

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

June 9, 2022
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Virtual Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Marciante, Vice Chair Stash, Commissioners
Beason, Helland, Kurz, Rebhuhn, Ting

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Paula Stevens, Andrew Singelakis,
Eric Miller, Mark Poch, Chris Iverson, Molly Johnson,
Department of Transportation; Monica Buck, City
Attorney's Office

OTHERS PRESENT: Lauren Mattern, Alex Mercuri, Nelson/Nygaard

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present in person with the exception of Commissioner Ting who participated remotely.

A. Remote Participation Approval

Remote participation by Commissioner Ting was unanimously approved by the Commission.

B. Approval of Amended Bylaws Regarding Remote Participation

Assistant City Attorney Monica Buck noted that the Commission's bylaws were last adopted in 2017. Under the current bylaws, two members can participate remotely up to four times per year, and advance approval is required. When the Covid pandemic hit in 2020, the Governor adopted an emergency order which suspended all in-person meetings. The Commission acted accordingly to suspend in-person meetings and allowed for remote participation for all members in line with an order by the City Council. In May 2022 the Council reinstated in-person meetings and allowed for some flexibility for remote participation for all boards and commissions. Ordinance 6662 allows up to three members to participate remotely at any meeting without limit on the number of times a commissioner can participate remotely per year. Approval for remote participation must occur in advance of a meeting, and the presiding officer must be present in person. If the presiding officer will be participating remotely, the duty must be delegated to a commissioner who is attending in person at a prior meeting.

Monica Buck stated that the proposed bylaws amendments included a number of non-substantive changes, including some cleanup. The only other substantive change was to Article VIII revising "No motion shall be entertained or debated until seconded and announced by the Chair" to read "No motion should be entertained or debated until seconded and announced by

the Chair." There have been situations where boards and commissions have debated and acted on motions that were never seconded. Pursuant to Roberts Rules, such actions are valid.

Vice Chair Stash asked what happens in the event someone cannot at a previous meeting give notice of remote participation. Monica Buck replied that unfortunately the City Attorney's Office has interpreted Ordinance 6662 to mean that members unable to get approval at a prior meeting will be counted as absent. Action taken previously in the meeting to allow Commissioner Ting to participate remotely was appropriate given that the ordinance went into effect immediately and there was no opportunity to obtain prior approval. The Council will be revisiting the rules in a year. Suggestions by the boards and commissions about how to handle remote participation can be discussed at that time.

Commissioner Helland asked what would happen in the event that more than the allowed number of Commissioners need to participate remotely. Monica Buck said the recommendation of staff was to add approval for remote participation to the agenda as a regular item under New Business. Given that only three members are allowed to participate remotely at any given meeting, the Commission would need to decide which members will be approved.

Commissioner Ting asked about members wanting to participate remotely on an extended basis given the fact that the pandemic has not yet ended and wearing a mask indoors is not mandated.

Vice Chair Stash allowed that some Commissioners have higher risk family situations and indicated support for allowing members to participate remotely for an extended period of time.

Chair Marciante and Commissioners Beason, Kurz, Rebhuhn and Helland all concurred.

Commissioner Helland suggested the ordinance is not workable and objected to the proposed bylaw changes.

A motion to approve the bylaws as amended was made by Vice Chair Stash. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beason.

Commissioner Helland reiterated that the bylaws as proposed are not workable. Should the Commission meet in November, but not meet in December, and the next meeting is in January, a commissioner that has work or family obligations come up following the last meeting in November will automatically not be allowed to participate remotely at the first meeting in January.

Commissioner Ting said the Transportation Commission has adequately demonstrated that remote participation by Commissioners is just as effective as having everyone meet in person. If possible, the Commission should just be able to continue with that format. It appears the limit is three Commissioners, but an openness to allowing even more to be remote was expressed.

Answering a question asked by Chair Marciante, Monica Buck said the Transportation Commission is governed by Chapter 3.63 of the Bellevue City Code. Each board and commission has its own chapter. The City Council had several discussions about how to amend the code requirements for each board and commission and concluded that the requirements for remote participation should apply equally to all boards and commissions. The City Attorney's

Office worked to revise the language of the bylaws for all boards and commissions. Chair Marciante allowed that the Commission serves at the pleasure of the Council and as such is bound to comply with all code provisions. The rules regarding remote participation as outlined may at times prove to be problematic. The concerns of the Commission, however, should be made known to the Council at the appropriate time.

Commissioner Rebhuhn said a household member could unexpectedly test positive for Covid making it prudent not to attend a meeting in person. In that situation, giving notice of remote participation at the next meeting could not be given at the prior meeting.

Monica Buck said the Commission does not have the flexibility to amend its bylaws in any way that does not comply with Bellevue City Code. Only the Council can amend the code. Other boards and commissions have expressed similar concerns.

Chair Marciante asked what would happen if the Commission were to choose not to approve the proposed bylaws. Monica Buck said the Commission would then be out of compliance with the code. Compliance with the code would be required regardless.

Commissioner Helland suggested that if the Commission does not have the power to make changes, it should not even be voting on the proposed bylaws. Monica Buck said the reason the Commission needs to approve the proposed bylaws is to have them be consistent with City Code.

Commissioner Beason suggested that at the end of the day the important thing is for the Commissioners to participate. It would be good to have some flexibility to allow valuable voices excluded from meetings due to unforeseen circumstances. The Commission has shown that it can work together well via remote participation and will continue to do so going forward, but it would be better to have some level of flexibility.

Commissioner Ting asked what mechanism could be used to approve remote participation as late as possible prior to a meeting. Principal Planner Kevin McDonald agreed it would be good to have the flexibility to address changing circumstances outside of a meeting but noted that neither the code as adopted or the proposed bylaws allow for that. Commissioner Ting noted being aware of some bylaws allowing for actions to be taken without a meeting. Mr. McDonald said there can be no action by the Commission in the absence of a quorum and a publicly noticed meeting.

Mr. McDonald allowed that other boards and commissions have expressed similar concerns. The suggestion was made to proceed with the bylaws as proposed and allowing time for questions and concerns to be consolidated and brought to the attention of the Council.

Chair Marciante asked staff to put the matter on the agenda of a meeting four meetings down the road to rediscuss the issues.

The motion on the floor carried 6-1, with Commissioner Helland voting against.

C. Election of Chair and Vice Chair for 2022-2023

Mr. McDonald noted that prior to the meeting a single nomination was made for Vice Chair Stash to serve as Chair, and Commissioner Beason to serve as Vice Chair. The floor was opened for additional nominations for the position of Chair. Absent additional nominations,

Vice Chair Stash was approved to serve as Chair. The floor was opened for nominations for the position of Vice Chair. Absent additional nominations, Commissioner Beason was approved to serve as Vice Chair.

Chair Stash expressed appreciation for the leadership of Commissioner Marciante. Commissioner Ting also thanked Commissioner Marciante for her enthusiasm, dedication and hard work as Chair.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Commissioner Helland. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Beason and the motion carried unanimously.

3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – None

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS, AND MEMBERS OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION – None

5. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. McDonald reported that the work done by the Commission on the Mobility Implementation Plan has been acknowledged as best practice and has won an award from the Puget Sound Regional Council for Vision 2050. The PSRC staff will present the award to the City Council on June 27.

Mr. McDonald drew the attention of the Commission to July 28 and the Commission's annual retreat, noting that the Mercer Slough Environmental Center had been booked for the event. An agenda will be established in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Traffic Standards Code Recommendation

Department of Transportation Assistant Director Mark Poch reminded the Commissioners that the proposed code amendment was introduced to the Commission on April 28.

Transportation Development Review Manager Molly Johnson reminded the Commission that the timeline calls for having the code amendments ready for submittal to the Council by the end of the month. That will be followed by work on the Implementation Guide. The work will culminate with a public hearing facilitated by the Commission for the new code. The existing code only looks at vehicles, where the proposed code looks at all modes of travel. The existing code considers only intersection level of service congestion, whereas the proposed code is focused on supply of transportation and the demand for transportation. Where the current code expresses thresholds in terms of vehicle trips, the proposed code expressed them in terms of mobility units. There has to date been a Director's Rule, and under the proposed code there will be a Comprehensive Implementation Guide.

A lot of outreach has been conducted since the Commission's April 28 meeting. There is a

website online and there have been a number of news releases. A virtual open house was held on May 3, and opportunity for the public to provide written comments was offered. No written comments were received except for one letter of support. There was one speaker at the Commission meeting on April 28, and while a number of people attended the virtual open house, only three persons spoke: two of the three expressed support and one expressed neither support nor a lack of support. The Chamber of Commerce submitted a letter in support. No revisions to the code were made based on the public input. A minor revision was made in response to Commissioner Ting to require having a viable project consistent with the Land Use Code in order to reserve units.

Molly Johnson said key dates going forward include a Council study session on July 27; adoption of the draft code by the Council in July; a public hearing on the Implementation Guide on September 8; revising of the Implementation Guide based on the comments made during the month of September; and implementation of multimodal concurrency in October. Thirty days is required between the transition from the old system and the new system. A special meeting toward the end of July will be held at which the draft implementation guide will be presented to practitioners such as traffic engineers. The meeting will not be widely advertised, and the focus will be on technical expertise and comments.

Molly Johnson said the recommendation of staff was to approve the draft multimodal concurrency code and transmittal memo and forward them to the Council. An additional motion will be needed to set the public hearing for September 8.

A motion to approve the recommended draft multimodal concurrency code and the transmittal was made by Commissioner Marciante. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Beason.

Commissioner Kurz asked if the concept of concurrency existed before the update, and if multimodal concurrency is the actual addition. Molly Johnson said the concept of concurrency has been around since 1990 with the Growth Management Act and since 1992 in Bellevue. The concurrency program has been modified a couple of times over the years, but it has always previously been vehicle/intersection based. Mark Poch explained that the supply and demand concept goes back to moving away from focusing only on vehicles and intersection congestion toward more of a system-based plan. So long as the supply of mobility units provided via transportation improvements exceeds the demand from development, the new concurrency standard will be met. With adoption of the Mobility Implementation Plan, the specifics of intersection congestion and vehicle mode performance will be analyzed along with the other modes.

Commissioner Ting suggested the meeting toward the end of July focused on technical expertise should be noticed through the regular channels. It is unlikely that the turnout will be overwhelming.

Commissioner Ting asked how the Director will set the price if a development requires additional mobility units. According to the code, should a developer want to build something but there are not enough mobility units available, money can be provided as an option for continuing development, but it is not clear how the mobility unit price is determined by the Director. Molly Johnson said as staff goes through the plan a cost per mobility unit is developed based on the forecast growth and forecast spending. The price varies fluctuates depending on the growth and budget forecasts look like. The Implementation Guide will include specifics and requirements about how often the price needs to be updated. Commissioner Ting stressed the need for the Commission to see those details, and to avoid

pricing mobility units at a level where it will be less expensive for developers to simply pay out money instead of doing the transportation system work needed for the development. There should be some guardrails to ensure that where a developer has to buy additional mobility units it will be sufficient to address the actual increase in mobility unit demand created by the development. Molly Johnson said those details are in the mitigation section of the code. The mitigation program in the previous code has been in place since 1992 and it has never been used.

Commissioner Helland asked if the term mobility units of demand is geographic dependent and mode specific. The price of mobility units should vary geographically. Molly Johnson said those details will be explained thoroughly in the Implementation Guide. There is a geographic component, a component based on the type of transportation land use, and components related to the Performance Management Areas in the Mobility Implementation Plan.

Chair Stash asked about the traffic engineers and users of the code who will be invited to the meeting in late July. Molly Johnson said they will be pulled from the list of contacts in the permit system, all of whom have in the past worked with the city on obtaining necessary permits. The meeting will be advertised on the website as well.

Commissioner Ting referred to the section on TDM and voiced support for the idea of TDM as a strategy for addressing the lack of mobility units, something that decreases the demand on the transportation infrastructure by reducing the number of trips. The question was asked about whether the current TDM program has an enforcement element to it. Molly Johnson said the TDM program as housed in the current code is aspirational. The city works with folks and conducts regular checks but does not engage in enforcement for not reaching goals. Commissioner Ting said using TDM as a mechanism to get more mobility units is good but said trying to layer something on top of what is not enforced something that is enforced could be confusing. How the enforcement will be carried out will need to be carefully thought through. Molly Johnson said meeting the minimum TDM requirements in the code is not sufficient to provide the mitigation required by the code. Any additional TDM must be above and beyond the basic requirements in the code. The method of enforcement will be through conditions of approval on the land use side. Conditions of approval have the force of the code.

Commissioner Rebhuhn asked how it is determined for a proposed new project how many vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians there will be. Molly Johnson said the model used by the city determines the different types of uses. The model provides a baseline and then anything that varies from the baseline requires supporting documentation. The work is conducted as part of the technical expertise of reviewing traffic for projects.

The motion carried unanimously.

A motion to approve the draft transmittal memo was made by Commissioner Marciante. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Beason and the motion carried unanimously.

A motion to set September 8 as the public hearing date for the Concurrency Implementation Guide was made by Commissioner Helland. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Beason.

Chair Stash asked if the public hearing would be specifically focused on the Implementation Guide or if other topics would also be addressed. Mark Poch said the hearing will address only the Implementation Guide.

B. Curb Management Plan Policy Recommendation

Chair Stash stressed that the Commission's recommendation will be made part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment package for 2022 and will be forwarded to the Planning Commission at the end of June.

Senior Transportation Engineer Chris Iverson said the requested action by the Commission was to approve the policy recommendations in Appendix A and transmit them to the Planning Commission. The curb management plan project has been under way for half a year or so and there has been some robust engagement and policy work. At the staff level the work has focused on the substantive material for the plan. The discussion will continue at the Commission's July 14 meeting. Staff's internal discussions will continue over the summer months and those materials will be brought back before the Commission in the fall.

Chris Iverson reminded the Commissioners that there are handful of policies in the current Comprehensive Plan the staff have advised to be repealed or modified, and seven new policies have been proposed. The initial policy recommendations were presented to the Commission on April 28. On May 12 the policies as revised as a result of Commissioner comments were reviewed and discussed; recommendations to further revise the policies were made, resulting in the final policies, which Chris Iverson briefly reviewed.

Commissioner Ting voiced the recollection that the policy language regarding electric vehicle charging was changed to primarily look at adding them to development review for new development as opposed to having them be city based. Chris Iverson said the language provided at the previous Commission meeting was "add electric vehicle charging stations in designated on-street parking areas as required through development review." The idea was the "as required" element would be employed on a case-by-case basis. Ultimately, any requirement for a developer to build a curbside electric vehicle charging station would be a follow-up action after the curb management plan is approved.

Commissioner Helland asked why the language is not tailored accordingly if the intent is to condition electric vehicle charging stations as part of development projects to avoid subsequent construction impacts and to achieve a more seamless curbside environment as the city builds out. Chris Iverson said the focus was on making things as simple and streamlined as possible, and on being agnostic so as to avoid a very long, watered down policy.

Commissioner Ting voiced overall support for the policies but said the concern lies with the details of how they will get implemented. While the vision will benefit the city and the Downtown, the question is how the tradeoffs will be made and how the different demands for the curb will be prioritized. Chris Iverson allowed that the implementation details will be part of the next level of discussion.

A motion to approve the recommended curb management policies for submittal to the Planning Commission was made by Commissioner Marciante. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Beason and the motion carried unanimously.

Chris Iverson said the voted recommendations will be forwarded to the Planning Commission on June 22 in study session. A tentative public hearing before the Planning Commission is slated for September for all of the Comprehensive Plan amendments in the annual work plan. Council adoption will occur in November.

C. Curb Management Plan Pricing Programs

Lauren Mattern, consultant with Nelson/Nygaard, informed the Commission that the discussion would entail introducing the curb pricing concept, and that the discussion would continue in more detail at the Commission's July 14 meeting. A final review of the issue will occur in the fall ahead of adoption of the curb management plan.

The curb management plan is intended to provide multimodal, holistic and coordinated curb management guidance. It will bring together the allocation and management of the different curb pressures Bellevue is experiencing and will continue to experience going forward. The curb management plan will include the pricing principles that will guide the design and implementation of follow-up pricing initiatives; recommendations on pricing approaches for specific modes and curb uses; and general recommendations to address pricing impacts and support a user- and business-friendly pricing environment. The curb management plan will not include detailed pricing recommendations or code or ordinance language to enable for support specific pricing programs.

Curb space is limited. The demand for the curb space is already high and is poised to continue growing. The intent is to see the demand translated into desired outcomes, including placemaking, mobility and other community benefits while trying to avoid excessive circling of cars creating unnecessary emission, insufficient loading spaces, and generally an imbalance of incentives. It all comes down to balancing the supply and demand. The curb management plan will aim to address both sides of the equation. The plan will contain two core components: the typology work to address the supply side, and the curb pricing framework to address the demand side of the equation.

Lauren Mattern said all effort will be put into making sure the curb management plan aligned with the city's mobility goals and avoids inadequate access to important destinations, impacts to residential streets, and poor operating conditions for all user types. The curb space is very valuable. It is the most convenient front door to adjacent uses for all modes. They are the most convenient access point to wherever people are going wherever they are coming from. Pricing is the most powerful and direct way to recognize that value. When the curb is unpriced there is a cost to the city in terms of maintenance. The experience of other cities shows that the process of enforcing the curb is particularly difficult. The different parking programs implemented by peer cities prove the point that enforcement is important to get right but also very difficult to get right. Bellevue's current approach to curb enforcement is fairly limited and could be more efficient. One common alternative to pricing is time limits, but the challenge to time limits is that they are predictably difficult and expensive to enforce. They typically require multiple revisits to locations. One of the subtle benefits of curb pricing is that it represents the value of the curb and helps with regulations that are more efficient to enforce. The parking revenue generated from curb pricing can help support critical goals and can fund programs focused on basic operations as well as placemaking improvements and enhancements to public services. Where the curb space is underpriced, the underlying funding model is not always sustainable.

Pricing is viewed as an effective and efficient demand management tool. A number of alternatives have been tried, including time limits, but they have not been all that effective. There are reasons why in some cities curb pricing has been a nerve-racking policy topic. Many pricing programs in the past have been designed without the user experience in mind and with fixed prices or rules that did not match with what seemed appropriate on the ground. However, one major lesson learned in the field has been that investment in designing pricing approaches well and simply can overcome the concerns. Amid current conditions and the expected curb

growth and pressures, it is known that pricing is going to be useful both in the short term and over time as a demand management tool. Pricing flexibility will be important in that pricing that fails to adjust to changing conditions can be problematic.

Parking pricing should be considered in the context of adjacent uses and in line with the broad curb management plan that takes into account strategies and incentives across all of the modes. The recommendation will include paid parking but also will include the notion of uniting loading/unloading, micromobility and on-street dining structures under a single framework. Pricing should be set intentionally and rationally in support the goals for all modes and elements.

With regard to the question of how to set prices, Lauren Mattern stressed the importance of getting them right by making sure the supporting structure will be future proof. Generally, the baseline cost involves opportunity costs based on how productive the curb space can be for other uses, and management costs in line with what it costs the city to administer, manage and enforce the use at the curb. Additionally, the city should be clear about what additional price incentives by way of subsidies or disincentives as a result of price increases are in alignment with the broader mobility goals. A demand management lens can be employed in line with the most important outcomes.

It is very important to get the structure right for how to think about setting prices. A best practice employed by many jurisdictions is aimed at the general goal of an 85 percent occupancy target at the curb. The theory is that an occupancy rate at that level is the most efficient for public parking spaces. If demand goes above that level, cars are forced to circle looking for a parking place, creating congestion, waste of time and fuel and more emissions. Those are symptoms of parking being underpriced or not priced at all. Demand does change over time and as that occurs having in place a set of performance metrics allows for things to change as needed.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Helland, Chris Iverson said the idea of having a broad curb management pricing strategy is to think in terms of anyone wanting to access the curb as a consumer. When one visits a retail establishment looking for a particular product, they must pay a price for that product. Parking wanted by shoppers and curb space needed for employers to operate a private shuttle system or needed by a food truck operator all need access to the curb, and the space needs to be priced accordingly. Currently in Bellevue curb space is both limited and highly valued, but there are only a few pricing components in place that reflect a proper tradeoff. Commissioner Helland asked where Bellevue stands currently on the target utilization curve. Chris Iverson said the most recent data is impacted by Covid, but there was some work done several years ago as part of the Downtown Transportation Plan that monitored curb occupancy. The team anticipates doing a parking study as part of the project.

Commissioner Kurz asked how many parking tickets Bellevue gives out on an average day, and if they are mostly for overstays or for blocking loading zones and the like. Chris Iverson said Bellevue averages 215 warning citations per month, 105 overtime infractions per month, and 125 safety infractions per month. However, the enforcement structure in place is primarily focused on the Downtown, which is where most of the tickets are issued. Curb and parking enforcement is handled via private contractor. The city's budget covers a single enforcement vehicle to cover the entire Downtown. Parking is time limited and from an enforcement perspective, two laps around the Downtown by the enforcement vehicle are required to actually determine violations. Realistically, vehicles parked in slots limited to two hours can be parked for four or five hours without getting a ticket. Pricing is instant given the new technology and it

is an easy thing for enforcement officers to know if someone has paid or not.

Commissioner Ting asked what kind of parking prices were used by cities similar to Bellevue pre-Covid who were trying to hit the 85 percent utilization mark, and if the pricing was the same all day or dynamic. Lauren Mattern allowed that prices vary a lot based on context. Some cities have established minimums and maximums along with operating procedures. For most peer cities, a couple of dollars per hour is a common price in higher demand areas. Some cities set their parameters to allow pricing to fall to twenty-five cents per hour, while other cities go as high as five or six dollars per hour. Demand responsive pricing is in place in many cities, though there are no cities that have implemented immediately responsive pricing. Chris Iverson noted that in Seattle parking rates are at or below two dollars per hour at 95 percent of locations and times. The highest rates are in the Denny Triangle area during daytime hours. Prices are adjusted based on location, time of day and day of the week. One of Seattle's goals is to hit the 85 percent occupancy target and prices are adjusted on a regular basis to achieve that goal.

Commissioner Ting asked how issues of equity are handled in terms of demand pricing. Lauren Mattern said one of the reasons to do a broader curb management plan is specifically to make sure equity is not defined only by one mode, car parking, but across all modes. Measuring equity access will require first looking at who is accessing the curb and in what ways and work backward from there. Beyond that, curb pricing needs to take into account any and all impacts. In some cities, parking revenues are earmarked for access for lower-income workers. Commissioner Ting allowed that that approach is reasonable and added that it will require gathering data relative to who is being impacted in Bellevue from an equity standpoint.

Commissioner Marciante pointed out that Bellevue does not have as much on-street parking as Seattle has and asked what percentage of the curb in the areas being studied would actually be impacted. Chris Iverson said as yet there is no calculated percentage of the curb in hand; the team is in the process of building that inventory. It is not, however, a large percentage of the curb compared to the total curb in the urban core area. The study is intended to help inform not just the demand for existing curbs but also the future in areas like BelRed where there is a planned street grid that includes street parking.

Commissioner Helland said the data that needs to be collected should include the notion of pricing based on who wants to use the curb. Shoppers are willing to pay a price for the products they want, and businesses that want parking in front of their establishments should also be willing to pay a price. Chris Iverson said much of that data is currently being collected and put into a format different users can use over the long term to build a framework. Additionally, there will be surveys conducted to monitor occupancy and demand both in terms of parking and usage for shuttle and transit stops.

Vice Chair Beason said it will be interesting to know how much of the current curb space is actually priced versus the potential. Chris Iverson said additional information would be brought to a future meeting.

Chair Stash asked what tricks or ideas there are to address situations in which occupancy exceeds 90 percent and where raising prices has not worked, primarily because there simply is physically not enough space. Lauren Mattern said one approach would be to apply more TDM strategies. The city of Berkley feeds some of their parking revenues in their central business areas into transit passes for employees in those districts. Cities with curb pricing strategies in place almost universally have the goal of getting the most blocks possible to hit the range.

Alex Murcuri, consultant with Nelson/Nygaard, said curb pricing principles are an important element of the study, noting that they will be refined based on the Commission's discussion. The principles essentially are to maximize the use and availability of the curb by pricing parking; generating revenue to meet key outcomes; ensuring clear communication relative to curb pricing for all users; simplifying the permitting process under the holistic pricing umbrella; and centering equity in curb usage both in terms of how the curb is used and in how revenues are invested.

Commissioner Marciante stressed the need for the policies to be very clear because at some point it will be necessary to make some tradeoffs. Curb use time limits will also need to be addressed at the appropriate time.

Commissioner Ting said it will be necessary to drill down into the specifics of how the principle of maximizing the use and availability of the curb would apply to Bellevue. For example, there could be regional concerns under which in specific areas the focus will be on a specific kind of use, and issues relating to time of day. Simply applying high-level principles may not directly relate to reality.

Commissioner Kurz said it will all come down to the impact on the user and making it easier to find parking. With regard to the overall system, the focus should be on minimizing the impacts on congestion.

Commissioner Helland stressed the need to keep in mind the costs of administering the program. Flexible pricing will require more administration and enforcement, while simply having a business pay for their parking in front of their door would be much easier to enforce and therefore less administratively intensive. Chris Iverson said the intent of the principle aimed at generating revenue to meet key outcomes envisions goals such as directing funds to desired elements for the long term as well as covering operational costs.

Commissioner Marciante suggested a principle referencing city goals and policies should be added to the list.

Chris Iverson briefly reviewed with the Commission the next steps.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. April 28, 2022

Mr. McDonald noted the receipt of some minor changes to the minutes offered by Commissioner Ting.

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Vice Chair Beason. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marciante and the motion carried without dissent; Chair Stash and Commissioner Helland abstained from voting.

B. May 12, 2022

Mr. McDonald noted the receipt of some minor changes to the minutes offered by Commissioner Ting.

A motion to approve the minutes as amended was made by Commissioner Marciante. The motion was seconded by Vice Chair Beason carried without dissent; Chair Stash abstained from voting.

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS

A. Approval of Commissioner Remote Participation for the July 14, 2022
Transportation Commission Meeting

Commissioners Ting and Helland requested to be allowed to participate remotely. There was consensus in favor of their requests.

Chair Stash reported that she would not be able to attend the July 14 meeting and designated Vice Chair Beason to serve as the presiding officer.

11. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – None

12. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. McDonald briefly reviewed the calendar of upcoming meeting dates and agenda items.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Stash adjourned the meeting at 8:54 p.m.



Secretary to the Transportation Commission

July 14, 2022

Date