

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

December 14, 2023
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Hybrid Meeting

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

COMMISSIONERS REMOTE: None

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Franz Loewenherz, Nick Bleich, Hu Dong, Ming-Bang Shyu, Paula Stevens, Andrew Singelakis, Chris Long, Michael Ingram, Department of Transportation; Councilmember Zahn

OTHERS PRESENT: Chris Breiland, Fehr & Peers

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting began at 4:30 p.m. by Mobility Planning and Solutions Manager Franz Loewenherz.

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present

2. AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Stash welcomed the attendees explained the special meeting had been called to allow the Commission to have a greater understanding of the items associated with the Bike Bellevue project.

A. Bike Bellevue Overview

Franz Loewenherz shared that the City Council adopted the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan following an intensive community engagement process. The plan outlined a vision for a connected network of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, and established a number of performance targets. The message of a 2015 update on the plan to the City Council was that more needed to be done and more rapidly, and that is when the Council set in motion the Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative which resulted in a comprehensive vision for connected, protected and rapid infrastructure, all outlined in a document called the Bicycle Rapid Implementation Program. Implementation of the program began following passage of the 2016 transportation levy. A number of other policies, plans and programs were set in motion to realize the connected network of infrastructure.

Continuing, Franz Loewenherz explained that during the last budget cycle the Council set aside

\$4.5 million for staff to review opportunities to implement rapid build bicycle infrastructure on existing streets. In launching the program, the Council approved a set of eight project principles to guide the work of staff. The principles – safety, connectivity, comfort, evaluation, coordination, partnership, engagement and equity – align with the core values of the community. The Council also considered a project area map with a focus on the urban core areas of Downtown, Wilburton and BelRed given the need to create connections to the light rail, Eastrail and Grand Connection facilities and adjacent land uses.

The draft design concepts guide was published in September and was updated in December to account for some clarifications. The document is available on the Bike Bellevue project page. A complimentary effort is also currently under way to formalize the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. The survey associated with the Comprehensive Plan update highlighted the fact that 72.7 percent of the respondents indicated a desire to see pedestrian- and bike-oriented street designs that prioritize safety and slower speeds. Only 27.3 percent suggested the streets should prioritize efficient automobile traffic.

B. Mobility Implementation Plan Overview

Principal Planner Kevin McDonald, project manager for the Mobility Implementation Plan, noted that the plan establishes the foundation for the metrics and targets for each mode of transportation the city is responsible for. The City Council adopted the plan in 2022 and work to implement it has been underway since. Bike Bellevue is one component of the plan.

The City Council established the Mobility Implementation Plan goals to focus on safety, equity, growth and access and mobility. With regard to safety, the intent is to eliminate serious injuries and fatalities from crashes in line with Vision Zero. The equity goal focuses on ensuring that all people, regardless of their means or mode, have access to jobs, housing, community service, retail and so forth. The growth focus recognizes that Bellevue is a growing community in need of transportation facilities to serve that growth. The access and mobility goal is complimentary to all of the other goals. The transportation network in any city is intended to assure residents have access to different land uses, including jobs, housing and retail.

The Mobility Implementation Plan is built around what is called the layered network. It is a fundamental function of transportation systems to serve land uses, and there are multiple ways in which the network provides that service. Pedestrians, bicyclists, vehicle drivers and transit operators all have needs. Some of those needs are combatable but some are not. An important part of the layered network is recognizing that all of the modes serve land use, though each in a different capacity depending on various factors. Integrating the land use and mobility functions facilitates the city in making informed investment decisions.

Two maps were presented side by side, one showing the bicycle layer and the other showing the vehicle layer as adopted in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative and reaffirmed in the Mobility Implementation Plan. The bicycle layer consisted of the bicycle network on the arterial system, not all of the bicycle facilities in the city, and as such there are opportunities for compatibilities and opportunities for integrating both the vehicle and bicycle modes.

The Mobility Implementation Plan includes performance metrics. The fundamental metric of the bike network is called Level of Traffic Stress (LTS). It is intended to evoke what it feels

like to be on a bike riding in traffic. The key vehicle network metrics are travel speed on the primary vehicle corridors, and the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio at system intersections. The combination of vehicle travel speed and type of bicycle facility yields the level of traffic stress. On the vehicle network side, the V/C ratio compares the volume of traffic wanting to use an intersection against the capacity of an intersection to accommodate that volume. The metric of travel speed on primary vehicle corridors is a function of the posted speed limit and the anticipated friction along the corridor resulting from things such as turning movements, driveways, signals, and other factors that influence the speed of drivers.

Not all areas of the city are created equal and to that end the Mobility Implementation Plan establishes three Performance Management Areas based on high-density, medium-density, and residential. The high-density areas will be served by light rail, while the medium-density areas are less dense and are served by buses. There is far less density in the residential areas, though they do contain small shopping centers, some offices, and a mix of residential types. The performance of the different modes varies by area. It is expected that vehicle travel will be accommodate, but not as fast along corridors than it is in the residential areas.

With regard to the Level of Traffic Stress, the Mobility Implementation Plan recognizes that there are different types of bicycle riders. Bicycle network facilities can be designed to accommodate those different types of riders based on the speed and volumes of traffic and the type of bicycle facility. The color-coded map in the Mobility Implementation Plan showing the bike network performance indicates the extent to which facilities along arterials meet the Level of Traffic Stress performance targets expected for each arterial. The facilities shown in blue do not meet the performance targets for the bicycle mode.

C. Modeling Overview

Senior Transportation Analyst Nick Bleich said several questions go into making travel decisions and understanding transportation demand, including: what activities to people want to participate in; where are these activities; when are these activities; what travel mode is used; and what route is used. Each of those factors are modeled and quantified to inform what is happening in the network, and to project and estimate what might happen in the future.

Bellevue has access to a number of state-of-the-art modeling tools. The macroscopic models tend to be used for reviewing policy changes, long-range planning, testing network, regional or citywide improvements, and testing projects that impact a larger area. The Puget Sound Regional Council has a macroscopic travel demand model called SoundCast that is used to do their regional transportation plans. The mesoscopic models get into a little more detail but still are at the regional scale. They take into account some of the interactions between traffic signals and drivers. Microsimulation modeling uses empirical equations to simulate what is happening in the real world in terms of operations on the ground. Intersectional modeling also uses empirical equations to quantify existing conditions. The outputs of those various models can be fed into different tools, such as Dynamic Traffic Assignment, and the ICLEI, MOVES and HEAT Tool models, each of which are industry standard models used for transportation planning.

The BKRCast model is an activity based travel demand model. It operates on the fundamental theory that everyone has the desire and the need to participate in an activity, whether it be job-related for socializing or shopping. The model takes into account the behavior of individuals and allows for understanding how an individual travels throughout the day without considering

how other people are traveling. The model is iterative and it learns. BKRCast was developed from the PSRC's SoundCast model which includes a daily schedule for every individual in the Puget Sound region. It represents a statistically accurate sample of the regional population. In the end, the model allows for understanding the pinch points and where congestion occurs. The BKRCast is a more detailed version of the model for the Bellevue/Kirkland/Redmond area and it was peer reviewed in 2016 using funding from the Federal Highway Administration. It is calibrated using regional travel survey data and traffic counts.

The BKRCast model uses the term "tour" rather than "trip." A tour is a travel event that starts and ends at one's home and includes a main purpose and a main mode. The term allows for the linking of a person's daily activities to better represent how they travel. A person who drives a car to work would at lunchtime have the option of using the car, walking or using a bus to go to lunch, but would not have the option of riding a bike. The tour links all of the various trips together into a larger travel pattern that can include sub-tours and stops along the way. The model is able to keep track of it all for each individual person in the region.

The BKRCast inputs are derived from travel surveys and from US Census data. Land use information is input from the city's Bellevue, Kirkland and Redmond in a detailed manner down to the parcel level and tracks by the number of households and jobs. Another input is the transportation network which is maintained and modified based on projects in the city and the region, including auto, transit and non-motorized modes. The operating assumptions that go into the model include tolls, parking costs, fuel prices, transit fares and the value of time.

The outputs from the BKRCast model can be used to estimate modeshare; approximate annual vehicle miles traveled; calculate intersection V/C ratios; determine corridor travel times; identify unique travel characteristics; and isolate trips based on household or person demographics.

It was noted the Transportation Commission had prepared a list of 48 questions for staff to respond to.

1: When was the last time a true bike count was done by the city to reflect how many bike trips were being taken?

Franz Loewenherz explained that Bellevue has made an investment in permanent counters on bike corridors and off-street paths. Currently there are 17 of the counters in place and the data is openly available on the city's webpage. The data from the counters is used as input for the modeling work.

2: Has the city done any year-round studies of bike ridership to see how it fluctuates with different seasons?

Franz Loewenherz said such studies have indeed been done, the results of which are also openly available on the city's webpage. The permanent bicycle counters automatically upload data to online data platforms, providing the city with an understanding of how bicycle counts fluctuate due to season construction activity, events and general infrastructure improvements.

3: What percentage of all travelers in Bellevue choose to ride a bike to work on a daily basis?

Franz Loewenherz said the American Community Survey shows bike share data segmented by those who live in Bellevue and those who work in Bellevue. For those who live in Bellevue, the bike modeshare is 0.7 percent, and for those who work in Bellevue but live anywhere, it is 0.5 percent.

4: What happened to the corridors/plans that were proposed in 2016 bike plan? Why are we not building on that plan?

Franz Loewenherz said the short answer is that Bike Bellevue includes corridors beyond those in the 2016 Bicycle Rapid Implementation Program in order to account for the Mobility Implementation Plan performance targets and the identified gaps. Bel-Red Road serves as a notable example. A significant amount of progress has been made to build out the projects in the Bicycle Rapid Implementation Program.

Commissioner Rebhuhn asked if the 2016 plan included any road diets, which seems to be one of the sticking points for the Bike Bellevue plan. Franz Loewenherz said the 2016 plan included a sparing recognition of the approach, though at the time it was not deemed something to consider. However, coming out of the Bicycle Rapid Implementation Program, Bellevue did implement the first repurposing of lanes on 108th Avenue NE in the Downtown. An extensive evaluation was done on the resulting data, which was shared with the Council, following which the Council's resounding message was to make it permanent. There are several additional prior-year examples of road diets throughout the city.

5: What major stakeholders in the Bellevue business community have you personally reached out to?

Franz Loewenherz noted that a number of formal presentations were made by staff to businesses and business organizations, including three to the Bellevue Chamber of Commerce, two to the Chamber's transportation committee, one to a committee focused on land use, and others, including the Bellevue Downtown Association. Some follow-up presentations are slated for February. Additionally, 27,230 mailers were sent to homes and businesses in the project area. Emails were sent to 74 businesses in order to reach some 52,000 employees through the CTR listserv, and to 4310 people on the city's transportation listserv. Posters were also put up in libraries, community centers, and other places.

6. How has the city notified Bellevue businesses and Bellevue residents specifically about the plan to take out six miles of vehicle lanes and turn them into bike lanes?

Franz Loewenherz said the draft Design Concepts Guide includes a reference on page 5 to an estimated 5.9 miles of motor vehicle travel lanes are earmarked to be repurposed for the project. The project webpage includes the same reference. Bike Bellevue has a standard strategy of communication that includes mailers, posters, flyers and social media posts, all of which direct the public to where they can find additional information.

7: Why are you looking at taking car lanes away from corridors that are parallel to each other?

Chris Breiland, consultant with Fehr & Peers shared a map of the Bike Bellevue project area as it relates to Performance Management Area 1, the denser part of the city, and said the corridors shown are from the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan master plan. The choice of which

corridors to include in Bike Bellevue was predicated on trying to implement as many of the corridors as feasible to serve the denser areas.

8: Why are you looking at taking car lanes away from Northup Way and NE 20th Street when the SR-520 trail runs right next to it?

Chris Breiland said the SR-520 trail facilitates long-distance travel. It is largely separated from local Bellevue streets, businesses and residences. Adding bike lanes along Northup Way will improve local connectivity.

9. What are the alternatives to building more bike infrastructure without taking away vehicle travel lanes?

Chris Breiland said the city's history of planning bike facilities goes back a number of years. The city works with developers to implement frontage improvements aimed at implementing the plans that are in place. The process takes time to implement, and the implementation is done in a disconnected fashion. The city also builds capital projects, which can take time to obtain the funding and work with adjacent landowners. The Council recognized the time it was taking to implement the bike plan and wanted to see things happen on a faster timeline. The rapid build techniques in Bike Bellevue are specifically designed to achieve that. The city also has plans to expand the behind-the-curb spaces, but that will take time.

10: What about Spring Blvd? That was built as a great roadway with bike lanes on the side. Why not focus on extending that on through as the principal east/west route?

Chris Breiland allowed that Bike Bellevue extends through the core of the BelRed area and includes bike corridors on Northup Way and Bel-Red Road, both of which are bike corridors in the bike plan, as is Spring Boulevard. The city has been working for many years to assemble the funding and partners needed to implement Spring Boulevard, and it is now finally coming into place. However, the middle section is still unfunded and bridging the funding gap will likely take many more years to accomplish. The Bike Bellevue project seeks to address the issue of having great facilities on either side of the gap that do not connect to anything by making sure there will be continuity.

Commissioner Ting asked if completing the middle section would make the corridor a candidate for being the primary Eastside corridor for the region. Chris Breiland said Spring Boulevard is one of the primary bike corridors identified in the Mobility Implementation Plan and the previous bike plan. Fully building it out will not take away from the fact that Bel-Red Road and Northup Way/NE 20th Street are also identified corridors. Commissioner Ting asked if it would be safer to have a single well-built and possibly separated corridor over having parallel corridors that are perhaps less safe. Chris Breiland said Spring Boulevard will be an LTS 1 facility, or close to it when complete, but in the time it takes to get that done there will be LTS 4 facilities basically everywhere in the BelRed area. Bike Bellevue aims to improve the level of traffic stress more quickly.

11: What about poor weather conditions in our area and the impact that has on the desire to ride a bike?

Chris Breiland agreed that Bellevue has seasonal bicycle riding patterns, and that is taken into account in the modeling. There are also different times of day when bikers are comfortable

riding. The fundamental piece trying to be addressed is that there is a consistent group of people who bike to access locations, and there is a need to provide safe and effective facilities to accommodate them. Just because there is heavy usage only part of the year does not mean the city should not provide the connectivity year round.

12: Is the staff considering maintenance in Bike Bellevue?

Franz Loewenherz said staff are indeed working with the maintenance team. Once there is clarity on the designs, the maintenance requirements will be known. At the conclusion of the process, there will be cost estimates for ongoing maintenance.

13: Is staff considering Fire Department operations in Bike Bellevue?

Franz Loewenherz said project staff members have met with Fire and will continue to coordinate with them as the Bike Bellevue concepts are refined. Staff will ensure the designs meet all applicable fire codes and address any concerns Fire may raise during the review.

14: Does it assume no Eastrail in both the Build and No Build scenarios? Is Eastrail in the TFP 2023 network?

Nick Bleich explained that the No Build future year model network is based on the 2033 TFP network, with the addition of a pedestrian Grand Connection between Eastrail and the Downtown Link Light Rail station. The 2033 TFP assumes Eastrail is completed between 118th Avenue SE and the northern city limit. The implementation horizon for the rest of Eastrail has been updated per the most recent King County parks data.

15: How did the BKRCast model computer modeshare in the Build vs. No Build models?

Nick Bleich said modeshare is calculated independently in both the Build and No Build models. The two models, while separate from each other, are derived from the same starting point, but the Build model includes the Bike Bellevue projects. The only differences between the two models are the 11 Bike Bellevue corridors. Modeshare is derived from the tours output from BKRCast.

Commissioner Ting asked for a brief explanation of how the model pops out modesplit and the key factors utilizing in doing so. Nick Bleich said at a high level the model develops daily profiles. One of the inputs in deciding what mode a person might choose to use is the input from the network. Time skins are the travel times on a corridor or specific route absent any congestion, and they are calculated for every analysis zones to every other analysis zone for all of the modes. That gives the model knowledge about what options are available. When the network is changed to add additional bike features, the travel time or attractiveness of a route may change. Time is a factor for the bike network, as is the type of facility; the more comfortable a facility, the higher the likelihood that people will use it. The LTS 1 facilities are deemed more attractive and are as such given an additional benefit. The model also takes into account grades and the volume of vehicles on the adjacent roadway. Additionally, the model takes into account the cost of gas and vehicle operation costs as factors.

16: Does the BKRCast model provide route/corridor data per mode?

Nick Bleich allowed that it does. The model provides routing information for 21 different vehicle classes or modes. It breaks the data down by vehicle or bike, toll or no toll, income levels, SOV vs HOV, and even truck size. The model also accounts for walk trips from origin to destination, but it does not route them on the network.

Vice Chair Helland asked how the model handles congestion. Nick Bleich said the model runs four iterations, with the first one empty. Using a set timeframe, it then spits out an initial set of trips assigned to the network based on the lowest cost from Point A to Point B. It then determines an equivalent congestion on each corridor based on the number of vehicles and the capacity of each corridor. The information is fed back into the model for the second iteration. The travel patterns may change depending on how congested the initial run was. The third iteration builds on the data from the first two, refining the routing in each.

17: Which alternative does the model assume from the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update 2023 DEIS?

Nick Bleich said for Bike Bellevue the initial model was based on the 2025-2033 Transportation Facilities Plan. That was the best available data at the time. The timelines for both projects have changed over the last few years and currently utilizing the Comprehensive Plan data and the land use being developed. Beginning early in 2024, the model will be updated to incorporate the preferred alternative land use scenario from the Comprehensive Plan with the horizon year of 2044.

Commissioner Ting voiced the understanding that the current data in the model continues to be valid, but will be supplanted by the 2044 data and land use distribution. Nick Bleich verified that. The Transportation Facilities Plan network and land use is based on the previous Comprehensive Plan's zoning distribution. The Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update effort that is currently under way takes a very different approach to land use distribution in the city so there may be some additional changes in travel behavior as additional density is developed in the BelRed, Downtown and Crossroads areas in the Comprehensive Plan network. The current 2035 data will be compared against the 2044 data to identify new development and land use patterns. The Comprehensive Plan looks at the full build out of land uses citywide, but in conjunction with community development a constrained land use forecast for 2044 is being developed.

Commissioner Ting asked if modeling had been done for any of the other alternatives in the DEIS. Nick Bleich said the same level of comprehensive analysis was performed for the base year No Action alternative, Alternative 1, Alternative 2, Alternative 3, and the preferred alternative. There is also modeling on each of the NE 6th Street extension alternatives.

18: Why are there no changes in the Project Area Bike Work Tours between Build and No Build?

Nick Bleich explained that the change between the two models happens to be zero. The only difference between the two networks are the Bike Bellevue projects themselves and land uses. The shifting land use patterns between 2019 and 2035 represent the bulk of the bike trip growth. Between the two projects there is a small but not insignificant growth in the additional usage of the corridor, possibly due to there not being a work tour in the project area.

Commissioner Ting asked if it was being stated that there are zero increases in work tours from

the Bike Bellevue projects. Nick Bleich explained that overall the model for the project area shows that between the Build and No Build scenarios there is a 7.5 percent increase in all-purpose bike tours. There is no change in work bike tours in the model, largely due to the land use distribution and the way work trips are determined in the model. The BKRCast model is built on existing travel surveys and does not take into account any large shifts in available bicycle infrastructure or bike types, such as e-bikes, or the densification of the area. Given that there are no land use changes between the two models, very similar trips can be anticipated to appear in the model to and from the area. Within the area, the model does prioritize the utilization of the corridors.

19: What are the separate walk vs. bike statistics? Separate this where “Active Transportation” or “Non-Motorized” are stated.

Chris Breiland said the question has to do with equity and enhancing equitable access in the Design Guide. The two were lumped together into a single Active Mode statistic in the report. Working with Nick Bleich and the modeling team was able to break out the original statement about people with lower incomes being more likely to use active modes. The data showed that people with lower incomes are 28 percent more likely to walk and 210 percent more likely to bike than people with higher incomes.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Rebhuhn, Chris Breiland allowed that the number of bike people in the survey was small so the percentage increases are very high. It was initially framed by saying that for active mode use, there is about a 30 percent increase by lower-income people in terms of overall usage of active modes.

20: Why did we select those particular equity indicators? Why not include low-income families?

Chris Breiland said the question references the appendix and the equity matrices specifically chosen as opposed to focusing on low-income families. The body of the Design Guide does focus on low-income families using input from the Transportation Commission in working through the Mobility Implementation Plan. The low-income areas within the city were highlighted and the statistics in terms of change of access were tracked. The additional five matrices shown in the appendix are based on best practices indicators for groups that have been historically underrepresented or underinvested in.

Chris Breiland clarified for Commissioner Ting that low-income populations are included. The primary equity metric used relates to change in access or use relative to low-income populations. The body of the document does not calculate the change in access for any of the other factors based on feedback from the Transportation Commission. Commissioner Ting suggested that from an equity perspective, low-income should be weighed heavily. Chris Breiland said because no index was created for any other composite measure, low-income can be considered to have been given all of the weight.

21: Add "Baseline + Eastrail" scenario to compare Build vs No Build scenarios. Why was this excluded? Are we assuming Eastrail is built out if and only if Bike Bellevue is built out?

Chris Breiland said a part of the report gets into measuring access, which is a calculation of how many places someone can get to in a given amount of time or cost, but primarily time.

Access is looked at from a number of measures, including jobs, community resources, schools, libraries and the like. The transportation system is all about providing access. The scenarios used were the baseline, which included the OSM-based network plus all existing segments of Eastrail; Bike Bellevue only; and Bike Bellevue plus Eastrail buildout. There was no comparison between the Build and No Build scenarios. The scenarios were intended to show the amount of access gained by linking Eastrail and Bike Bellevue without any intent to show one is dependent on the other.

Commissioner Ting stressed the need for a scenario comparing the baseline with the proposed Eastrail without Bike Bellevue in order to have a true apples-to-apples comparison.

22: Job accessibility is increased, but how do we calculate actual usage? Can people afford housing 20 minutes bike distance to their work?

Chris Breiland said the report was focused on increases in access, which is a measure of the ability for the transportation network to connect origins and destinations. The estimated actual usage was calculated using BKRCast and the ICLEI methodology and is presented in other parts of the document. With regard to the question of whether or not people can afford housing within a 20-minute bike commute from work, the methodology focused on low-income residents and their accessibility to jobs and other destinations. There is no speculation about whether or not people can afford housing within the access sheds in any of the analyses.

Commissioner Ting asked how the data should be considered given that no significant change in work tours is anticipated. Chris Breiland said that is one datapoint from the BKRCast model; it is not necessarily the only way to consider changes in people's behavior in association with Bike Bellevue.

23: Why is 200 percent of federal poverty line used here (vs. 100 percent of federal poverty line)? Separate walking and biking stats (they are often stated together).

Chris Breiland said the threshold for defining low-income families in the Alta Accessibility Report is 200 percent of the federal poverty line. The work got moving a little earlier and did not get synched with data used elsewhere, which did use the 100 percent of federal poverty line threshold. Many Washington state income assistance programs use the 200 percent threshold in conducting poverty analyses. The two datapoints actually tell a similar story and would not look much different if mapped side by side.

Commissioner Ting asked if the study separates out walking versus biking. Chris Breiland said only bike access was looked at.

24: What percentage of buildings provide secure parking, repair, rentals and property changing facilities (Level A)?

Chris Breiland said the question gets into the ICLEI model, a tool used by Community Development as part of the city's work on sustainability. It is focused on greenhouse gases emissions inventories for all things in the city. It has a transportation component that is used in conjunction with the BKRCast model. The model defines three archetype land uses that should be considered when applying the model. Level A is the typical Downtown situation that has some bicycle facilities and some amenities in buildings, including changing rooms, showers and lockers. At the other end, Level C is a very bicycle-rich environment. There is no

percentage number, it is just a context of the model.

Commissioner Ting asked how it is known that Bellevue is at Level A as opposed to no amenities. Chris Breiland explained that the application of the model is from the idea that Bike Bellevue is intended to move from a no amenities condition to something that has more amenities. The key difference between Level A and no amenities is actually the bicycle network itself.

Commissioner Ting noted that the definition actually calls out amenities such as secure parking, repair, rentals and proper changing facilities and asked how much of that is actually available in the project area. Chris Breiland said the question is whether or not there is a place to park a bike, shower or change. Community Development may have data with regard to how many buildings have such amenities as required by their permit conditions. Anecdotally, bicycle facilities are not uncommon in Downtown Bellevue or in newer developments proposed for BelRed and Wilburton. Commissioner Ting said it would be good to see the data as part of understanding that the city is actually at Level A currently.

Commissioner Brown asked how many of the new buildings provide at least Level A amenities. Nick Bleich said all of them do as a condition of approval. Commissioner Brown commented that having facilities available are key to people making the choice to ride a bike to work, thus the assumption that there will be a zero uptick in bike commuters does not seem to jive. Nick Bleich explained that the BKRCast model is built around today's conditions and projected changes in land use and transportation networks in the future. The survey off of which the data is built was collected in 2018, and it is currently being updated. The model itself uses the information about a person's likelihood to use a certain mode based on location, neighborhood density, income level, job type, educational attainment and availability of vehicles to project into the future what mode they might want to use. The model itself does not take into account any of the fundamental changes in amenities until an updated travel survey is conducted, which is done every three years or so.

Chris Breiland said the BKRCast model is relatively insensitive to changes in bike infrastructure one modeshare. The ICLEI tool is based on a review of national studies that look at the phenomenon of rising modeshare as bicycle facilities are built out, something the traditional travel models have a hard time picking up. Research has shown that as cities like New York and San Francisco have implemented their bicycle infrastructure, they have seen about a doubling of bike modeshare. Portland has seen about a tenfold increase in bike modeshare as their system has been implemented. The ICLEI tool was used to acknowledge the fact that BKRCast is not as sensitive as some of the research would indicate.

Chair Stash asked if Portland took away travel lanes as part of building their bike infrastructure. Chris Breiland said Portland is an older city that is largely built out, making it hard to move things like curbs, and as such many of their retrofits were accomplished via the repurposing of lanes and streets. They have also built substantial new infrastructure at the same time. Bellevue's approach is similar to the approach Portland has used over the years.

Franz Loewenherz noted the need to end the meeting in order to allow for a 30-minute break before the regular meeting of the Transportation Commission begins.

Commissioner Rebhuhn asked if it would be possible to address the remaining questions as part of the Commission's regular meeting. Franz Loewenherz stressed that there is a

programmed agenda memo for the regular meeting. If there is a desire to pivot away from that, the Commission would have to vote to do so.

Chair Stash said one major element of the Commission's regular meeting is to hear from the public. The intent is to allow adequate time for everyone to speak. The suggestion made was to move ahead with the normal Commission meeting and seek to schedule an additional special meeting to address the rest of the questions.

4. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:04 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date