

From: [p.johnston](#)
To: [PlanningCommission](#)
Subject: Refer to Staff recommends incorporating implementation discussions on housing choices
Date: Wednesday, July 14, 2021 8:22:35 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

- “Staff recommends incorporating implementation discussions on housing choices in the neighborhoods into upcoming Citywide efforts. The larger issues can then be considered in tandem with the concerns and interests expressed by residents themselves throughout the Great Neighborhoods process. In particular, staff found that both Northeast Bellevue and Northwest Bellevue residents felt that introducing new housing typologies to only their neighborhoods and not others was inequitable and did not consider the larger needs of the City as a whole. Implementing any introduction of these new typologies to the neighborhoods should account for the impact on all neighborhoods rather than only these first two to be updated through Great Neighborhoods. Staff also recommends that a larger education effort about the Citywide needs, challenges, and opportunities be a central part of the future implementation efforts to address housing affordability concerns. It was clear that the more specific, in-depth discussions that took place at the housing options Great Neighborhoods event led to a greater understanding of the complexities of this issue, particularly when connections to larger Citywide growth discussions were considered. Deeper discussion was then possible, but this discussion is required on a larger scale to properly address these issues and their relationship to growth pressures across the City. Tackling these issues through an appropriate level of informed discussion will require a longer and more in-depth Citywide process than can be accomplished as part of the scope of updating these two Neighborhood Area Plans. The details of implementing the draft policies will require code discussions, which requires Citywide input. In particular, hearing more diverse voices at this stage will be essential. This is best achieved when engagement is targeted across the City, better utilizing existing cultural networks that often draw from Bellevue and even the Eastside as a whole.

“

<https://bellevue.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=9457204&GUID=EB2627C0-E864-4954-8BF1-092FF42603E9> p 3

-el

e...s

From: [Chris Johnson](#)
To: [PlanningCommission](#); [TransportationCommission](#)
Cc: [Johnson, Thara](#); [McDonald, Kevin](#)
Subject: Bellevue Chamber Correspondence - Multimodal Concurrency Standard
Date: Friday, July 16, 2021 5:51:17 PM
Attachments: [Bellevue Chamber Re Multimodal Concurrency 2021-07-15.pdf](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Dear Chair Moolgavkar and Chair Marciante - The Bellevue Chamber thanks you both for the opportunity to comment on proposed changes to the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. The Chamber strongly believes that a Multimodal Level of Service and a Multimodal Concurrency Standard, will both be essential to Bellevue's ability to accommodate the explosive growth in employment and population which are coming our way.

Nonetheless, we do have offer suggestions which we hope will improve implementation, specifically early adoption of strong metrics for each mode, and linkage to the Capital Investment Program (CIP) and proposed Mobility Implementation Plan (MIP). Similarly, we offer a note of caution regarding consideration of multimodal impact fees.

According to our understanding, there will be a Final Review public hearing held by the Planning Commission on July 28, 2021, and we ask that the attached correspondence be entered into the record.

Thanks for considering our views and let us know how we can be of assistance. - Chris

Chris Johnson | Director of Government Relations
Bellevue Chamber of Commerce
P: 425.213.1208 | F: 425.462.4660 | E: cjohnson@bellevuechamber.org
330 112th Ave. NE, Suite 100, Bellevue, WA 98004



July 15, 2021

Bellevue Planning Commission

P.O. Box 90012

Bellevue, Washington, 98009-9012

Re: Multimodal Concurrency Standard

Dear Chair Moolgavkar and Commissioners:

With the lifting of COVID-19 restrictions statewide having recently occurred, we are certain economic recovery will accelerate. In Downtown Bellevue alone, we're expecting 30,000 additional jobs within the next two years. To accommodate this expected growth and changing land-use patterns that will support it, we'll need a transportation system that keeps up.

The Bellevue Chamber has long supported adoption of Multimodal Level of Service (MMLOS), which as originally envisioned, would assign actual performance metrics for each transportation mode. Now, we voice our support for the inclusion of a well-defined Multimodal Concurrency Standard that gives clear guidance to Chamber members and city staff into the Transportation Element of Bellevue's adopted Comprehensive Plan. There are several reasons why.

First, in the land use districts noted above, future daily person trips are presumed to be spread across a variety of modes, rather than simply allocated to single-occupant vehicles. Second, per the Transportation Commission's preliminary recommendations of May 27, 2021, "we'll need to rebalance the transportation system to address the Performance Targets and the forecast demand for mobility in each update of the Transportation Facilities Plan." Third, without a multimodal standard in place, projects providing badly needed multifamily housing, could be in jeopardy of failing concurrency.

We do not believe the objectives articulated above are in conflict with long-established policies such as congestion relief or improved mobility. Rather, a multimodal standard, if based upon dynamic modeling for specific land use districts and properly calibrated, will allow for concurrency to reflect the multimodal transportation system anticipated by the Mobility Implementation Plan and will make it more likely the system can accommodate trips to be generated by a particular development.

To ensure that a multimodal concurrency standard meets these objectives, we offer the following observations and suggestions.

We agree that Bellevue needs a multimodal concurrency standard that is tied to land use patterns and in urban land use districts, the standard should reflect urban levels of service and will likely be calibrated towards person trips assigned to transit and non-motorized modes. However, we also believe that for some land use districts and transportation facilities, particularly where there are commercial shopping centers or auto dealerships, a vehicle-based standard will make sense. Therefore, we question the

advisability of completely eliminating TR-2 as currently written and suggest maintaining a commitment to congestion reduction.

Assuming the objective of a MMLOS and concurrency standard is to capture as many person trips as possible, we recommend adopting specific person trip metrics for inclusion in the standard. According to our understanding of the recommendation recently adopted by the Transportation Commission, the “MIP Metric,” “MIP Target” and “MIP Geography” for each mode are deferred for inclusion in the Mobility Implementation Plan.

Similarly, the terms “Transportation Infrastructure Mobility Units” and “Land Use Person Trip Mobility Units” are used to link transportation “supply” with transportation “demand.” We think this linkage makes sense. However, without clearly defined metrics for each mode in place, upon adoption of a multimodal concurrency standard, we will have no idea what the number of person trips are which will need to be accommodated by or assigned to each mode within the “layered network.”

In order for the necessary improvements to be in place concurrently or within six years of a development, it will be essential to know what the “MIP Metric” and “MIP Target” will be for a particular mode within a given land use district. Otherwise, it will be extraordinarily difficult for the “layered network” to accommodate additional person trip “mobility units” likely to be generated by a particular development.

Lastly, we are concerned about the future conversation on impact fees under the umbrella of multi-modal level of service. Bellevue’s current impact fee regime is limited to a share of arterial capacity improvements, including adjacent bike lanes. The regime adheres to state law, and the fee amounts are set at a reasonable level. As the conversation proceeds, please be mindful of the fact that raising impact fees increases the cost of producing housing, and that state law limits the application of impact fees to system improvements that are: (a) reasonably related to new development; (b) reasonably benefit the new development; and (c) do not exceed the new development’s proportionate share of those costs (RCW 82.02.050(4)).

To be clear, the time has come for Bellevue to advance beyond a concurrency standard linked solely vehicle level of service, and we are confident that over time, the Mobility Implementation Plan will establish metrics for each mode. However, we also believe that until these standards are in place, there is no guarantee that simply adopting a multimodal concurrency standard will, on its own, prevent an individual project from failing concurrency or at the system level, a city-wide growth moratorium.

Thanks for your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joe Fain". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long vertical line extending downwards from the end of the name.

Joe Fain , Bellevue Chamber
President & CEO Chair

From: [Joyce Hansbearry](#)
To: [PlanningCommission](#)
Cc: [Johnson, Thara](#)
Subject: For your consideration
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 11:51:14 AM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

It has come to my attention that my employers, Downtown Action to Save Housing, have requested permission to build and/or increase their properties at Glendale Apartments and Evergreen Court. I have been a resident apartment manager for DASH for the last 16 years. I know that DASH is comprised of ethical, caring, honest, efficient and logical people, both employees and board members. They have always put RESIDENTS first ahead of excess profits. The properties they own are well-kept, well-managed and serve populations of seniors, disabled persons, families with children and working individuals who might otherwise be homeless.

As a resident manager, one of my functions is to rent apartments. While I haven't kept definitive records on persons I cannot help (because they are under 62 years of age,) I can promise that I get calls daily from people who are homeless, about to be homeless or have had to vacate their current residences due to loss of job, domestic violence or landlord issues (even prior to Covid19.)

Everyone knows that Bellevue is an expensive city. But even the well-monied people of Bellevue expect to be serviced in restaurants, fast food eateries, dry cleaners, coffee houses, retail establishments, etc. Why should these workers, who might earn minimum wage, commute from Renton or Kent or Bothell? Not only are these workers performing valuable services, they are consumers, too! This is why we need more affordable housing in Bellevue.

Over the years I've also encountered Bellevue citizens that have lived here all their lives and have suddenly found themselves not able to continue sustaining their homesteads, either due to lack of funds or lack of strength for the upkeep of their property. Widows whose husbands made, and lost, massive fortunes

are suddenly thrown to the curb, having to resort to moving out of their beloved city to keep a roof over their heads. This is a disgrace!

I implore you to allow DASH to expand on their existing properties. The property already belongs to them and they are earnestly trying to fulfill a need that you might not even know exists.

Thank you for your time,

Joyce Hansberry

Joyce Hansberry | Community Manager

Ashwood Court Apartments

DASH – Downtown Action to Save Housing

11018 NE 11th St., Bellevue, WA 98004

(W) 425-455-9473 (F) 425-455-9484

ashwood@dashhousing.org | www.dashhousing.org

-

Have a wonderful day!

From: [Beth Salazar](#)
To: [PlanningCommission](#)
Subject: Need for additional senior housing/ Bellevue
Date: Tuesday, July 20, 2021 10:55:26 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

TO: Planning Commission of Bellevue
FROM: Beth Salazar
DATE: July 20, 2021
RE: Need for additional senior housing/ Bellevue

I have been a resident at Ashwood Court Apartments, a DASH property, for 7+years. When I retired, I wanted to stay in Bellevue because it has been my home for many years. I enjoy living at Ashwood Court: location is great, staff is amazing, I don't have yard work or maintenance, great opportunities for socialization and very important to me living on social security, AFFORADABLE. I've found DASH to be generous, yet conservative, too, with the amenities they provide, in how they manage their business, take care of their property and continue to be a visible landlord.

I've heard that DASH wants to build more affordable housing options and I want to add my voice to encourage the city of Bellevue to assist in that endeavor. DASH is already here, they already own their properties, why deny them the ability to help people afford housing in our great city? Our senior population is growing but not necessarily their incomes.

With a look to the future, let's start now!

Thank you.....

Beth Salazar
425 644 4040
Ashwood Court #109

From: [MWannamaker WANNAMAKER](#)
To: [PlanningCommission](#)
Subject: July 28th hearing on Transp. CPA on MIP Policies.
Date: Wednesday, July 21, 2021 3:18:18 AM
Attachments: [PC MIP Vote 21.07.21 lttr.docx](#)

[EXTERNAL EMAIL Notice!] Outside communication is important to us. Be cautious of phishing attempts. Do not click or open suspicious links or attachments.

Chair Malakoutian and Commissioners,
My letter for the July 28th hearing on the Transp. Element CPA on the Mobility Implementation Plan (MIP) Multimodal Concurrency Policies is attached.

Sincerely,

Michelle Wannamaker
4045 149th Ave. SE
Bellevue, WA 98006

July 21, 2021

Chair Malakoutian and Commissioners,

The public's #1 issue in the City's surveys for at least the past 5 or 6 years, has been traffic congestion. The City Council is well aware of this. The Transp. Dept. should be, too. And most, if not all, of the sitting City Councilmembers ran on platforms that included working to reduce traffic congestion.

Chair Marciante claims that the new Transp. MIP Policies still include "work to reduce congestion." For the sake of this argument, let's assume that Chair Marciante is correct. The general public doesn't have a background in transp. and they don't have the additional training and access to staff and consultants for briefings, that Transp. Commissioners receive & have available.

After reading the new MIP Policies, what those members of the general public who have read the Transp. Element of the Comprehensive Plan, in the past, will say is, "They've *removed* the Policy which states strive to reduce congestion. Don't the Transp. Dept. & Transp. Commission care about that, anymore?! Don't they know how important that is to us?! How much it impacts our quality of life?" Those members of the general public who have *not* read the Transp. Element, until after the new Policies are inserted, are going to read through the new list of Policies and say, "There's no statement about reducing traffic congestion in here. We've told the City and City Council year after year that this is the issue that concerns us the most! The City, Transp. Commission, Planning Commission, & City Council aren't hearing us or listening to our concerns!"

The general public won't have Mr. McDonald or Chair Marciante sitting next to each and every one of them, explaining the Policies to them as they read through the list.

But if, as Chair Marciante has stated, the new MIP Policies *do* still include "striving to reduce congestion," what harm would it do to explicitly add that back in as a new policy **in addition to all of the proposed new MIP Policies?** It wouldn't take anything away from improving the *multimodal* transp. system. At worst, it would be redundant. But what it would do, is show the general public that striving to reduce congestion *is* still in the Transp. Policies. What it would do, is tell the general public that the Planning Commission & City Council are listening to their concerns. That striving to reduce congestion is still a priority for them. And what it would do, is tell the general public that their City Councilmembers are still working to keep their campaign promises on reducing congestion.

For all of these reasons, I'm asking the Planning Commission to **add back in**, a new MIP Policy which states "Strive to reduce congestion." Another option would be to add "*including* striving to reduce congestion" to one of the *new* MIP Policies. Please think of the general public and do this for them. Show the general public that the Planning Commission and City Council are listening to their concerns. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Michelle Wannamaker
4045 149th Ave. SE

July 21, 2021

Bellevue, WA 98006