

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

April 23, 2009
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioners Kiel, Tanaka

STAFF PRESENT: David Cieri, Drew Redman, Eric Miller, Paul Krawczyk, Department of Transportation

GUEST SPEAKERS: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 6:34 p.m. by Chair Northey who presided.

2. ROLL CALL

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

Chair Northey welcomed new Commissioner Dave Jokinen who took a moment to tell little about himself and his interests in transportation.

3. STAFF REPORTS

Transportation CIP Construction Manager Dave Cieri added his welcome to Commissioner Jokinen as well.

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

5. REPORTS FROM COMMISSIONERS

Commissioner Simas commented on the email he received earlier in the day from the Washington State Department of Transportation regarding the SR-520 project proposals. He noted that he had forwarded the email to all of the Commissioners. Simulations of each option

have been posted to YouTube.

6. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None

7. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

8. STUDY SESSION

A. 2010 – 2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Update

Capital Programming Implementation Manager Eric Miller reported that Associate Transportation Planner Drew Redman has been tapped to fill the position vacated by Kristi Oosterveen relative to updating the TIP. He noted that by state law every jurisdiction is required to update its TIP annually. He explained that projects in the TIP are drawn from the Comprehensive Plan, the long-range facility plans, the Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP), Capital Investment Program (CIP), and regional projects in which the city may wish to participate financially.

Chair Northey asked if the Council has done anything with the \$15 million placeholder for ped-bike projects that was included in the CIP. Mr. Miller said that issue has not been taken up yet by the Council.

Mr. Redman informed the Commissioners that some jurisdictions combine the projects from their CIP and TFP to generate their TIP. While Bellevue could do the same, the city has traditionally added priority items from subarea plans and the like that could potentially be funded by federal grants. Projects in the TIP do not have to be funded. Projects must be included in the state TIP, which is the collective projects from the TIPs of all jurisdictions, in order to be eligible for state or federal grants.

Mr. Redman said a public hearing has been scheduled for May 28. The Council must approve the annual TIP by the end of June.

Mr. Redman explained that the projects in the draft TIP are divided into four sections. Section I includes all of the projects that are in the current CIP; Section II includes all of the projects in the current TFP; Section III includes unfunded project priorities identified from subarea plans; and Section IV includes projects from regional plans that are not under the control of the city. He noted that the draft includes 18 new projects, and 13 projects previously shown in Section III that were transferred to Section II. Projects for which there has been some change since the last TIP was adopted were noted in italics. The two projects removed from the CIP and the projects moved from one section to another were highlighted in pink.

A Title VI equity analysis will need to be conducted on the list before it can be adopted. That process will analyze the project impacts across the city and determine which languages the public process should be translated into.

Commissioner Larrivee asked if the projects in the draft TIP are prioritized in any way. Mr. Redman allowed that they are not, nor do they need to be before the list is adopted.

Commissioner Glass asked what thought process was behind removing projects entirely from the CIP. Mr. Miller said there were two projects removed from the CIP, both of which were in the Bel-Red corridor. The projects were not included in the CIP adopted by the Council in early 2009 because projects in the Bel-Red plan supersede them.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Glass, Chair Northey suggested that there are reasons for not including every possible project in the TIP. She said a great deal of effort is put into prioritizing the TFP, and even more is put into prioritizing the CIP to highlight the projects that should be funded first. If the grant list is far broader than either the TFP or the CIP, the priorities of some external agency could trump those of the city. If the total project list were short, it might make sense to broaden the scope, but that is not the case. There are any number of competitive candidates in the budgeted documents for which grants should be sought ahead of projects that are not budgeted.

Mr. Miller allowed that some of the Section III projects are intended to serve as catch-alls. He called attention specifically to TIP #93 pedestrian and bicycle transportation plan implementation and held it up as an example, noting that with the project an argument could be made that anything consistent with the Bel-Red plan is eligible for grant funding.

Commissioner Larrivee added that state grants can be very specialized, particularly in the areas of ped-bike and alternative mobility options. If broad projects descriptions are not included in the TIP, the city could risk losing the opportunity for outside funding. Such projects do not necessarily compete head to head with prioritized and funded projects.

Mr. Miller pointed out that once the TIP is finalized for public hearing, the projects that have been deleted or moved will not be highlighted, and the projects will have new numbers.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Simas, Mr. Miller clarified that projects in the CIP are automatically included in the TIP. Projects from the long-range facilities plan can be included or left out at the discretion of the Commission. He reiterated that the projects in the TIP will not be prioritized, and that projects in the TIP become eligible for outside grant funding. Input from the community is sought to determine if there are projects on the list that should not be, and projects not on the list that should be; a public hearing is also required by state law.

Commissioner Glass recalled that during the development of the TFP the environmental process highlighted some possible future problem areas. He asked if any of the Section III

projects address those future problems. Mr. Miller said projects have not been added to the draft that are aimed at addressing those issues. It will be necessary to conduct another planning process in order to identify specific projects, or to revisit the concurrency methodology.

Motion to adopt the TIP as proposed for purposes of the public hearing was made by Commissioner Glass. Second was by Commissioner Simas.

Motion to amend the motion by striking all projects in Section III was made by Chair Northey. Second was by Commissioner Larrivee, the amendment failed.

The main motion carried unanimously.

B. West Lake Sammamish Parkway Project Update

Project Manager Paul Krawczyk invited the Commissioners to attend the project open house slated for June 10 from 4:00 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. at the Sambica Club.

Mr. Krawczyk reminded the Commissioners that the project was created as part of the 2007-2013 CIP and represented the culmination of a very successful outreach project that gained public approval for the cross section that still enjoys wide support.

The Council included in a supplemental CIP \$1 million to conduct a pre-design study. That study allowed for examining some of the engineering details including pavement, drainage, and aesthetic elements. One open house has been held that was focused on retaining wall and landscaping types.

The next step will be to look at the phasing of the construction project involving 5.5 miles of roadway and costing an estimated \$30 million. It would be very difficult to build the project in a single phase. The open house scheduled for June 10 will give the public an opportunity to voice opinions concerning what the first phase should be. There is some \$5 million available, which is not sufficient to fully construct any of the phases as currently sketched out.

Mr. Krawczyk said the five segments are uniform in a number of ways. In most of the segments, the pavement is in need of repair; each requires drainage improvements; and the cost per foot is approximately \$1500.

Chair Northey asked if storm drainage or any other city utility will share the costs for their portion. Mr. Krawczyk said shared funding is usually obtained in instances where a facility is being upgraded that otherwise needed to be repaired. The engineering study has not identified any such elements that must be repaired. The existing storm drainage is adequate to serve the roadway in its current configuration.

Mr. Krawczyk explained that following the open house staff will return to the Commission to share the results of the survey and present a conceptual design plan for the first phase of the

project. The project design report for the first phase will also be shared; it will be presented to the Council for approval and for the allocation of additional construction funding.

Chair Northey said it was her recollection was that the package forwarded to the Council about prioritizing the mobility initiative included \$15 million for ped-bike and another pot of money for the Parkway. Deputy Director Dave Berg said that additional funds totaled about \$7 million. Mr. Krawczyk said those funds would be in addition to the funds currently allocated for the West Lake Sammamish Parkway project.

Commissioner Simas asked if in the opinion of staff there is one particular phase that should be done first. Mr. Krawczyk said each of the engineers involved with the project have expressed different biases based on the conditions in each segment. There are advantages in the south end associated with providing a new traffic signal and pedestrian crossings. To the north the roadway has pavement problems that need to be addressed. Each of the five segments has unique drainage issues to be addressed. No matter which phase is constructed first, the support of the public will be required going forward.

Commissioner Glass said the Commission has been hearing the \$30 million figure for a long time. He asked if the estimates have been updated as the design work has advanced. Mr. Krawczyk said the estimates have been reviewed. The recent significant reductions in construction costs have been to the advantage of the city, but if the bid climate changes the overall project cost will change accordingly.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Simas, Mr. Krawczyk said the proposed strategy is to construct each phase in a single construction season. With sufficient funding lined up, the entire project could be wrapped up in five years.

Commissioner Jokinen asked if there have been conversations with parks regarding adjusting the crosswalks for the Spady and Wewona Beach properties. Mr. Krawczyk said transportation staff has been meeting with parks staff as part of the project specifically to discuss park and trail connections.

Commissioner Larrivee said the current momentum the project is enjoying is a good thing. He said he would not want to see the open house conducted and the public select which phase to start with only to see the project die out for lack of funding. If the city is going to move forward with the project at all, it will need to be willing to construct all five phases. It would make no sense at all to construct a single segment only. Mr. Krawczyk concurred.

Chair Northey commented that a good turnout at the open house will serve to remind the Council of the level of community support for the project.

9. OLD BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS – None

12. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. March 12, 2009

Chair Northey referred to the last paragraph on the fourth page of the minutes and suggested that the phrase “Ms. Hunter said what exists on I-90 currently is a scaled-down version of active traffic management” should be revised to read “Ms. Hunter said what soon will exist on I-90 currently will be a scaled-down version of active traffic management.”

Commissioner Larrivee called attention to the fourth paragraph on the fifth page of the minutes and the interchange between Chair Northey and Ms. Hunter regarding capacity and throughput. He suggested that the paragraph could use some clarification.

It was agreed to put off approving the minutes until staff had opportunity to review the meeting recording.

B. March 26, 2009

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

13. REVIEW COMMISSION CALENDAR AND AGENDA

The Commissioners discussed with staff the Commission’s calendar and upcoming agenda items.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Northey adjourned the meeting at 7:46 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

Date