

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES

November 10, 2022  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
Hybrid Meeting

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Beason

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Paula Stevens, Department of Transportation; Kate Nesse, Department of Community Development

OTHERS PRESENT: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 6:45 p.m. by Chair Stash who presided.

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Vice Chair Beason who was excused.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

An

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

A motion to amend the motion to add a discussion regarding Commissioner approval of remote attendance was added to the agenda under New Business was made by Chair Stash. The motion to amend the motion was seconded by Commissioner Marciante.

The motion to amend the motion carried unanimously.

The main motion, as amended, carried unanimously.

3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Alex Zimmerman, 14150 NE 20<sup>th</sup> Street, Apartment 258, spoke as president of Sand Up America, began with zeig heile and called the Commissioners super smart happy idiots, and noted having announced on Monday running for City Council. Seattle and King County is facing a unique form of fascism, which is very dangerous. Stopping Amazon will be foundational to the campaign. Amazon looks like a killing machine like Microsoft was in 1996. Small cities like Bellevue cannot accept a factory for \$50,000; it is a dead penalty for the city. The Amazon situation is critical because the company will bring to the city 30,000 slaves that will destroy

everyone in Bellevue and everyone 20 miles out from Bellevue. All will be dead, the whole Eastside. A few years ago New York refused Amazon in a very smart move. The Bellevue City Council is very stupid and that is very dangerous. The Council needs to be changed so Amazon can be stopped. What Amazon did to Seattle was a nightmare. They totally destroyed the city and large numbers of people moved away because they could no longer afford to live there.

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

Councilmember Zahn reported that Bellevue Essentials held its transportation section on November 9 and the class was very excited about the presentation and the tour of the City Hall room with all the video analytics.

The Commissioners were informed that Bellevue will hear in January about whether or not it will receive the Be Safe grant that was submitted to the USDOT seeking \$40 million in collaboration with other agencies and private businesses to work on improving connections to Eastrail, Complete Streets installations and innovative practices to more broadly implement Vision Zero. Given the level of collaboration, the city is confident it will be successful.

Amazon has donated \$2.5 million toward the Grand Connection Phase 2, the bridge over I-405. The city will match those funds and use them to work toward 30 percent design. In addition to the ped/bike bridge, the focus is on building a lid over the freeway, connecting Wilburton with the Downtown.

Councilmember Zahn noted that it was announced earlier in the day that the Center for Digital Government awarded Bellevue a first place Smart Cities award for cities with populations of between 125,000 and 250,000. The award will be accepted at the National League of Cities meeting in Kansas City next week.

Commissioner Helland asked if there is a conceptual design for the I-405 lid project. Councilmember Zahn said Amazon hired a firm to produce some very conceptual sketches, and they have been provided to the city as one potential idea. Councilmember Zahn added that on a recent fact-finding trip to Denmark the work being done there to incentivize people to walk and bike was highlighted. The focus was on the creation of pedestrian and bicycle only bridges, making it faster and more convenient to walk or ride a bike. Many there utilize cargo bikes that have room for carrying two children.

Commissioner Helland asked if the actual design work on the lid will be a city process and if there is already funding earmarked for it. Councilmember Zahn said there are funds in hand for some preliminary design work. It will take a number of partners to actually get from preliminary design to a fully funded project. It will take time for that to happen. The Amazon funds are a good start. Discussions with WSDOT are underway to make sure everyone is on the same page.

#### 5. STAFF REPORTS

Kevin McDonald shared that the curb management plan policies forwarded from the Commission to the Planning Commission will be presented to the City Council on November 14 by the chairs of both commissions. Action by the Council to adopt the policies is expected to occur in December.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Comprehensive Plan Update

Senior Planner Dr. Kate Nesse noted that the city’s boards and commissions are key to giving feedback in regard to the Comprehensive Plan update policies, but they are not the only stream of engagement. Public comment at open meetings are part of the feedback loop, and staff have engaged in public outreach at events and other venues.

Dr. Nesse said the process for the environmental impact analysis has started. The analysis is needed because the updates to the Comprehensive Plan are fairly substantial, including adding capacity for more housing units. Three growth alternatives have been put forward as part of the scope of the update. The no action alternative is the one against which the other alternatives are evaluated. Two additional analyses will be conducted as part of a new requirement under the Growth Management Act. The first is in regard to racial disparate impacts and focuses on the impacts current policies are having on different racial groups and changes needed to avoid racial disparities. The history of how the city has grown and how that has impacted housing and other issues must also be evaluated, and ways must be found to make the system more equitable. All the alternatives will look at whether people will be displaced and who those people are. That information will feed into policy language.

The city has set growth targets of 35,000 housing units and 70,000 jobs. Currently there is capacity for about 30,000 housing units and 117,000 jobs. The update work will include looking at how to increase the housing capacity beyond the 35,000-unit target.

Commissioner Helland asked how those targets were developed. Dr. Nesse said the state first projected population into future years. The Puget Sound Regional Council then took those numbers and applied a certain amount of growth to each of the four counties. Within King County, the cities worked together to distribute the growth among themselves.

Dr. Nesse noted that currently almost all of the city’s housing capacity is in Downtown and BelRed. As part of the update, consideration will be given to how to add capacity in those two areas as well as in other areas of the city. The first alternative adds capacity in the mixed use centers, and adds capacity for what is called middle housing, specifically duplexes, triplexes, townhomes and small apartment buildings, in all zones across the city. The second alternative looks to add more capacity around the mixed use centers of Downtown, BelRed, Wilburton, Crossroads and Factoria, and a little more density across the city, particularly around the neighborhood centers, the small commercial nodes around the city. The third alternative throws in all of the options from the first and second alternatives. Alternative 1 has capacity for 44,000 housing units; Alternative 2 has capacity for 55,000 housing units; and Alternative 3 has capacity for 70,000 housing units.

Focusing on the Transportation Element, the Commissioners were told the options include adding new policies, repealing existing policies, making either major or minor edits to existing policies, and moving policies to different sections where they might find a better fit. Minor amendments generally are to clarify and add consistency across the Comprehensive Plan and other city plans. Given that the goal of the Comprehensive Plan is to provide overall direction, policies that are overly prescriptive need to be modified, leaving implementation details to other plans, such as the Mobility Implementation Plan and the Transit Master Plan. Some policies

address projects that are almost completed or that have been fully completed. Direction for future projects should be retained in the policies, but specific project citations should be removed.

Ultimately, the Comprehensive Plan must be consistent with the 2050 Regional Transportation Plan, which includes a new land use category called Countywide Centers that focuses transportation investments. Called mixed use centers in the last Comprehensive Plan update, the new designation is related to transportation dollars. Prioritizing multimodal investment is another area of emphasis, as is addressing racial and social equity, and responding to the causes and effects of climate change.

Dr. Nesse briefly outlined the process next steps, noting that the topic will be before the Commission again in March 2023 by which time there will be additional community input in hand along with the racial disparate impact analysis, and data from other analyses. In July the Commission will be presented with the final draft of the policies.

Principal Planner Kevin McDonald said the staff-proposed policy amendments respond to the need to add clarity and consistency, remove redundancies, adhere to specific implementation strategies, and align with King County, Puget Sound Regional Council and state requirements. The recommendations do not reflect any public comment, any environmental analysis, or any of the alternatives under consideration in the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update. The substantive amendments will be part of subsequent review

Chair Stash voiced the assumption that when referring to bicycles in policies, nearly all wheeled vehicles are included, such as skateboards and like. Kevin McDonald confirmed that. Chair Stash also noted the need to clearly define terms like “micromobility” and “active transportation.” Given that the Comprehensive Plan is the city’s highest level document, the language should outline the vision rather than be a prescription for how to get there. Kevin McDonald concurred with that rationale.

Commissioner Helland said there are both pros and cons associated with stripping too many details from the Comprehensive Plan policy language. Kevin McDonald suggested two reasons for keeping the language simple. First, policies that are overly prescriptive are subject to being outdated as the city changes its implementation strategies or as circumstances change, and to change them means having to change the Comprehensive Plan. Second, implementation strategies that are included in adopted plans do not need to be re-expressed in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Helland asked how can someone know where to go look for details without having to read all of the various plans. Dr. Nesse allowed that there currently is a lot of overlap between the Comprehensive Plan and various plans. There will need to be a fuller conversation about what needs to be in the Comprehensive Plan. In laying it out, the plan is to include guide boxes on the side. Using annexation as an example, Dr. Nesse said there are annexation polices in the Utilities Element and in the Land Use Element. In both of those elements, the update will include a box indicating where to look for details. The relationship between transportation and land use is also very close and references will need to be included.

Commissioner Marciante asked for an example of how the Comprehensive Plan is used pragmatically. Kevin McDonald said a policy that was adopted in December 2021 directed the development of the Mobility Implementation Plan and the adoption of multimodal concurrency. Absent the Comprehensive Plan policy direction, the work could not have gone forward. Another good example is the that the development review staff relay on the Comprehensive Plan,

particularly the Transportation Element policies, to ensure that as new private development occurs it implements components of the Comprehensive Plan.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Helland, Dr. Nesse said the Transportation Element has the second-most number of policies of any element in the Comprehensive Plan. Not all of the specific direction included in those policies needs to be in the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Ting suggested it would be worthwhile to review the best practices for policies document. In reviewing the policies, particular care needs to be taken in regard to the verbs that are used and the reasons for using specific verbs. There also need to be clear definitions for things like “active transportation” and “micromobility.” Care needs to be taken in regard to changing the scope or intent of policies in trying to simplify the language. Where changes are made, the authority used to make the changes should be documented. Often what might be considered implementation detail is actually the core intent behind a policy. For example, specific mention of bicycles could be deemed to be an implementation detail while in addressing bike lanes specifically the intent is in fact to reference bicycles.

Commissioner Ting also suggested there should be some discussion about whether it is a good practice to delegate policy decisions from the Comprehensive Plan to other documents. For example, a policy that calls for implementing priorities X, Y and Z allows for flexibility, but that flexibility loses the intent of oversight and having a process for meeting the goals and priorities. Kevin McDonald responded by saying that implementation documents like the Transit Master Plan and the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan are adopted by the Council. The direction with regard to policy amendments is to eliminate some of the implementation strategies that are duplicated in those adopted plans. With regard to implementation plans that are not adopted by the Council, such as the Transportation Demand Management Plan, the intent is to leave much of the implementation strategies in the policy language. Commissioner Ting voiced support for the notion of retaining implementation details in the policy in order to capture the intent. Most who read the Comprehensive Plan will not also read through the other documents the Comprehensive Plan refers to.

Chair Stash agreed. The Comprehensive Plan is updated every ten years and much can happen and change in a decade. Since the Comprehensive Plan is the uber document, the intent details need to be included in it.

Kevin McDonald shared with the Commissioners a spreadsheet listing specific policies and the recommended action for each, and noted that what has been done in the past was to include in one column the original proposed policy language, which is different from the adopted language, and another column with revised language that is responsive to the comments received. The policies were not listed in any ranked order.

Chair Stash suggested policy TR-2 should not be moved as proposed. The exact wording of the policy can be worked out later. Given that the policy is a broad statement, the word “safety” should be added to it to stress that safety is an important part of transportation and land use. In policy TR-4, the language talks about transportation- and pedestrian-oriented design features, but nothing is said about wheeled vehicles like bicycles.

Commissioner Marciante asked why policy TR-2 should not be moved to the mobility management section. Chair Stash said the policy serves as an overarching statement by use of the phrase “aggressively plan, manage and expand transportation investments.” As such it is worth stating in the land use section. Commissioner Marciante pointed out that the mobility

management section is part of the Transportation element, and the proposal is just to reorganize the Transportation element, not to move the policy to another element.

Commissioner Ting referred to policy TR-7 and asked if the three specific items in the policy were proposed to be moved to another place or simply deleted. Kevin McDonald said the proposal refers to the Comprehensive Plan and how the Land Use Element addresses changes based on growth. In areas near high-capacity transit, the Comprehensive Plan Land Use element will describe how the city allocates land with respect to the three specific items, and as such, it is redundant and unnecessary to include them in the Transportation element policy.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Marciante, Kevin McDonald stated that in the event policies are moved to the Land Use Element, there still will be other policies within the Transportation Element that describe how the transportation system serves the land use around transit stations. The siting and design of transit stations is in the transit section policies. The access to and from the transit stations is in the pedestrian and bicycle access section. Individual components are covered in separate sections, but the overall policy guidance is based on what land use is designated to be around high-capacity transit stations.

Commissioner Marciante asked who has the tools, the transportation department or the planning department, to encourage private developers to execute agreements to provide joint use and funding of shared parking facilities as stated in policy TR-6. Kevin McDonald said there is a land use review that implements the Land Use Code, and a transportation review that implements the Transportation Code. Staff from both departments work together to apply the codes in a joint and comprehensive way for all development proposals. Similarly, for public sector projects, the same level of review is put into their review and approval.

Dr. Nesse explained that the entire Comprehensive Plan applies to all actions taken. Just because something is a transportation project does not mean the Land Use Element is not referred to.

Commissioner Helland said the question of whether or not to move a policy should be based on what will make it easier for transportation to work with planning.

Commissioner Marciante suggested that policy TR-6 should be moved as proposed because it is not the transportation department that has the front seat for the responsibility. The density around transit stations is not a transportation function. Encouraging a developer to provide child care on site can help transportation, but is a land use function.

Commissioner Ting supported the notion of trying to put the policies closer to the decision makers. With regard to policy TR-7, some of the points should be retained. The proposed version of the policy essentially calls for making sure the Comprehensive Plan is followed, and that does not add any value. By including the three points the policy better outlines the vision.

Turning to the Transportation Demand Management policies, Kevin McDonald said the proposed revisions were largely recommended by the subject matter experts in the transportation department. They supported retaining the existing policies and recommended only a couple of minor amendments.

Chair Stash reiterated the need to define “micromobility” as used in policy TR-17. Commissioner Kurz agreed, noting it was not clear if the language includes e-bikes.

Commissioner Kurz pointed out that a minor revision had been made to policy TR-12, though it

was not highlighted as having been revised.

Commissioner Ting asked if e-scooters are included in micromobility in policy TR-16. Kevin McDonald said a definition for micromobility will be provided in the glossary section of the Comprehensive Plan, adding that currently e-bikes are included. E-scooters are technically not available for the public to use in the public right-of-way. Commissioner Ting suggested that if e-scooters are to be included or excluded, the decision should be made intentionally based on either other parts of the Comprehensive Plan or guidance from the Council.

Commissioner Helland asked if there is a definition of “mobility hub.” Kevin McDonald said the definition from the Countywide Planning Policies states that a mobility hub is a local connection point where multiple mobility options meet up and allow a user to transfer from one mode to another.

Chair Stash asked why “mobility hub” was added to policy TR-22. Kevin McDonald said the Countywide Planning Policies suggest including the concept of a mobility hub in the policies. Chair Stash noted that policy TR-21 calls for ensuring the transportation system provides mobility options for all modes. Policy TR-22 can be read to imply that it calls for improvements and operations among the travel modes. By adding mobility hubs to policy TR-22, the policy appears to be focused only on mobility hubs rather than on the transportation system infrastructure. Dr. Nesse stressed that mobility hubs are about the connections between the modes. Policy TR-22 is also about the connections, thus the addition of the mobility hubs reference. It might be a good idea to look at policy TR-21 and policy TR-22 together to make sure they are addressing separate issues.

Commissioner Marciante commented that if by current definition a mobility hub is every location where two travel modes intersect, should the definition later be revised, it could narrow the scope and intent of the policies. Kevin McDonald agreed that the definition should be specific. Additionally, the mobility hubs could ultimately be mapped.

Commissioner Ting suggested the proposed language for policy TR-22 could be simplified to call for improving mobility hubs. Kevin McDonald said by reducing the language that way the policy could be seen as an implementation strategy, but allowed that it could provide some context. “...mobility hubs and provide facilities...” could be revised to read “...mobility hubs to provide facilities....”

Chair Stash asked about the highlighting of two cells in the spreadsheet relative to policy TR-28. Kevin McDonald said the city attorney wants to make sure “level of service” is retained in the policy language. The existing policy references what was adopted in the multimodal concurrency code.

Commissioner Rebhuhn said it appears policy TR-27 is recommended to be repealed because all the specifics are in the Mobility Implementation Plan. Kevin McDonald confirmed that, noting that the MIP sets the performance targets for travel speeds along arterials. The city does not take measures to keep volumes within reasonable limits on arterials, but it does manage the flow of the traffic. Accordingly, there is a need to make a distinction between arterials that rely on the MIP and the neighborhood streets that are in a different section called neighborhood protection. Commissioner Rebhuhn agreed the policy should be removed. As written it is unworkable and does not really mean anything.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Helland, Kevin McDonald said the MIP is specific

in regard to how the performance targets get translated into actions. By referring to the MIP, the reader has to dig a little, but the guidance is there.

Chair Stash voiced the assumption that somewhere in the Comprehensive Plan it will state that modifications will be made in order to achieve the MIP performance targets. Kevin McDonald said the narrative section of the Comprehensive Plan, which is outside of the policies, includes an entire section on the MIP that explains how it is used. Commissioner Marciante added that policy TR-29 is on point in that it calls for monitoring and documenting transportation system performance in accordance with the performance targets and Performance Management Areas established in the MIP.

With regard to policy TR-27, Commissioner Ting suggested it should all be about whether or not it should be considered a priority. If it is to be removed, it should be clear that it is because it references a goal the city no longer thinks it should try to accomplish.

Commissioner Ting voiced concern about having Comprehensive Plan policies reference external documents, like the MIP, and putting the prioritization of things in those external documents. The goals and vision should live in the Comprehensive Plan, but the Comprehensive Plan should not delegate to things like the MIP. The MIP is the implementation document, not the other way around. Policies TR-23 and TR-24 should not specifically reference the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan and the Mobility Implementation Plan.

Commissioner Marciante agreed that the Comprehensive Plan is to state the general policy. However, it makes sense to point the reader to the operational plans, which ultimately are adopted by the Council. Leaving out the references altogether means losing the connectivity.

Commissioner Ting agreed the Comprehensive Plan should outline the policies and the implementation details should be housed in separate documents. It is also okay to reference the implementation documents in the Comprehensive Plan. The implementation documents, however, should not have the power to override the priorities established in the Comprehensive Plan. References to implementation plans should always be preceded by high-level policy statements.

Dr. Nesse said staff could work on the wording and agreed that no implementation or functional plan should contradict the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Marciante agreed and voiced concern over using in the policies the phrase "...in accordance with..." this or that implementation plan. The guidance must be in the policy, not in the implementation plans. Dr. Nesse agreed the better option would be to use the phrase "...this is implemented in..." and list the specific plan.

Kevin McDonald pointed out that the policies under discussion are all in the mobility management section. As such, the policies provide the overarching direction in regard to providing mobility across all modes citywide. The policies do not specify projects or priorities. There is also a transit section and a pedestrian and bicycle section and it is in those sections where the policy guidance that informs the Transit Master Plan and the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan are housed. The Commissioners were urged not to be too specific in the policy language until after reviewing the other sections.

By way of example, Commissioner Marciante turned to policy TR-29 and suggested it should simply read "Monitor and document transportation system performance." A reference to the MIP



can be included for further details.

Commissioner Ting called attention to policy TR-23 and suggested the first part of the policy, “Incorporate pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements into roadway projects” is a good start, but there should also be something said about the why to make sure the goal will endure beyond any changes made to specific implementation plans.

Commissioner Marciante did not agree, suggesting to not overcomplicate policy language. The policy should simply be “Incorporate pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements into roadway projects” is the policy and is clear in regard to intent.

Commissioner Ting said every important component of the vision should be documented and become a priority in the Comprehensive Plan. That includes things like equity.

Commissioner Helland voiced support for including specificity in the policy language. Adding “in accordance with,” however, implies a hierarchy that does not exist. Including references to implementation documents is okay.

Chair Stash noted that policy TR-32 refers to Complete Streets goals, and policy TR-23 references the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan. The question asked was if there will be a diagram of the sub-tier documents. Dr. Nesse said at the end of each section of the current Comprehensive Plan there is a section that lists the related functional plans. Where that will end up in the new Comprehensive Plan is not yet clear, but there will be a listing of the various functional plans and where they tie in.

Commissioner Ting voiced a preference for not including the phrase “from new development” in policy TR-28. The statement should be that the demand is to be met regardless of the origin of the demand. On policy TR-32, the comment regarding community engagement will hopefully be captured somewhere else. The comment for policy TR-33 that addressing performance gaps is not necessarily to accommodate demand could be strengthened by wording that seeks to accommodate more capacity demand.

Commissioner Helland proposed revising policy TR-28 from “...that meet the demand from new development...” to “that meet demand from new development...” With respect to the reasoning section for policy TR-33, “be be” seems to be a typo that should read “can be.” Policy TR-34 is listed as a major modification, yet the reasoning paragraph only calls for simplifying the language. Kevin McDonald agreed it should be referred to as a minor modification.

Commissioner Marciante suggested two new sections need to be added, one for equity considerations and one for technology considerations. Those are both important topics that have emerged over the last ten years. Kevin McDonald said there are a couple of policies regarding technology that could be aggregated.

Commissioner Kurz proposed adding a single policy calling for supporting the emergence of new modes of transportation.

Commissioner Helland asked how the various categories were determined. Dr. Nesse said most of them go back to the creation of the Growth Management Act in 1990. The city’s first Comprehensive Plan adopted under the GMA was in 1993. Most of the categories and how the plan is organized stem from that 1993 plan.

Turning to the regional transportation coordination section, Chair Stash referenced policy TR-42 and suggested it should be kept. It is true that environmental impacts are covered under the SEPA process, but in the overarching Comprehensive Plan it is worth stating as a policy that the city cares about what its neighbors are doing.

Commissioner Helland also voiced support for retaining the policy absent some specific reason for getting rid of it.

Commissioner Helland referred to policy TR-41 and suggested it would be useful to include in the Comprehensive Plan something that refers to interlocal agreements. Kevin McDonald stated that the Council has the ability to engage in and initiate interlocal agreements. Accordingly, the policy does not add any value.

Commissioner Marciante encouraged the removal of anything not actually needed. Policy TR-36 sets the intent for what the city wants to do relative to regional collaboration. Commissioner Helland agreed that in that light policy TR-41 is redundant.

Commissioner Ting agreed that TR-41 could be repealed, but only if it is redundant. It certainly is not unimportant. It could simply be no one understands why the policy was added in the first place. The average person looking policy TR-42 may have concerns about cut-through traffic from neighboring jurisdictions and want to see the jurisdictions work together to address the issue. That could be a policy priority that should be included even if it is redundant.

Chair Stash noted that policy TR-41 gets to the how and as such can be repealed. Commissioner Ting agreed and suggested that there should be an understanding of why the various policies were added in the first place. Staff has the institutional knowledge that could be explained in the reason column.

Commissioner Marciante pointed out that the recommendations outlined in the spreadsheet are from the staff and they are based on their institutional knowledge. Commissioner Ting agreed but said it still would be helpful to have more about the why behind the recommendations. Dr. Nesse said staff certainly can come back with more history on the various policies if asked.

Commissioner Helland voiced support for deleting policy TR-41 and keeping policy TR-42.

With respect to policy TR-43, Commissioner Ting noted the minor modification simply removes the phrase “provide an arterial system” and expands the scope of the state to provide a multimodal transportation system. Those issues are not really covered by policies TR-1 or TR-3. Kevin McDonald said the state in 2020 adopted an integrated multimodal active transportation plan. The policy does not reference that plan by name. The phrase “provide an arterial system” is not needed because the city has an arterial system in place. That was not the case in 1993 when the policy was first adopted.

Commissioner Rebhuhn asked about policy TR-52, allowing that it seems vague but also agreeing that the policy had been adopted for some reason in the first place. Kevin McDonald explained that in the past there had been issues related to signage, but that is covered in the Land Use Code in the sign element. There are also issues related to extraneous objects such as advertising signs advertising. That kind of thing is regulated by the Sign Code. Vegetation is something that can create visual distractions. Vegetation encroachment into the right-of-way is the responsibility of the private property owner. The city does not actively minimize such things through transportation regulations or operations.

Commissioner Helland said it would be helpful to explain in the reasons column how the issue is actually regulated.

Chair Stash called attention to policy TR-46 and noted that between the policy text and the proposed language the mention of trees got removed. In some policy, there should be mention made of retaining trees for street character. Kevin McDonald said the MIP there are performance metrics for back-of-curb development, including a landscape strip and sidewalk. The trees are included within that landscape strip. Chair Stash commented that Bellevue reaps huge benefits from trees. At the policy level somewhere, trees should be mentioned.

Commissioner Marciante said the policy could simply be “Encourage space for street trees and landscaping in the right-of-way.”

Chair Stash referenced policy TR-54 and suggested that also at the policy level it should be stated somewhere that the city does not want people cutting through residential neighborhoods seeking a shortcut. Kevin McDonald said that is addressed in the neighborhood protection section.

Commissioner Ting said the simplest option would be to just retain policy TR-54. Kevin McDonald said there are in place policies related to neighborhood protection. The issue of creating a bypass for regional traffic through neighborhood areas is vetted as part of the TFP and CIP projects. The policy could be retained if the thinking is by doing so the direction will be strengthened.

Noting the late hour, Commissioner Helland suggested tabling the review of the rest of the policies to another meeting, adding that if needed the Commissioners could submit their comments to staff in writing.

There was suggestion for the Commissioners to submit to staff written comments by November 30. Dr. Nesse agreed to summarize the comments to serve as the start of the discussion at the next meeting.

A motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes was made by Commissioner Marciante. The motion was seconded by Chair Stash and the motion carried unanimously.

A motion to schedule a meeting in December to continue the discussion of the policies was made by Chair Stash. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marciante and the motion carried unanimously.

## 8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### A. October 13, 2022

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Kurz. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ting and the motion carried unanimously.

## 9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

### A. Approval of Commissioner Remote Participation for the December 8 Meeting

Chair Stash noted Vice Chair Beason had not been able to join the meeting via zoom due to a last-minute scheduling conflict. The Commissioners were asked if the Commission’s liaison

Councilmember Zahn should carry forward to the Council the Commission’s desire to see the rule regarding previous meeting approval changed.

Commissioner Marciante said the request should be that approval to participate remotely should be allowed to occur at the beginning of every meeting rather than at the previous meeting.

A motion to allow Commissioners Ting, Beason and Kurtz to participate remotely on December 8 was made by Commissioner Marciante. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Helland and the motion carried unanimously.

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Kevin McDonald read into the record comments received from Steve Fantle of 4722 130<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE, a long-time Bellevue resident and a volunteer with the transportation department assisting in the areas of bicycle safety infrastructure and Vision Zero as well as Complete Streets. Specific suggestions were put forward consistent with Vision Zero, including improvements to crosswalk signal design such as an advanced walk signal before traffic gets the green light; all-way walk signals with no turn on red allowed; automatic walk for the entire green cycle without the need to push a button; countdown timers for the entire walk cycle; lower speed limits with an emphasis on higher speed arterials streets and streets lacking adequate bicycle infrastructure, specifically Newport Way, Factoria Boulevard, Coal Creek Parkway, 124<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE, Lake Hills Connector and SE 8<sup>th</sup> Street; the use of safety cameras and associated technology; enforcing speed limits 24/7; and complement limited police resources. Additionally, ordinance that reduce distracted driving behavior should be considered, including no handheld phone use by bicyclists when in motion, no handheld phone use by pedestrians when in a crosswalk or a multiuse path, only single earbud headphones used by bicyclists when in motion, and single earbud headphones used by pedestrians when in a crosswalk or on a multiuse path. Revenues should be used for safety education training for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians. Achieving the goals of Vision Zero will require bold steps to shift current behaviors.

12. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

Kevin McDonald took a moment to briefly review the Commission’s calendar of upcoming meeting dates and agenda items.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Stash adjourned the meeting at 9:09 p.m.

---

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

---

Date