

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

December 8, 2011
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Paul Krawczyk, Eric Miller, Tim Stever, Michael Ingram,
Kevin McDonald, Department of Transportation

OTHERS PRESENT: Joe Story, DKS Associates

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:33 p.m. by Chair Tanaka who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Lampe, who arrived at 6:34 p.m., and Commissioner Larrivee, who arrived at 6:42 p.m.

3. STAFF REPORTS

Capital Programming Manager Eric Miller reported that the city had received Transportation Improvement Board grants for two different programs. An additional \$3 million was received for the NE 4th Street extension project, with the funds to be used for right-of-way acquisition; that brings the total grants for the project up to \$8.6 million. Also received were \$2.6 million for Stage 1 of the 120th Avenue NE project, and \$3 million for Stage 2.

Mr. Miller said the city also received an Urban Sidewalk Program grant in the amount of \$125,000 to construct a sidewalk on the south side of NE 8th Street between 116th Avenue NE and 120th Avenue NE.

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

5. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Chair Tanaka said interviews with candidates for the open Commission seat were slated for December 15 beginning at 5:00 p.m.

6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Patrick Bannon with the Bellevue Downtown Association shared with the Commission a downtown access strategy, a document approved by the BDA Board of Directors in November. He said from time to time the organization challenges its members to reach agreement regarding high-level statements regarding transportation principles and priorities. He noted that there are many levels of agreement with both present and past city policies and principles, and that the membership voiced a number of consistent themes. Employers of all sizes understand the benefits and tradeoffs associated with an effective transportation system; workers, customers, and the transport of good all rely on a workable system. Residents and visitors alike desire a better ped-bike experience and continued efforts to improve traffic flow for cars and transit. Developers seek markets where infrastructure supports growth and tenant stability. He thanked the Commissioners for their ongoing planning focus around a thriving and economically competitive downtown.

Mr. Bruce Nurse with Kemper Development said the company is deeply invested in the downtown. The customer base averages between 60,000 and 65,000 people per day, with as many as 100,000 people per day during the holidays. The need to move the public into and out of the downtown, as well as within the downtown, is vitally important. He said Kemper Development looks forward to working with the Commission and staff in the coming year as the downtown transportation plan is updated. Kemper Development thinks in terms of responding to customer demand, both for its properties and in welcoming people to the downtown. The transportation system must work for everyone, not just a select few. Cars and pedestrians should be separated whenever possible. Maximum efficiency will flow from a true integration of all modes of travel, though the demand for each mode is not equal. He said he personally walks, rides a bike or drives to work. The planning work should give proper credit to the amount of walking done within the mixed use projects in the downtown. The Federal Highway Administration statistics indicate that nearly a quarter of all trips are for the purpose of shopping. Only 17 percent of all work trips are to and from work, and that number has been steadily decreasing. Signal preemption for transit vehicles is a serious concern in that it interrupts the flow of automobile traffic. On-street parking is a concern as well; it was implemented by the Council on a temporary basis on the thinking that it would be removed when additional capacity was needed. On-street parking is very expensive to construct given the costs associated with rights-of-way, and the number of spaces is not all that great. It has been some time since a parking survey was done in the downtown. Getting cars off the streets as quickly as possible helps the overall flow of traffic. Within the downtown, about a quarter of all traffic is origin/destination. Ideas that should be entertained during the update include skybridges, connecting tunnels under the streets, depressed intersections with covers over them

for pedestrians, and underground use of the pedestrian corridor for buses, HOV and SOV use. Of great importance is where the final transportation center should be located.

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

8. STUDY SESSION

A. Bicycle & Pedestrian Access During Construction Projects

Right-of-Way Supervisor Tim Stever said there are basically four types of work done in city rights-of-way: work done by city crews; work done by contractors hired by the city; franchise utility work; and work associated with development. The latter three require right-of-way permits to be issued by the city. The conditions associated with right-of-way use permits include, among other things, temporary traffic control and access for pedestrians and bicyclists. The documents that establish the guidelines for setting conditions include the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Title VI, and Chapter 6 of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD).

Mr. Stever said the considerations that go into the conditions established for work in the rights-of-way relative to non-motorized access include existing conditions in the field, such as sidewalks, ADA compliance, bike lanes, level of usage, the nature of the work to be done, the duration of the work, and the cost and reasonableness of mitigation relative to the work to be done.

During construction, the applicant is responsible for providing all appropriate pedestrian and traffic control. Sidewalks and trails are to remain open at all times during the operation, though short-duration closures may be permitted when it can be accommodated through detours or other means. Prior to any construction activity, applicants must receive approval of a site-specific traffic control plan, including consideration for non-motorized users. Applicants must barricade off any areas where excavation is to occur to assure public safety. No vehicles are allowed to park on the sidewalks during the activities associated with the permit. If a sidewalk ramp is removed as part of a project, replacement must be with an ADA-compliant ramp. The contractor must keep existing sidewalks clear of debris and other hazards that might block pedestrians during construction.

Pedestrian shelters are often utilized during construction. When the apartment building across the street from City Hall was under construction, the sidewalks along NE 4th Street and 112th Avenue NE had pedestrian shelters, allowing the sidewalks to safely remain open during construction. In those instances where the sidewalks remain open for safe public use, the contractor is not required to pay a mitigation fee. In some instances temporary walkways are constructed for public use; the option was used during construction of the Lake Hills library

when a long section of sidewalk on 156th Avenue SE had to be torn out for utility work and frontage improvements. Construction phasing is often required to accommodate pedestrians. Developers are allowed to utilize detours if they can show pedestrians can reasonably be accommodated around sidewalk closures. However, if a closure lasts for more than two weeks, the developer is required to lease the right-of-way on which the closed sidewalk lies.

Commissioner Larrivee said his experience has been that while the provisions are sound, regular and consistent enforcement is needed. He said he has observed many instances where the provisions were violated, especially outside the downtown area. Mr. Stever said every attempt is made to consistently enforce the provisions. One reason situations occur that do not appear to comply with the letter of the law is that allowance is made for reasonableness; another is the fact that there are a limited number of inspectors. The city issues some 900 right-of-way permits annually, some of which are for major projects and some of which are for small projects; follow-up for all of those permits is done by only three inspectors.

Commissioner Larrivee suggested part of the public outreach process attached to development projects should include engaging stakeholders and alerting them to the fact that there are guidelines and certain expectations that come with construction. Those who see violations should be encouraged to notify the city about them. To many, the expectation is that if a project is under way it has been fully permitted by the city and nothing can be done about it. The fact is that that is not necessarily the case.

Commissioner Larrivee asked how safety issues are accounted for in determining cost benefits. He commented that quite a lot of construction was recently done at the Lake Hills Connector and SE 8th Street intersection, during which time it was very unsafe for any pedestrian or bicyclist to cross the street during the times no policeman was directing traffic. Mr. Stever said there are situations in which the regulations could be used to require a developer to construct a \$20,000 temporary walkway for a job that will only last a few hours. Those are the instances where the reasonableness factor is taken into consideration. He said he was not fully informed with regard to the pedestrian portion of the traffic control plan for the Lake Hills and SE 8th Street project, but allowed that pedestrians should have been accommodated through the duration of the project. Commissioner Larrivee said the guidelines make perfect sense and if enforced would assure pedestrian and bicycle safety; for the project in question signs directing vehicular traffic were located in the middle of the sidewalks. Mr. Stever said he has encountered those situations but pointed out that while the rules state that signs must be placed in a way that will maintain at least as much pedestrian space as is available before the project begins, in some cases that cannot realistically be done. He agreed, however, that everyone permitted to work in rights-of-way should be reminded of what they need to be doing relative to non-motorized access and safety.

Commissioner Glass said he has also encountered signs located on sidewalks and in bikeways and asked if there are different sizes of signs that can be used, adding that the larger signs certainly are more disruptive. Mr. Stever said the city requires signs that are 48 inches by 48

inches because that is what MUTCD calls for. Commissioner Glass asked if the signs could be pole mounted for projects anticipated to last for quite a while. Mr. Stever said that is often done for longer-term projects. Commissioner Glass noted that the city will soon be torn up for light rail projects and there will need to be signs for every project.

Commissioner Larrivee added that the Light Rail Best Practices Committee found that cities that took a proactive stance relative to mitigation efforts in association with large construction projects found that keeping walkways and bikeways open to the public helps to avoid problems, as does phasing construction to keep any one area from being impacted for too long.

B. Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) Update

Senior Transportation Planner Michael Ingram reminded the Commissioners that there are five criteria for scoring roadway/intersection projects: safety, level of service, transit, non-motorized and regional partnerships. He proposed revising slightly the wording of the last two criteria, adding to the non-motorized criterion the element of ADA compliance, and renaming the regional partnerships criterion to plan consistency and outside funding.

Mr. Ingram said the city did a comprehensive inventory of its existing sidewalks and curb ramps relative to ADA compliance. The analysis shows that there are extensive segments of sidewalk that are out of compliance with ADA. There are 399 block faces with a high barrier ranking in terms of ADA condition. Revising the non-motorized criterion allows for incorporating ADA consideration into the overall evaluation scheme.

The proposed language change for the non-motorized criterion also references bicycle facilities. During the process of updating the ped-bike plan Priority Bicycle Corridors were identified and incorporated into policy.

Referring to the proposed scoring matrix for non-motorized projects, Commissioner Larrivee said it appeared to him that an ideal project on an identified bicycle priority corridor that completes a missing link and also corrects an ADA deficiency could garner 125 points. Mr. Ingram said staff was not proposing to readjust the weight of the non-motorized scoring within the overall framework. The maximum possible would be 100. The notion of adding 25 points for a facility that builds out a segment of a priority bicycle corridor would only kick in if a project otherwise scored less than 100.

Mr. Ingram said the ADA inventory measured a lot of inputs. With those measurements in hand, staff developed a scheme to integrate them into an Impedance evaluation. To get to the overall Barrier ranking, the Activity score takes into account ten different inputs, including census and land use data. The physical condition of facilities comes into play in determining impedance. It is the combination of the two that generate a Barrier score.

Policy PB-2 in the ped-bike plan specifies that within ten years at least two completed,

connected and integrated north-south bicycle routes, and at least two east-west bicycle routes, are to be implemented. Additionally, within five years at least one completed and connected north-south bicycle route, and at least one east-west bicycle route, must be implemented through the downtown. Mr. Ingram said the city is not on track to complete those objectives within the specified timelines, though progress has been made.

With regard to the plan consistency and outside funding criterion, Mr. Ingram noted that in addition to the title change the proposal includes removing from the matrix old language referring to regional plans that are no longer relevant and including specific references to the regional Transportation 2040 plan and general references to state and regional plans, priority lists and studies.

Commissioner Larrivee asked why the plan consistency and outside funding score reflected an absolute amount rather than a percentage of the project. He commented that receiving \$900,000 in outside funding for a \$2 million project is better than receiving \$1.1 million for a \$100 million project. Mr. Miller said in the types of grants being sought over which there is a lot of direct department control, there is no real high end in terms of millions of dollars. The big money grants for big projects require going the legislative or congressional route, and those funds are becoming scarce. Commissioner Larrivee pointed out that the Commission likely will have the outside funding numbers in hand when it comes time to rank projects, and probably will give additional weight to those projects that will bring in the most outside dollars.

Commissioner Lampe suggested that rather than using less than \$1 million or more than \$1 million in the matrix the better approach would be less than 50 percent of project cost or more than 50 percent of project cost as the dividing line between medium and high priority.

Mr. Ingram pointed out that the proposed matrix revision includes giving ten points to projects identified in a local subarea plan or similar planning process but not included in Transportation 2040; previously such projects were given no points at all.

Mr. Miller agreed to discuss the matrix scoring issue with the grant coordinator and bring her comments back to the Commission in January.

Commissioner Simas asked whether the matrix format as proposed would create a bias in favor of areas with high amounts of traffic activity over residential areas with far less traffic activity. Mr. Miller allowed that there is a natural bias in most grant programs toward high-activity areas, so in that vein the matrix does incorporate some bias.

With regard to the ped-bike scoring criteria, Mr. Ingram noted that they were most recently vetted by the Commission in 2005. He said the proposal is to implement the adjustments for the ADA inventory and the priority bicycle corridors into the scoring criteria. However, rather than calling the ADA element out specifically, the idea is to integrate it into the system linkage

and land use categories. For system linkage, five points would be added up to the maximum of 35 for projects that address one or more block faces with a high Impediment ranking, and for land use five points would be added where projects correct ADA deficiencies in one or more block faces with a high Activity ranking.

Mr. Ingram said staff has a document with close to 100 pages listing the Impedance and Activities scores as well as the associated Barrier score. All of them are ranked in terms of high, medium and low priority. The proposal is to use the Impedance figures for the system linkage category of the ped-bike project scoring criteria, and the Activity scores for the land use category.

Commissioner Glass asked why the proposal is not to use the melded barrier score. Mr. Ingram explained that to do that would require reassessing the rates for the three category components. The barrier score would have to be given its own weight given that it has component parts. Commissioner Glass observed that the activity score gives a higher score to a multifamily home than to a single family home. By giving multifamily housing an additional 7.5 points in the land use category would seem to double-count multifamily to some degree. Mr. Miller clarified that the only double-counting would be associated with existing facilities that have ADA compliance issues. Mr. Ingram added that the activity score is generated from a total of ten inputs.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Larrivee regarding the safety matrix, Mr. Ingram agreed that the matrix is confusing. The engineer who developed the matrix understands it and uses it to evaluate projects every cycle. He said he would seek some clarifications and provide them to the Commission at a future meeting.

Mr. Ingram reminded the Commissioners that the city's Utility Department has a program to strategically address locations that have the most benefit to fish. A number of high-priority locations have already been addressed, and a large project on Coal Creek Parkway will begin construction in 2012. Many of the existing barriers, however, are associated with state highways; I-90 and I-405 in particular have some significant barriers which, until addressed, obviates the value of fixing up-stream issues. Some remediation work is under way for some of the barriers on SR-520.

By including a rating for transit and the non-motorized system the city is adhering to the precepts of a sustainable transportation system. The proposed adjustments to the non-motorized category may increase some of the scores within the element of the overall scheme, thus strengthening the sustainability aspect.

Mr. Ingram said one thing the city is increasingly looking at is how to make projects better with less local impact and incorporating natural drainage practices. Some factors, however, cannot be known until projects reach a certain design point.

Title VI requires the city to reach out and engage folks who may be underrepresented in some of the traditional outreach processes. New census data will be used to better understand the characteristics of the population and which aspects trigger the Title VI thresholds for things like limited English proficiency and low-income, and the information will be used to inform the public involvement process.

With regard to the public involvement process, Mr. Ingram said the intent is to conduct open house meetings in six locations throughout the city. Comments will be gathered concerning projects slated for neighborhoods as well as those in other areas of the city. That information will be supplemented with the results of a survey made available online and in hardcopy at the open house events. The public input will be sought in February and March 2012 and will be used to inform the overall assessment of projects by the Commission and the staff.

C. Downtown Transportation Plan Update – Measures of Effectiveness

Senior Planner Kevin McDonald explained that measures of effectiveness are intended to provide information regarding how a project would perform relative to the objectives to be accomplished. Performance can be based on specific types of modes and can be used to compare mode changes against one another. Measures of effectiveness can be combined to achieve an aggregate transportation system performance for the downtown, and they can be used in determining how different projects should be packaged to achieve mobility objectives.

The measures of effectiveness unveiled for the Commission at the November 10 meeting have been subdivided into two categories: core measures of effectiveness, and supplemental measures of effectiveness. The core measures of effectiveness are those that will be generally used in looking at all of the project recommendations for the downtown; they will be the ones that appear most likely to reflect the needs of the transportation system as well as the community objectives for mobility. The supplemental measures of effectiveness may be applied situationally as things arise that are a bit out of the ordinary; they may or may not apply to every situation. Measures of effectiveness can be locational in that they apply only to an intersection, a roadway segment or a corridor, or they can be aggregated to the downtown subarea level. The measures are split by modes of travel and the focus is on the people who are traveling not the vehicles doing the moving of people. There is also a sustainability measure of effectiveness to apply in determining how projects rank against the objectives.

Joe Story, consultant project manager with DKS Associates, reiterated that the modal specific measures of effectiveness are to be targeted at system users and not vehicles. To that end, there are five measures of effectiveness under the heading of private vehicle occupant mobility, one that applies to intersections or locations, two that apply to segments or corridors, and two that apply to the downtown subarea. The intersection or location measure focuses on the typical level of service calculation. The corridor measures focus on average travel time in seconds for vehicle occupants on a per-mile basis, as well as on the number of on-street spaces for parking and loading. The subarea measures focus on the aggregate intersection delays in

seconds per private vehicle occupant, and on the number of daily vehicle trip ends.

Commissioner Glass asked why there was a measure of effectiveness for providing on-street parking under private vehicle occupant mobility. Mr. Story said the intent was to recognize the need to pay attention to the possibility of on-street parking as one of the goals of the downtown plan. On-street space data will be used developing a final package of options. On-street parking affects roadway speeds and the accessibility of private vehicles for particular land uses. Commissioner Glass noted that no decision has been made yet with regard to making on-street parking a goal for the downtown. Mr. Story said the goal is more focused on assessing on-street parking, and the measure is needed in order to assess it.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Simas, Mr. Story explained that private vehicle traffic has traditionally been looked at in terms of how it behaves during peak times; all the other hours of the day have tended to be put on the side. The number of vehicle trips coming into and out of the downtown when compared against the total number of persons coming into and out of the downtown is important in determining if a person can get around the downtown without using their private vehicle by parking and accomplishing their tasks as a pedestrian. The factor is different from modeshare which is more an indication of the journey from home to work.

Commissioner Simas asked if there is a way to effectively measure the movement of people outside the core area and how that integrates with the movement of people within the core area. Mr. Story said the segment or corridor measures will look at that issue. Connectivity between the downtown and the rest of the city is an important consideration for all of the different modes. Average travel time will be the segment or corridor measure.

Mr. Story said there are five measures of effectiveness under the heading of pedestrian mobility, one of which applies to intersection or location, two of which apply to the corridors, and two of which apply to the subarea as a whole. He noted that the intersection crosswalk and the walkway quality scores are the mechanisms recommended by the Transportation Research Board for defining pedestrian levels of service. They take into account capacity as well as comfort measures and delay. The average travel time in seconds for pedestrians per mile might be somewhat ambitious but it equates to the per-mile basis used for private vehicle occupant mobility. The subarea measures include the number of internal downtown walking trips and the percent of total daily person trip ends.

Commissioner Lampe asked what factors are included in determining a walkway quality score. Mr. Story said the elements include the quality of the sidewalk, lighting, whether or not there is a buffer between the walkway and the street, the speed of the traffic on the adjacent street, and the presence of on-street parking.

Mr. Story said the number of measures related to bicycle mobility was kept to only three. The bicycle facility score is based on a level of service determination used nationally. The other

two measures are percent of arterial streets served by preferred bicycle facilities, and the percent of total daily trip ends made by bicyclists.

Commissioner Larrivee asked why there should be an intersection location score for crosswalks for pedestrians but not for bicyclists. Mr. Story said a crosswalk score for cyclists could be added, however, specific intersection improvements would be captured within the corridor.

Mr. Story said there are three measures of effectiveness under transit rider mobility, one dealing with bus stop locations and provide preferred components, one measuring travel time in seconds per transit rider per mile of travel corridor, and one focused on the percent of total daily trip ends by transit within a five-minute walk of a high-frequency transit service.

Commissioner Lampe asked why the measure should be limited to bus stop locations given that one or more light rail stations will eventually be sited in the downtown, and given the fact that vanpooling is analogous to transit ridership. Mr. Story noted that the downtown transportation plan update will consider pedestrian and bicycle access to the station. Mr. McDonald commented that everything in the downtown light rail tunnel and stations will be within the purview of Sound Transit, though the city can to some extent influence the design. The surface amenities that facilitate user access to both the bus system and the light rail system will be of great importance, and it would be appropriate to consider access to light rail facilities as well as bus facilities within the scope of the downtown transportation plan update.

Commissioner Glass noted that buses operating on city streets without pullouts simply stop in the roadway to pick up and let off riders. Other vehicles using the roadway must stop as well and wait for the bus to move again, and that delays the overall travel time. He asked how that delay is measured. Mr. Story said such delays are factored into overall travel times. Giving priority to transit may in fact cause travel times for persons in private vehicles to be increased.

Mr. Story said the measures of effectiveness of regarding sustainability outcomes are all aggregates for the downtown subarea, specifically the aggregate percent of non-SOV daily work trips, the percent of non-SOV total daily trips, the percent of non-SOV total trips internal to the downtown, the vehicle hours of delay, and transportation greenhouse gas emissions. The forecasts for residential and non-residential growth in the downtown make calculating the trips internal to the downtown all the more important; a much greater multiplier is expected in terms of the percent of internal downtown trips.

Mr. McDonald called attention to the two hypothetical scenarios include in the staff memo. He noted that Scenario A depicted the elimination of a two-way left-turn lane, though not the movement, from a five-lane Downtown arterial and the addition of a landscaped median and bicycle lanes. Using the measures of effectiveness, a rough score was applied to the scenario using minus one for each mobility metric degraded, a zero where there was no effect on the metric, and a plus one where a benefit could be demonstrated. He reviewed with the

Commissioners the score for each measure of effectiveness for each mode of travel and noted that the aggregate score yielded a three-plus increase.

Mr. Story stressed that the calculations will be looked at in a cross section. It is possible the decision will be made to favor pedestrians more on one particular road and favor automobiles on another road. The decision-making process will include factors other than just the scoring.

Commissioner Larrivee commented that the word “score” indicates an absolute when in reality the scenario results are more directional toward making things worse, making things better, or having no effect.

Mr. McDonald walked the Commissioners through Scenario 2 in which the same turn lane was eliminated, but instead of favoring bicycles added a transit lane along with a landscaped median. He noted that while the individual scores for the measures of effectiveness for each mode of travel were different, the overall score was again a three-plus increase.

Mr. McDonald said the objective for January will be to take the community outreach results and develop a scoping report that identifies the major issues and possible projects. Then the measures of effectiveness will be used to evaluate ideas for addressing the transportation issues documented in the scoping report.

D. 130th Avenue NE Station Area Plan

Mr. McDonald indicated that the scope of work for the station area planning was focused on helping to refine and graphically illustrate the concepts embedded in the Bel-Red subarea plan. The plan helps to address things like the characteristics of the new neighborhoods that will emerge; where and what type of parks and open space the neighborhoods will have; what type of restoration should be done in Goff Creek and how to carry it out; improvements to the ped-bike system in the neighborhoods that include access to the planned 130th Avenue NE light rail station; and early redevelopment possibilities.

The Bel-Red subarea plan envisions the transformation of the existing light industrial and commercial uses to a more high-density mixed use area. In presentations to national audiences about the corridor, the transformation has been dubbed the “gray to green” strategy. As the urban neighborhood develops, there will be more trees, more green elements along the streets, new parks and open spaces, and improved stream corridors.

The land uses around the 130th Avenue NE station site will include a mix of housing with supportive retail and neighborhood services, with a little bit of office. The uses will be accommodated in buildings up to 150 feet tall in the core of the neighborhood, dropping down in height toward the edges and the existing neighborhoods. The station plan offers a fixed point from which to work in developing the infrastructure needed to support the station and the neighborhood.

As the light rail and roadway design work has been proceeding, the need to identify specific locations for stream culverts emerged, particularly for Goff Creek. Because Goff Creek currently is piped, its ultimate location can be moved to best fit the needs of the neighborhood.

The city wants to influence the design of the station and the associated park and ride so they will integrate with the neighborhood. That factor has been a prime element of the station area planning work.

Mr. McDonald said the station area planning work was funded in part with stimulus funds from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The project is due to be completed by the end of February.

Goff Creek is an important linear amenity for the station area, but it must be crossed by pedestrians, bicyclists and automobiles. Time has been spent in trying to understand where the crossings should be and what they should look like. Actual bridge design will be a function of the roadway and pedestrian system design work.

The heart of the transportation system will be light rail running down the center of the new NE 16th Street with side platforms serving the 130th Avenue NE station. Sound Transit is proposing a surface park and ride lot adjacent to the station, but over the long term it may be possible to redevelop the site into a transit-oriented development with housing above, retail at the street level, and parking below for both commuters and residents and business patrons.

The Bel-Red subarea plan calls for a network of new streets to serve the new neighborhood around the station. The local streets will provide access to the new housing. They will typically have only one lane running in each direction with on-street parking, generous landscaping, and sidewalks on each side. Midblock crossings will be created where needed along with curb bulb-outs at the intersections.

The already existing 130th Avenue NE would be redesigned as a retail shopping street but will also include green landscaping elements. Along with having one lane in each direction and on-street parking, the retail streets will include bicycle facilities having direct access to the transit station.

The internal streets that will help fill out the grid system will be called green streets. They will have an additional landscaping component but will also be functionally more green by accommodating stormwater infrastructure and including rain gardens and pervious pavement treatments. The soils in the neighborhood are particularly well suited for on-site rainwater percolation into the ground. Pedestrians and bicyclists will be favored along the green streets because the traffic will be calmed by design features. The green streets will terminate at riparian corridors and transition to multipurpose paths.

Mr. McDonald shared with the Commissioners an analysis of the walking distances that can be achieved by completing the street grid within the neighborhood. Five- and ten-minute walks from the hypothetical location of the station were shown in a map. With a connected street grid and connections across the streams, the neighborhood will be far more walkable.

With regard to bicycle access, Mr. McDonald noted that routes on existing and planned roadways are envisioned as connecting the neighborhood to light rail, to other areas in Bellevue and to regional bicycle facilities. The planned bicycle facility between 124th Avenue NE and 130th Avenue NE is a multipurpose path that crosses the West Tributary in a separate, parallel alignment to the NE 16th Street crossing. Bicycle facilities will include bicycle lanes, cycle tracks and sharrows.

Mr. McDonald said the final report will be delivered to the City Council in February 2012.

9. OLD BUSINESS

Commissioner Glass reported on his intention to invite representatives from the Cascade Bicycle Club, Ron Sher and Bill Ptacek, to comment on whether or not the club would favor collaborating with the Commission on the notion of advancing the idea of bicycle safety and education.

Commissioner Jokinen said he would like to hear first a report on what the city is already doing along those lines. Mr. Krawczyk pointed out that the city is limited from a resource point of view from doing much. That is why the outreach effort was raised in the first place.

There was consensus for Commissioner Glass to invite the club representatives to address the issues at an upcoming Commission meeting.

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. September 8, 2011

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Larrivee. Second was by Commissioner Simas and the motion carried unanimously.

B. October 13, 2011

Motion to approve the minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Simas and the motion carried unanimously.

13. REVIEW COMMISSION CALENDAR AND AGENDA

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

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Tanaka adjourned the meeting at 9:22 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

Date