity.

Commissioner Northey reiterated her call to make the equestrian trails issue a parks issue. She suggested that if the Commission chooses to spend all its time to doing a Bridle Trails equestrian subarea plan, there will be no time left to get the ped-bike plan adopted in a timely fashion. The issue is huge, it carries with it a great deal of community contention, and there are major implications for private property rights. If the Commission wants to tackle the equestrian trails issue, it should be done following adoption of the ped-bike plan. Mr.

Loewenherz said staff gave consideration to splitting the plan into its pedestrian and bicycle components. However, the various projects ultimately serve multiple needs making it nearly impossible to segregate them.

Chair Yuen said the Commission needs to hold off until the Bridle Trails Community Club brings forward its recommendation. He agreed that trails serving only equestrian users and connecting only to a park should be a parks issue. Any trail that connects with a roadway, however, is the purview of the transportation department.

9. OLD BUSINESS

Commissioner Northey suggested it would be worthwhile for the Commission to be given a briefing on the BROTS update work.

10. NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Cieri presented to the Commission a draft memo regarding the package of downtown Comprehensive Plan amendments. He asked the Commissioners to pass on to staff any edits. The memo will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for their December 12 meeting.

Motion to set the meeting time for all Transportation Commission meetings at 6:30 p.m. on the second and fourth Thursdays of each month was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Northey and the motion carried unanimously.

11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

13. REVIEW CALENDAR

A. Commission Calendar and Agenda

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

B. Public Involvement Calendar

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Yuen adjourned the meeting at 10:01 p.m.

---

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

---

Date

---

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

---

Date