

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES

September 12, 2024  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
Hybrid Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Vice Chair Magill, Commissioners Keilman, Kurz,  
Rebhuhn

COMMISSIONERS REMOTE: Commissioners Marciante, Ting

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Chair Stash

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Michael Ingram, Kristi Oosterveen,  
Department of Transportation

OTHERS PRESENT: Chris Breiland, Fehr & Peers

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Chair Stash.

Commissioner Rebhuhn welcomed new Commissioner Susanna Keilman and invited the Commissioners to introduce themselves.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Keilman. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Rebhuhn and the motion carried unanimously.

3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Principal Planner Kevin McDonald noted having forwarded to the Commissioners all written communications received.

Chris Randels from Complete Streets Bellevue spoke representing those walking, rolling, and taking transit in the city and expressed support for adding several biking and pedestrian project concepts to the TFP. It was noted, however, that according to the city's Mobility Implementation Plan (MIP) dashboard, 97 percent of Bellevue streets meet their speed targets for motor vehicles, and 88 percent of intersections are meeting their V/C performance targets.

Those navigating Bellevue by car are able to get wherever they would like to go with minimal risk and delay. The same cannot be said of people walking, biking, or rolling in that they face significant challenges due to a lack of infrastructure, making large parts of the city inaccessible. Only 58 percent of arterials meet their pedestrian performance targets of having sidewalks on both sides of the street, and only 54 percent of streets meet the LTS bike targets. While the proposed projects would help, there would still be gaps even if all TFP projects were implemented by 2040. If the city is serious about reaching Vision Zero by 2030 and protecting vulnerable road users, there is a need to prioritize planning for bike and pedestrian facilities. Two specific improvements were suggested. First, extending project MIP B-11 from 164th to 165th Avenue NE to connect with the East Bellevue neighborhood greenway. Second, extending project MIP B-6 northward from SE 27th to SE 24th Street, connecting it to infrastructure by the Lake Hills Greenbelt. The Commission was also urged to address transit speed performance by turning placeholder projects TFP-303 through TFP-309 into precise design recommendations and incorporating bus-only lanes and signal priority.

Zhao Yuanmeng, an Overlake Village resident who commutes using the B-Line to Crossroads and the 2 Line Downtown, spoke in favor of MIP B-5, which would improve bicycle access between Crossroads and the 2 Line. It was noted that many cyclists already use facilities along 156th Avenue NE on the Redmond side, but cyclists near Crossroads Mall often ride on sidewalks. MIP B-5 specifies an LTS 3 instead of LTS 1 or LTS 2. A preference was expressed for a safer implementation.

Valentina Vaneeva advocated for prioritizing bike projects MIP B-5, B-7, and B-9, which would benefit connections to Interlake High School and Overlake Village Station. There is an increasing number of teenagers using e-bikes and there is a need for improvements to reduce traffic during school drop-off times. There is also an absence of transit-related projects in the MIP and suggested infrastructure improvements are needed to increase bus reliability, particularly on routes like the B-Line.

John Zulanis, who noted biking more than driving, voiced support for the addition of the bike-centered MIP projects into the TFP, particularly MIP B-5 on 156th Avenue NE. The speaker described harrowing experiences with cars while biking on this road and emphasized the need for safer infrastructure, and also highlighted the lack of sidewalk infrastructure on 156th Avenue between Lake Hills Boulevard and NE 8th Street, calling for improvements to address the accessibility gap in the area. The Commission was urged to add a project concept to address the issue along that corridor.

Alex Tsimerman began with a Nazi salute and called the Commissioners dirty damn Nazi Gestapo antisemite pigs. The speaker decried the fact that two city committee meetings were going on at the same time. The Commission acts like pure cretins, slaves and idiots. The city has pure Nazi Gestapo rule and it is a nightmare. The ten people limit established by the Council 12 years ago was only for Alex Tsimerman. That is a pure Nazi Gestapo principle. The Commissioners should stop acting like retarded persons and zombies and change the rule. No other city has the same rule. It is not legal. With regard to transportation Seattle has a policy

where low-income persons with a parking ticket, or red light camera ticket, are allowed a reduction. Bellevue should do the same. Bellevue is a very rich city.

Pamela Johnson voiced thanks for the Commissioners looking at the whole Bike Bellevue project. It is, however, still confusing. The Eastrail map shows an extra thing coming off it and going to 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. In the Spring District, there is an extra thing that will finish out Spring Boulevard itself as an LTS 1. Ichiro Way to Northup Way has no bike lanes, no bike facilities at all, apparently by design to keep bikes from going that way instead of going down Eastrail and taking that section to 120<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and then go over to Spring Boulevard. That does not make sense. Also, the budget for Bike Bellevue extends all the way to 2029, so when people hear rapid, they get confused. They think it is going to happen now. Another confusing thing is when looking at the federal government information, it says that road diets are meant to work best and on streets that are under 20,000 vehicles per day, which does not fit Bel-Red Road or Northup Way. On 116<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE there is a center lane, and bike lanes on the side. The Commission was urged to look at the high priority bike routes versus the Bike Bellevue routes.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS, AND MEMBERS OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION

Vice Chair Magill thanked the Commissioners who were able to participate in a bike ride of 100<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, and thanked the members of the public who have been submitting very constructive comments regarding how to get from here to there by bike.

5. STAFF REPORTS – None

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Mobility Implementation Plan

Kevin McDonald said at the end of the presentation the Commission would be asked to take action to refer the project concepts to the update of the TFP. After a brief review of the process of going from a concept in the vision of the Comprehensive Plan to implementation through the CIP, it was stated that the mobility implementation plan is right in the middle. It looks at the performance target gaps identified through long range planning, the functional plans and the Comprehensive Plan, puts them through a prioritization screening process to develop the list of the highest priority projects, and from that list of high priority projects, develops project concepts to update the transportation facilities plan. The four-step process has been undertaken, and the process benefited from the coincidental update of the comprehensive plan and the final environmental impact statement of that process that identified all the performance target gaps for each mode. That allowed for starting out with an inventory of performance target gaps at

every place in the city for the pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle mode that did not meet the performance target established in the mobility implementation plan.

An evaluation was conducted of the inventory of project concepts and performance target gaps with respect to the four goals of the mobility implementation plan and a score was assigned based on how well each project concept addressed the performance target gap. Having developed the high-priority project list, it was posted to Engaging Bellevue and the community was asked for input on the projects. The Engaging Bellevue platform was open for about a month in the summer and the high-level findings were reported with the Commission in July. The complete report is posted to Engaging Bellevue and was included in the Commission meeting packet. Some of the project concepts are well supported by the community members who participated in and followed the Engaging Bellevue process. The final project list represents the four-step process, which hopefully has been publicly transparent. Engaging with the community and the commission has led to a product that will help inform the transportation facilities plan.

Consultant Chris Breiland with Fehr & Peers reminded the Commissioners that the MIP addresses the existing performance target gaps to inform know where to spend dollars. All While there were a couple of high-scoring gaps identified, the prior TFP had tracked the gaps and had advanced project concepts for all of them, whether or not they were scored highly in the MIP framework. The recommendation was made that all projects previously identified performance target gaps should be carried forward as existing TFP projects.

Chris Breiland highlighted two performance target gaps that did not have an MIP project concept identified for them. In working with the staff in engineering and transportation departments, the determination was made not recommend new concepts for those gaps. One gap is at 148th and SE 16th Street, where some levy-funded improvements addressed the gap identified in the comprehensive plan EIS. The intersection is still hovering near the gap and monitoring will continue. The other gap is at NE 16th Street and Northup Way, where environmental and topographic constraints near a wetland make it inconsistent with certain environmental goals.

Commissioner Ting asked about the project on 148th Avenue NE and SE 16<sup>th</sup> Street and asked what the process is for a project the MIP does not recommend but is otherwise being funded. Senior Planner Mike Ingram explained that the project would be implemented through the levy program, which is a separate funding stream and prioritization. Such projects tend to be smaller scale.

Commissioner Ting asked if the projects will show up in the TFP or CIP. Mike Ingram said they often are listed in the TFP for transparency so people can see that the city is aware of the problem. Some of the projects also show up in the CIP. The levy funding is only about \$2 million a year, which is enough for analysis and some modest improvements. Sometimes additional money is needed to actually make improvements., which has been done in recent cycles.

Commissioner Ting asked if it would be fair to say that even if the projects are not specifically recommended by the MIP, they will still appear in the TFP for transparency. Chris Breiland clarified that the 148th Avenue NE and SE 16<sup>th</sup> Street project was funded and is in fact already done and as such will not appear on the TFP.

Commissioner Rebhuhn asked for clarification of the 158th Avenue NE/ SE Eastgate Way project. Chris Breiland said the project was part of the Eastgate transportation study done a few years back. It mainly involves adding some travel lanes within the current curbs by restriping the roadway to increase capacity. There might be some short lanes that continue through. It is not a massive capital project but aims to make existing infrastructure more efficient while maintaining the pedestrian and bicycle space.

Commissioner Rebhuhn referred to the Lake Hills Connector at SE Eastgate Way project, noted that the turn lane tends to back up frequently, and asked if the project will address that issue. Chris Breiland voiced the understanding that the project involves some lane modifications by utilizing the medians and adding pavement to manage those heavy turns.

Commissioner Ting noted that some have said adding lanes to an intersection results in a decrease in safety, but narrowing lanes increases safety. The question asked was how to address infrastructure projects that add lanes without increasing the right-of-way. Chris Breiland explained that even where right-of-way is not added, the footprint of the paved area can expand, potentially increasing pedestrian or cyclist exposure to vehicles. It is something to keep in mind during the design phase along with adjusting pedestrian signal timing, or adding high-visibility crosswalks and bike lane markings. The goal is always to ensure safety while balancing project needs. So, although adding a lane might expand the exposure area, it is less impactful than physically widening the road. Engineering assessments help with such decisions. Any project could potentially decrease pedestrian safety will be flagged and may not be recommended for further action.

Vice Chair Magill referred to TFP 279, the project at 148th Avenue SE and Lake Hills Boulevard, and noted that while it was previously reviewed, it is not included in the list of current recommendations. Chris Breiland explained the project was funded and is considered complete in terms of planning, but it may still need to be built.

Chris Breiland said the recommendation of staff and the consultant is to move forward the projects that address the high-priority gaps as identified by the Comprehensive Plan process. Referring to the network map, it was pointed out that the high-priority projects were shown in purple, while those shown in yellow already have TFP projects that are assumed will be constructed in the next cycle. The recommendation is to move forward all of the TFP-funded projects that address the gaps listed in the TFP. Six projects noted as not meeting the LTS performance targets for the arterial pedestrian network are recommended for consideration in the existing TFP. There are still decisions to be made about whether a pedestrian facility should be on one side of a street or the other, or both, and those details will be answered as the projects move into the TFP.

Turning to the bicycle network, Chris Breiland noted that the high-scoring gaps were shown in purple on the map. Some gaps in the city did not rate highly but can be addressed as the priority project list is implemented. Some are already covered by TFP projects, and others are recommended for addition to the TFP. The Bike Bellevue corridors were highlighted in green on the map. For the handful of projects already in the TFP the recommendation is to carry them forward. For the MIP referral to the TFP, there are a number of Bike Bellevue corridors, including 1, 3, 4, 5 and 11. The map showed the non-Bike Bellevue projects in green, each of which is recommended for referral to the TFP.

Commissioner Rebhuhn referred to MIP B-12, SE 37th Street between 158th Avenue SE to Eastgate Way, which goes through the tunnel, and asked what the project might look like. Chris Breiland said the referral relative to that project is to investigate how to implement a lower stress facility. The bicycle/pedestrian master plan envisioned widening the sidewalk through the tunnel to create a multi-use path. The details will be worked out during engineering, but it is expected to be a bidirectional path on one side.

Commissioner Rebhuhn commented that given the limited space, it will be challenging to implement the project. Chris Breiland agreed, adding that since the project will be on WSDOT property, coordinating with them will add additional complexity. If possible to work within the existing space, it will be easier than requiring major changes.

Commissioner Ting asked how the projects relate to the priority bicycle routes in the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. Chris Breiland said many of the projects align with the priority bike routes from the plan. Those routes have a lower level of traffic stress expectation, which are considered in the MIP. The routes are not explicitly weighed as part of the prioritization as a standalone. The factors are not double-counted. There is a fair bit of alignment between them.

Commissioner Ting asked why the focus should not be on prioritizing a fully connected network along the routes from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, especially the key north-south and east-west connections. Chris Breiland said the north-south and east-west connections are not fully built out yet and allowed that there is a fair amount of overlap in them. The MIP also considers areas with higher density and modal diversity, reflecting an evolution in thinking. However, if the commission prefers prioritizing the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan corridors, it would be valid to make the recommendation.

Commissioner Ting voiced support for revisiting the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan to ensure the key routes are prioritized, with a focus on building a solid network. Some feedback from the community has suggested that while routes exist, they do not offer a great biking experience. It would be better to invest in creating strong, connected backbones rather than piecemeal projects by updating the routes and focusing on them. Kevin McDonald pointed out that a close look at the map will show that the broader green lines connect with the narrower green lines, which are parts of corridors that already exist. Accordingly, the broader green lines fill gaps. Many of the broader green lines are part of priority bike corridors identified in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan.

Commissioner Ting referred to MIP P-6 and asked if it is part of the backbone in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, and also asked if the Downtown/Overlake connection is prioritized on the map. Chris Breiland allowed that not all of the Bike Bellevue connections are shown on the map given that some have already been advanced. Some of the connections are effectively recommended to be carried forward. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan focused on priority bike corridors, and the pedestrian projects are not related to the bike corridors. It is fair to say the projects help to align the gaps in the system, not all of which are part of the priority corridors. The goal of the MIP was to focus on areas with the most growth and potential usage, which aligns with concerns the Commission has raised about where people are using the modes the most. The Commission can elect to focus on the priority corridors from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan and less on the MIP recommendations from the plan. Both plans are valid, just with different focuses.

Commissioner Ting proposed taking a look at and updating the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan and using it to inform the TFP prioritization for the bike projects. A lot of thought went into the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, and though it might be outdated, updating it could yield a stronger foundation for building a core network of north-south and east-west connections.

Kevin McDonald clarified that every line on the map, regardless of color, represents a line from the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan. The lines and the performance targets established in the Mobility Implementation Plan, except for Bel-Red Road, are all from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. No segments have been chosen randomly, rather the focus is on methodically working through the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan.

Commissioner Ting asked if MIP P-3 and MIP P-6 are both from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. Kevin McDonald confirmed that, stressing again that every line on the map is from the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan.

Commissioner Rebhuhn pointed out that the goal for a number of the designs in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan is a protected bike lane. The question asked was if there is one design for a protected bike lane, or if there are different designs that can be used based on the space available to work with. Kevin McDonald explained that the 2009 Pedestrian Bicycle Transportation Plan didn't have as many project types as are available currently, including things like buffered bike lanes. The Mobility Implementation Plan introduced the concept of Level of Traffic Stress, which is based on the speed limit of the street, the average daily volume of traffic on the streets, and type of bike facility on the street. The higher the speed and the higher of traffic volume, the more robust a bike facility needs to be. A range of designs are worked with, including like multiuse paths, buffers with vertical and horizontal components, and regular striped lanes.

Commissioner Ting observed that the Downtown-Overlake connections is not prioritized in the MIP, yet Bel-Red Road and Northup Way have been added as priority routes. Chris Breiland clarified that Spring Boulevard is a key piece of the Downtown-Overlake route. It is actually a CIP project, not a Bike Bellevue project, and it is s meant to close the gap between 130th

Avenue NE and 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. The rest of Spring Boulevard is mostly complete, and there has been other city work, like the NE 12<sup>th</sup> Street multi-purpose path between 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE and 112<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. There is also a Bike Bellevue project going west of 108<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE. It is effectively funded as part of the CIP project and is partially built, which is why it is not being advanced. The Spring Boulevard route is in the plan to be funded as priority for implementation. The Bel-Red Road and Northup Way routes were added as part of the Bike Bellevue work based on identified gaps in the system.

Commissioner Ting agreed to take offline a continued discussion of some apparent divergences between the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan and the maps shown as part of the presentation.

Chris Breiland clarified that B-110 north-south, B-111 north-south, and B-100 north-south are the Northup Way bike facilities listed in the bike plan as part of the bicycle network.

Commissioner Ting encouraged prioritizing the priority routes in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, and explicitly stating what conditions have changed.

Commissioner Marciante disagreed with Commissioner Ting by saying that while the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan is important, a lot of work has gone into the Mobility Implementation Plan, which builds on that foundation. The MIP and its scoring provide a more updated focus for prioritizing the projects.

Kevin McDonald sought from the Commission a motion to approve the projects concepts in the TFP. It was stressed that the formal process of prioritizing the projects within the TFP will occur as part of the TFP process.

Commissioner Keilman voiced concerns about the prioritization process, suggesting there should be more transparency on how the projects link back to the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan and how the priorities were set. Absent having that information, it would be difficult to vote on the package. Kevin McDonald explained that the prioritization process was done in a transparent manner by the Commission in public meetings over the past several months. The 2009 plan put the lines on the map for the bike network connections. Some of those connections were categorized as priority bike corridors. Most of the projects that are recommended for consideration in the TFP include segments of the priority bike corridors that are not yet built.

Commissioner Rebhuhn said approving the project concepts in the TFP only involves ideas of what the Commission wants to try to do for the projects. The action will not put the Commission's stamp of approval on any particular design. Chris Breiland clarified that the listed projects all address performance target gaps, specifically the big ones the Commission directed staff and the consultant to look at first based on the highest needs.

A motion to approve the referral of the recommended Mobility Implementation Plan project concepts for consideration in the update of the Transportation Facilities Plan was made by



Commissioner Rebhuhn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kurz and the motion carried unanimously.

## B. Transportation Facilities Plan

Program Manager Kristi Oosterveen explained that the TFP is a 12-year list of transportation improvements in the service area. Transportation improvements include design, acquisition of right-of-way and construction. Every two years or as otherwise directed by the Council, the transportation commission is charged with reviewing and as necessary presenting an update of the TFP to the City Council for consideration. The TFP is a financially constrained plan in that it includes the financially budgeted seven-year CIP and projects beyond the CIP using assumed dollars.

There are two purposes for the TFP. First, it is an intermediate-range planning tool that serves as the foundation for the CIP where projects are actually implemented. Second, the TFP serves as the basis for the Impact Fee program.

Kristi Oosterveen reiterated that the 12-year TFP includes the seven-year CIP along with five additional years of projects beyond the CIP. The CIP is updated every two years at which time two additional years are added to the plan. The city is considering shifting to a 10-year CIP. Including the additional five-year horizon gap would mean shifting the TFP is a 15-year plan, allowing for more planning growth. Changing the timespan will require an associated change to BCC 22.16.050.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Kurz, Kristi Oosterveen explained that the six-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is updated annually. It is a comprehensive project list, including those from various studies, and it is not financially constrained. Projects in the TIP serve as candidates for the TFP. All studied transportation projects are housed in the TIP. The TIP includes projects in which the city might want to participate with regional and outside partners.

Senior Planner Mike Ingram explained that by default, any projects in the existing TFP that are not completed are carried forward for candidates for consideration in the new TFP. There are 54 discrete projects in the existing TFP. Five of them are associated with the Congestion Reduction Program partially funded by the transportation levy. Five more are neighborhood sidewalk projects that are in process, all of which are anticipated to be completed by 2026. Of the remaining projects, five have sufficient funding and are advanced enough to expect completion by the end of next year. Additionally, the Council in the fall of 2022 added funding for eight new projects in the CIP. In the current budget cycle, the Council is considering adding funding for five more projects; those projects will be included in the new TFP.

Mike Ingram said the last several TFP cycles have recognized that it is fairly impractical in the process to dive into the details of how projects are identified as the highest priority or the best opportunities for transit and bicycle improvements. The analyses are often partly opportunity-driven, especially on the transit side, and they need to be conducted through a separate process.

While a certain amount of prioritization can be done on a city-wide basis, it is not possible to do any detailed analysis as part of the TFP process that would be appropriate to determine the highest priority improvements. For that reason, a strategy has been utilized that allocates what have been called “reserve funds,” usually around \$10-12 million, for the bicycle side of things. The idea is to recognize that there is a need, but that a separate process will need to occur to advance that work. There will be more conversations about whether or not that is the right approach this time around. But, realistically, we can do some level of prioritization. The difference for the current TFP iteration lies in the fact that the MIP framework is in place to build from, which may lead to a somewhat different process.

Commissioner Ting commented that it has always been difficult to understand why one TFP project is considered better than another. Cost and implementation can be understood, but it is hard to gauge them and give meaningful feedback as a commission. It would be helpful to have an understanding of what the biggest issue is for each TFP project. Mike Ingram said with the MIP evaluation system in place, gap projects can be scored. Commissioner Ting allowed that the MIP operates on a mathematical formula, but to really understand a project requires going beyond the pros in the description to an understanding of the specific concerns for a specific project. Mike Ingram said the other piece is public engagement. Every TFP update involves robust public engagement, and that yields helpful and meaningful input from the community. Staff compiles that feedback in a way that is easy for the Commission to understand.

Commissioner Ting suggested it would be useful for the TFP project list to include a line item for the common theme in terms of feedback from the community in terms of issues and benefits. Kristi Oosterveen shared that it would be very difficult to add to the spreadsheet all of the public feedback. Doing so would grow the document significantly. For that reason all that data is kept in a separate document and relied on when discussing things like safety and priorities. All of that can be made more transparent to the Commission.

Commissioner Keilman added that it would be helpful to have information about how projects initially came to be, whether it be from public feedback, an accident involving safety, or something similar. That would give more context beyond the initial MIP scoring.

Commissioner Kurz touched on the reserve allocations, which to a large degree was a pre-MIP method aimed at preserving some mode of quality. Under the MIP framework, perhaps the reserve allocations are not as necessary. Mike Ingram confirmed that, especially for the bicycle side of things. The MIP work did not go into the evaluation of the transit side. Transit projects are often opportunity-driven, like when Metro is ready to look at enhancing a route. Commissioner Kurz stressed the importance of the MIP as a crucial tool. It is meant to guide prioritization. Of course, community feedback is also important, but the MIP should be trusted to cover many of the core needs, though every project will still have its unique aspects.

Commissioner Ting recalled that the reserve allocations were made per mode. Mike Ingram said there were reserve allocations for the bicycle and transit modes. Commissioner Ting asked for confirmation that the MIP does not handle cross-modal prioritization and Mike Ingram said

that is the case. That is always a challenge because one can rank and score similar projects, vehicular, bicycle and pedestrian, but combining those lists is as much art as science.

Mike Ingram stated that the 2022-2033 TFP, the total projected revenues totaled \$496 million in transportation revenue. Of that, \$76 million was already allocated by the City Council, and \$108 million went to ongoing programs, such as street overlays and maintenance. After accounting for those, there was \$312 million left to allocate to projects. For the new TFP, the numbers will be different. Updated revenue information from the finance department will be available in the spring. Typically a finance department representative shares the information with the Commission in person.

Commissioner Ting asked how good the estimates are in terms of total lifetime project costs. Mike Ingram said there is a system in place for estimating ongoing maintenance costs. For every new project added to the city's infrastructure, there is a corresponding maintenance allocation. Kristi Oosterveen added that project maintenance and operations are housed in the operating budget; they are not capital expenses. The TFP does not show any of those numbers. Once a project goes to construction, data regarding quantities, costs and labor are gathered and folded into the maintenance and operations budget biennially. By their very nature, some projects cost more to maintain than others. Commissioner Ting suggested that if certain projects offer more "bang for the buck" across their lifecycle, it could influence prioritization.

Mike Ingram shared information about the revenue sources for the TFP, stressing that the actual details will not be in hand until the spring. For the current TFP, the \$496 million figure comes from various sources, including \$38 million from general revenue from sales tax, B&O tax, and any Council-approved debt; \$166 million from dedicated transportation funds, which includes state gas tax, a portion of the city's B&O tax, and a portion of the real estate excise; revenue from a TIFIA loan, which is a low-interest federal loan that was used for improvements in the Spring District and in BelRed; the levy which brings in \$95 million over 12 years; \$42 million from impact fees and other developer contributions; and various grants and outside agency contributions.

Updating the TFP will take about a year. In October the Commission will be updated regarding the public involvement strategy and will review projects from the current TFP as candidates for the next cycle. The levy program will also be discussed. There will be regular check-ins with the Council to discuss the preliminary project list and later in regard to updating the impact fee schedule.

Vice Chair Magill asked if there is a drop-dead date for the TFP. Mike Ingram allowed that there is not. The update process is just beginning and will not be wrapped up until the end of 2025, which is within the realm of the code timelines.

Vice Chair Magill asked if it is the responsibility of the Commission to read through all of the public comments and tie them to specific projects. Mike Ingram said past reports have clear and readable in terms of mapping the projects, the project lists, and a summary of comments indicating favor, opposition or a neutral position. It is clear from the reports which projects

receive the most feedback. Unfortunately, the mapping tool used in the past is no longer available and staff are working on how to replicate it. The goal remains to make it as easy as possible to track the feedback.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. July 11, 2024

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

Kevin McDonald briefly reviewed with the Commissioners the calendar of upcoming meeting dates and agenda items.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Magill adjourned the meeting at 8:33 p.m.