

TRANSPORTATION POLICY MOVES QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE

Planning Commission | April 10, 2024

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1471700	Do not eliminate any auto lanes for any reason under any condition.Bike lanes are almost always empty and are very large expense for a very, extremely very small number of users		
1471779	Updates to policies related to pedestrian and bicycle projects to include other forms of transportation like wheelchairs, strollers, scooters, etc. Update to policy to focus on addressing gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian network identified in the Mobility Implementation Plan.	Not enough bike infrastructure studies how other cities change curb designs to slow down cars and protect pedestrians	Biking in Bellevue is a really dangerous affair. Efforts to improve it is greatly appreciated
1472254		We should not allow like e-scooter or e-bike options. They drive litter and trash. These vehicles end up getting abandoned all over the city	
1472407		To maintain the main road to be drivable without obvious risky conditions. On 2023-12-23, I drove my sedan and hit a deep hole right in the middle of the crossing of main street and 116 AVE NE. Immediately my car had flat tire. I have dashcam recording of the happening. Thank the worker that the deep hole has been fixed around 2024-01-10, which is good, so it doesn't impact others. I just hope it could have been fixed earlier or marked obviously so I could have avoid it in the first place.	To maintain the main road to be drivable without obvious risky conditions. We can have the parking enforcement office to watch the road conditions while they are driving on the roads all the times. Or collaborate with USPS delivery team to watch roads as well.

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1472443		<p>To maintain the main road to be drivable without obvious risky conditions. On 2023-12-23, I drove my sedan and hit a deep hole right in the middle of the crossing of main street and 116 AVE NE. Immediately my car had flat tire. I have dashcam recording of the happening.</p> <p>Thank the worker that the deep hole has been fixed around 2024-01-10, which is good, so it doesn't impact others.</p> <p>I just hope it could have been fixed earlier or marked obviously so I could have avoid it in the first place.</p> <p>my email is muzheng@hotmail.com, in case you want to reach me</p>	<p>To maintain the main road to be drivable without obvious risky conditions. We can have the parking enforcement office to watch the road conditions while they are driving on the roads all the times. Or collaborate with USPS delivery team to watch roads as well.</p>
1472483	<p>Including include safety considerations to include bicycle facilities like lockers, bike racks, etc near transit stations would be very helpful to encourage people locally and from other areas to visit Bellevue. Also, making sure there is opportunity for wheelchairs, strollers is helpful too, considering the aging population.</p>	<p>What is missing, is to make sure there are enough areas where vehicles could stop safely to drop off people and trucks could pull in to make deliveries without impacting ongoing vehicular traffic.</p>	<p>accessibility for ALL</p>
1472566	<p>Alternative transportation sounds good. Can you focus on self driving vehicles</p>	<p>Car traffic needs to be addressed. Everywhere new bigger apartment buildings go up but nothing is done to improve car traffic and flow, Example spring street district. Nice neighborhood but no parking I believe there are way to many cars moving and parking</p>	<p>Include new technology like shelf driving cars or busses Get the traffic moving on the interstates and neighborhoods.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1473416	I am wary of all of them. I have found that the transportation department is sneaking and deceptive.	<p>I believe the entire Mobility Implementation Plan that Vision Zero plan implementation need to be redone.</p> <p>RE DO the entire plan for this section of the 2044 plan!</p> <p>Much of the planning for the bicycle use was done in 2018. Things have changed. More people are working from home, we are getting light rail, and have electric busses. We need new, solid research on the safety of protected bike lanes, and what the future is likely to hold.</p> <p>There is no serious discussion about extending transit to underserved areas. You can't get off of Somerset easily if walking is a hardship. There are no busses.</p> <p>There is no serious discussion about making transit easier and more weather friendly, eg, covered bus shelters.</p> <p>And since there are no busses in areas like Bridle Trails and Somerset, you want all the density in neighborhoods that are already dense because there is transit. UNFAIR!!! ADD TRANSIT to other areas like the little downtown bus!!</p> <p>There is no mention of coordinated traffic signal and improving safety for left hand turns, and making driving safer for those who cannot take transit or bike.</p>	<p>Reconsider assumptions and re-do the plans. RE DO THIS SECTION OF THE PLAN WITH NEW, STATICALLY VALID DATA ABOUT WHAT TRAFFIC IS LIKELY TO BE GIVEN THE DEMOGRAPHIC IMPACT OF THE PANDEMIC.</p> <p>Stop all activity until we can get more Bellevue residents involved, better data and a statistically valid resident survey. Base decisions on actual safety data and statistically valid residents' responses, not outsiders.</p> <p>I strongly support a good, multi-transit approach to getting around. However, the Planning Commissioners and other boards will see many of my comments are influenced by the profoundly negative effects of the proposal that the transportation planning staff unveiled about protected bicycle lanes.</p> <p>Planning Commissioners need to understand what is presented to the public.</p> <p>For example, residents need to know EXACTLY what these policies mean. Example, if you close lanes, how bikers would use the roads by hour of the day and route. What the actual cost for improved bike access per bike ride?</p> <p>Please schedule public meetings with pictures and maps, like the Planning Department did for the Wilburton plan.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1474536	Enhancing existing trails like Mountains to Sound and the BN Corridor make sense.	li see nothing that indicates we are planning for the significant increase in automobile traffic that will be generated by the planned residential and commercial development. We need to plan for additional lane mines (South Bellevue Way, for examle).	I believe there is too much emphasis being placed on dedicated bicycle lanes, especially in the CBD and Bel-Red areas. Turning auto lanes that citizens have paid for into bike lanes is a travesty. Planning for more of same makes no sense to me.
1475761	Transit, major trails, environment. Seem to be the most important to me.	no	
1476145	transit. increase bus and trains	too many cars	traffic is too loud
1476144	Transit and pedestrian policy moves sound good, because those have been neglected or under resourced for far too long.	Sidewalk improvements are barely noted in the statements above (just one?), but they are a crucial element in pedestrian considerations.	Please consider adopting a sidewalk building policy, even on just one side of the street, especially along busy road stretches that have none (Newport Way to Lakemont, 150th to Summerset, Farmer Road to Saddleback Park, Allen Road, etc.)
1476558	Designing transit security	Cameras	Traffic impact around parking

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1485759	Electric vehicle/ in 20 years, this will be critical to be able to support.	Transit options in Lakemont. Also more transit for high schoolers to build the habit and to help support access to after school jobs and activities	
1485789	Improve walkability. Walking and biking is the best way to reduce traffic and improve quality of life		
1485798	None of them	Car mobility	Quit pushing bike crap and transit
1486346	Bicycle trails are important for commuting and safe exercise. Free Level 2 EV charging around the city would be helpful for those that do not have EV charging at home.		
1486465			

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1486606	Increasing transit options and availability is great. It is far too difficult to get the last mile from transit in Bellevue often.	Yes, link policy to reducing traffic congestion through transit alternatives. Having bus routes available does not help if they are stuck in traffic as well.	The unsustainable growth Bellevue has experienced has increased traffic to unacceptable levels regularly and has decreased quality of life for residents.
1487359	<p>NONE. Vision zero should be repealed. It's just an excuse to make driving less convenient by falsely claiming that more safety projects are needed. How about this? if you don't want to be hit by a car, don't walk in the road.</p> <p>No more bike infrastructure. There are not enough cyclists to justify spending money on this.</p> <p>High capacity transit? to where? this is foolish.</p> <p>Transit doesn't go where people need/want to go.</p> <p>Total waste of resources.</p> <p>NO EBIKES OR SCOOTERS!</p>	preserving automobility for personal vehicles. Restricting growth within Bellevue. We are full. Density is ruining Bellevue and degrading quality of life there.	what steps have you taken to lobby the legislature to repeal the growth management act? Why are you pursuing the same failed policies as Seattle. do I have to move away from Bellevue like I moved away from Seattle to get away from this crap?
1487698	I am happy about provisions to improve conditions for pedestrians. I walk Bellevue much more than the average resident - I walk almost everywhere and rarely drive. But many parts of Bellevue, relatively close to the downtown core, are unsafe for pedestrians (e.g. 108th Ave NE north of NE 20th as no sidewalks)	I'd like more philosophical clarity on where bikes and e-scooters etc. are supposed to operate. Will they continue to be allowed on sidewalks and streets as they currently are, or within areas where protected "bike" lanes are available are they restricted to them. Bicyclists and small e-transport on sidewalks presents a hazard to pedestrians which isn't currently addressed and it seems like cyclists are given carte blanche when it comes to traffic enforcement. As a result, I am not supportive of efforts to encourage more cyclists because I find them a nuisance	I'd like more philosophical clarity on where bikes and e-scooters etc. are supposed to operate. Will they continue to be allowed on sidewalks and streets as they currently are, or within areas where protected "bike" lanes are available are they restricted to them. Bicyclists and small e-transport on sidewalks presents a hazard to pedestrians which isn't currently addressed and it seems like cyclists are given carte blanche when it comes to traffic enforcement. As a result, I am not supportive of efforts to encourage more cyclists because I find them a nuisance

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1487869	Major trails (I walk all over Bellevue, on both trails and sidewalks and road shoulders). Other pedestrian stuff.	Expand Bellhop-type options.	
1488018		Bikes should not be mixed with high traffic areas or streets. Also bikes must stop at intersections just as cars and pedestrian s do.. Do not allow higher bike speeds than the cars. Visiblityy at night for bikes is a huge safety issue.	Cars need parking that is easy to find and allows non tenants sufficient spaces to use multi use commercial spaces. The new buildings on main for example don't do this.
1488133	I think vision zero updates and updates to bicycle networks are really important. Bellevue has extensive infrastructure dedicated to cars and so few options to get around otherwise. Wide roads mean people speed constantly, so the lack of safe routes for those walking or biking is felt even more acutely.	I think a policy idea to reduce road capacity for personal vehicles is crucial. Bellevue’s roads are ENORMOUS, and the sheer number of lanes just encourages people to drive. Street space needs to be reallocated for other more efficient uses (bus lanes, bike lanes, parklets, dining, etcétera).	That Bellevue can never be more car friendly than it is now, and going forward, as vehicles get more and more expensive and traffic deaths continue to climb, we have to not only commit to focusing efforts on other modes, but actually push to deprioritize personal vehicles on our roads.
1488163	Environment - it’s of critical concern that we’re addressing climate change		
1489067			We do not need any more bike lanes in downtown Bellevue, in fact, we should eliminate some of the ones we have that are rarely used. We have more residents & they drive cars not bikes, so we need to keep all roads we have to keep traffic moving. As much as the environmentalists would like us to ride bicycles, in will never happen with the wet climate we have here.

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1489272	The bicyclist, pedestrian move. with a caveat. A lot of what we are missing is infrastructure.it would be amazing to have more people able to access Bellevue in any way they wish.	Where do I start- Paint is not infrastructure. As a bicycle commuter- I have been in danger many times while in the bike lanes. The fact is that cars do not care and will cut over painted lines when it suits them. on top of this- when bike lanes switch positions in the road such as cut across to allow cars right turn lanes- that actively discourages people who are trying out the lanes. Without a wall- bicyclists will always be an afterthought to drivers and all of Bellevue. The next thing is that while we do have good lanes- Bellevue has forgotten probably a more important aspect- PARKING. It's all well and good for recreational riders- though for the person who just spent over a thousand on a bike shop quality bike at Gregg's- it's downright nerve wracking to not have secure bike lockers.	Please- create actual infrastructure! We are on the right path! But we can't see more green outcomes if we aren't willing to build the infrastructure to support them.
1490109	Transit	Owners of Electric bikes and scooters should be required to license their vehicles and speed limits should be posted for them. Bike lanes should be separate from pedestrian walkways, especially where motorized bikes and scooters are heavily used. Parks such as Bellevue Downtown park which are primarily for pedestrians should have "Please Walk your Bike" signs. I have often observed people riding bikes at high speed or doing stunts in Bellevue downtown park when there are many pedestrians of all abilities walking there. (Children ages 3 and under with families should be exempt from these rules and allowed to use small bikes and scooters at slow speed.)	

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1490125	Moving transit to electric. Vision zero	Mandate all apartment complexes to have electric charging stations. Even the old ones. This would encourage moving to greener fueled cars	
1490251	I like all these policy options. I would really like to be able to get around Bellevue safely and comfortably with more than just my car and I support policy that reflects that. I especially like the policy that enables more Mountains to Sound Greenway integration as I currently bike on that path a lot.	I'd like to see more policy that specifically promoted safe and comfortable bike infrastructure, particularly protected bike lanes, as I still see lots of unprotected lanes being built in Bellevue.	Please don't be afraid to make radical decisions! The best time to make Bellevue better and safer is today.
1490277	It sounds great that the city is moving towards more Multi model mobility. It's great that the city is focusing on Transit hubs as a utility.	The city could focus on amenities near transit hubs such as luggage lockers. As well as making downtown areas along arterial roads friendlier to pedestrians.	Building wide long streets and roads with lanes that are built to highway code is a recipe for speeding vehicles and unsafe pedestrian environments. When trying to build the city to be more walkable and multi model, It is essential to right scale the transit infrastructure for car traffic. Not every road has to be an arterial, Not every Stripmall needs hundreds of parking spaces. It is frankly very strange that we talk about high cost of land and housing when there's still surface parking lots in downtown Bellevue.
1490293	Transit station that are safe Better and safer pedestrian and bike passage will all be very useful to encourage safe alternative transportation methods	Frequent street cars and trams to better connect downtown, wilburton and spring district. Right now going from main street area of downtown to the northern boundary of downtown is 30 min walk. Wilburton and spring district is even further. The light rail station is located far enough such that public transit and walking options will take 30 minutes, which is too long and inconvenient compared to driving. Adding frequent street car and tram network within downtown area will greatly improve mobility.	

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
		Bellhop was quite convenient in serving this gap but during busy hours it is too unreliable compared to what an actual street car can deliver.	
1490484		Please consider more labor intensive jobs like street maintainence, for example , in the neighborhoods especially where there are no sidewalks and people have to walk in the street. Plant maintaince and weeding of islands placed in streets of neighborhoods. They are currently neglected and sweepers cannot adequately do the job of cleaning around the islands.	Safety... currently there is a Metro bus stop on 156th Ave and 5th NE placed next to ditch which is hazardous to people waiting to catch a ride. There is andolutely NO protection from oncoming traffic. There may be many such areas with similar disregards for safety.
1490550	I like the update to policy on designing transit stations to include considerations of security, maintenance, and general operation. Our transit hubs should have bathrooms, shops, and restaurants in them, like how they are in Tokyo. I would love to run a small chain of convenience stores located in our light rail stations that sold exclusive transit merch, drinks, and snacks.	There's always something, isn't there? I think you all are doing great though :) But do take a look at the transit stations in Toyko (google image search works) and see the different kinds of shops they have in those. It would be very unique to Washington and I think people would love it.	Thanks for all the hard work. You are making Bellevue a nicer place to live and work.
1490622	I resinate with any policy moves that focus on other than 'single-occupancy-car' movers. I grant there are reasons for single-occupancy car movement--I don't have a problem with that!! But when one gets out and walks to services or to transit, one becomes keenly aware of where the pleasant experiences are and where the unpleasant or unsafe experiences are.	I hope to see all local vehicle thoroughfares with at least one sidewalk!	Probably everyone on the various commissions needs to move out (on foot and on small-wheels) into the neighborhoods where they live (preferably covering all the neighborhoods of Bellevue) and experiencing the positive issues and the places/issues where improving the movers' experience are wanted. I appreciate all moves toward finishing the 3 major pedestrian/wheeler thoroughfares!

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1490703	Bike shares, more emphasis on safety. Making it possible for more people to bike makes everyone safer: drivers will expect to see bike riders, they may slow down, etc.	Better signal timing for pedestrians and bike riders on the big sidewalk paths. Bellevue is horrible to walk in because beg buttons take so long to respond. It's especially horrible on the borders of downtown, crossing Main or NE 12th, where east-west car traffic gets priority over "neighborhood" traffic heading north or south.	No one on the Transportation Commission bikes for utility (as opposed to recreation.) Very few people in our city government actually walk or bike around the city (kudos to the mayor!) Most of our transportation staff live outside the city. There is no real representation for pedestrians and bike riders in Bellevue.
1490900	All of them sound right to me. I want to get out of my car as much as possible, want to feel safe on my bike, and want to be able to get around the area on foot & bike. Even if we all drive electric vehicles, we'll still be too congested if we don't get out of our cars.	Can the city actively discourage folks from driving: influence employers to provide orca passes? make fewer parking spaces in multi-family buildings - maybe one per unit? make Main St. a walking street!!!	I am retired and happy to live in Bellevue, and I expect my city leaders to help me make the changes away from the car culture I've been part io my whole life.
1491054	Increasing the use of electric vehicles in transit and any except those promoting "walking, biking, and rolling options" since despite wanting other people to use them that is not the reality of life on the Eastside.	Improvements for parking at light rail and in downtown Bellevue	
1491404	All		
1491492	Bike lanes are crucial. Please make them protected and not just painted lines.	Street cars. It is embarrassing that the city is not looking into this. All civilized cities outside of the US have these.	Stop investing in electric cars. Public transit and walkable neighborhoods are much more important and will reduce carbon. More cars are not the answer

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1491967	We need bike lanes and safe alternative commuting options. We need more charging stations for electric cars. Bike and walking trails are always a plus. Making it easy to use clean energy and transit should be a priority.		
1492256	Bicycle, Pedestrian, and other Mobility Options, Transit and Environment. In order to substantially reduce our GHG emissions, it is imperative that better biking roadways are added and transit is improved with better scheduling and bus stops. Right now it's very difficult to get from point A to B without the bus taking 2-3 times as long as by car. Unless that improves, people will opt to drive.	See #4.	See #4
1494212	Development and integration of Eastrail, the Mountain to Sound Greenway, and Grand Connection into the City's transportation network are key. As they currently exist, these facilities are, with few exceptions, essentially stand-alone routes that take folks through Bellevue but do not offer access for destinations throughout Bellevue. They, along with the I-90 trail and the 520 trail, should serve as the spine for a larger, non-car network of protected transportation facilities throughout the city.	<p>Integration of the I-90 trail into Bellevue's transportation system is incomplete at best. The most obvious "connection" to downtown along 108th is sketchy, with dedicated bike facilities being inconsistent, not uniform, and unprotected until you get to Downtown. Where bike facilities do exist, they are often blocked by garbage cans or they run you right into curb bulbs. The crossing at Bellevue Way is also sketchy and I have nearly been hit by turning cars at that intersection numerous times.</p> <p>Similarly, the 520 trail should be improved and more closely integrated into Bellevue's transportation system.</p> <p>The bicycle facilities along 114th should also be completed and hardened. Yes, Eastrail will eventually exist, but full completion of the trail is years away as is completion of the grand connection into downtown.</p>	It sucks to be anything other than a car driver in Bellevue. Full stop. Every single transportation facility is geared toward making it as easy as possible to drive a car to your destination. As a pedestrian, I find myself waiting through full light cycles to cross a street, while cars seemingly spend less time waiting. The beg buttons to trigger a crossing are also almost always weirdly placed, requiring me to lean out into the road to press them or to otherwise have to look to weird places to hit the button (e.g., to cross 405 on 4th, on one of the crossings of the on-ramps, a pedestrian literally needs to step off the sidewalk onto the shoulder of the on-ramp to hit the button). As a cyclist, I am almost hit daily by turning cars or while attempting to cross streets. Please, for the sake of vision zero and for global warming, make it safer to be a non-car user in the city!

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
		In the short term, improving the non-car transportation experience along 114th is one of the seemingly most accessible ways to provide a safe non-car route into Downtown.	
1498247	General: safety issues Transit	I would be happy to take transit but it is very difficult if I cannot drive and park to a transit center.	Whether walking, waiting for transit, riding on transit: Safety is #1: efficiency is #2
1498279	Major trails new policy to on Mountains to Sound Greenway. When we purchased our home in Eastgate the city had plans to run the trail along the southside of I-90. It appears this vision has stalled. It's a much needed area for safe walking trails.		Please focus efforts outside of the Grand Connection. There are already sidewalks and bike lanes downtown. We need safer methods of transportation in the neighborhoods.
1498452	Discouraging car use is great.	Eliminate zoning rules and parking requirements that make it hard to create stores, eating establishments and home businesses in residential neighborhoods. America's stupid zoning rules force people to drive to stores and other amenities.	
1498450			Bellevue is a sprawling city that was built for the car. It will continue to be so. We need to remember that from the first nobody claimed that Sound Transit would take any cars off the road. In my opinion it would be bad policy to remove car lanes and replace with wheelchair lanes or any other lanes. Mixing vehicles with other "pedestrian" types of traffic is dangerous and reduces our ability's to get around.

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1498575	all good	<p>Implementation-wise, try to integrate transit options in south bellevue like in Somerset and Cougar Mountain and Newport areas where there are more options for connectivity other than cars.</p> <p>Transit seems so downtown focused with even BellHop pilot being implemented. Would be great to think innovatively on expanding upon model of connecting more to transit systems so ridership will be higher and more accessible.</p>	Need for interconnectedness throughout the entire city and all neighborhoods not just downtown core. Investments and focus on safety of transit prior to Lite Rail connecting to Seattle -- Think BART in Bay Area or other transit in major cities.
1498836			
1499019	development of trails because these open spaces may otherwise be subject to other development		
1499282		Better access to public transportation in neighborhoods. For example connection from neighborhoods to South Bellevue Transit station or East Gate P&R.	
1499389	<p>These policies are good. Please prioritize safe walking, safe bike trails for regular people (not just cyclists), and active transit.</p> <p>Prioritize means that funds and efforts should be</p>	Bellevue should be very wary or building new roads or widening roads. The existing road network should be evaluated to see how it can be repurposed to improve safety, greenery, and active and public transport. This has been very successful	<p>Please make our city a leader in active and public transportation. These options are more efficient, cleaner, and more affordable for society.</p> <p>Please ensure that cost models include long-term</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	redirected to accelerate active and public transit, rather than other forms of transportation.	<p>internationally, and also improves road safety because people don't speed as much on narrower roads.</p> <p>Walking and biking trails should be designed to be useful for ordinary residents, not just recreational or suited to cyclists who are willing to take significant risks with cars. That means walking and biking infrastructure must connect communities with places to work, shop, learn, and play.</p> <p>Bike trails that are just paint on a road are not safe from cars. There is considerable evidence that true safety from cars is needed before most people in the US will be willing to bike as a form of transit. Bellevue has a lot of work to do in this area, but fortunately there is an increasing number of international cities that have proven how to do this work effectively.</p>	maintenance and social impacts (positive impacts for health; negative impacts from pollution including greenhouse gases), as well as the burden on residents to participate (e.g., to participate in a road, a resident needs a costly car). This is particularly important for all investments in roads where there are many hidden costs.
1499670	Almost none of it. It's not enough.	You need to stop any focus on cars. We need to focus completely on transit, bike, and pedestrian infrastructure to support our growing population.	If you add more car lanes or roads, mandate parking anywhere, or aren't making bus lanes and bike lanes priority, you're messing the whole thing up.
1500028	Overall most of these policies resonate with me and provide a good foundation to put Bellevue on for the future.	I would really like to see some points specifically for reducing VMT/CO2 and some focus on creating vibrant third places that are free from cars.	While these updates to policies certainly address important aspects of transportation, it is imperative that we recognize that they might not enough to effectively reduce car usage and keep Bellevue on track to be a leader climate change. More decisive and comprehensive actions are required to combat the growing dependency on cars and prioritize sustainable modes of transportation. Choice is good, but the transit network needs to get robust enough to

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
			<p>be the preferred choice for the most common trips in/around the city.</p> <p>Additionally, promoting car-free third places not only fosters community cohesion and social interaction but also contributes to a sustainable and environmentally friendly lifestyle. By removing the barrier of private vehicles, these spaces become safer, more inclusive, and inviting to all members of the community. Bellevue can unlock the potential car-free third places that will have positive economic impacts, benefiting local businesses and the overall economy.</p>
1500101	The moves that help connect the transit options with trails and bicycling infrastructure make a lot of sense. For the transportation network to be truly multimodal, people need to be able to switch between modes inside a trip, extending the effective range of their mode of transport.	I think it is missing consideration for short term car rentals filling the gaps in the current multimodal system. Many people could save a lot of money getting rid of their car that they only occasionally need. Instead, if there was an affordable and reliable service to use a car for those necessary trips, then they would not need to continue to own a car, and their frequent trips will be done via another mode.	People will generally choose to use a car if they have one, so the primary users of these multimodal transportation avenues are those who feel confident that they can go about their lives without owning one. There needs to be a plan to accommodate common trip types that are highly preferential towards cars, such as groceries/shopping and trips from residential areas. If major needs are met by cycling, transit, etc. then, for example, a young person may not choose to purchase their first car.
1500236	More public transport. Increase walkability in general. I want to live in downtown, park my car for a week or two and dont feel the need to use it. Aim for a higher degree of car free living.	More public transport. Increase walkability in general. I want to live in downtown, park my car for a week or two and dont feel the need to use it. Aim for a higher degree of car free living.	

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1501801	Greater investment in bicycle lanes and safety for bicyclists and pedestrians as well as more bus options. Also, having bus stops covered and protected from the elements.		
1501779		I disagree with policies that allow for repurposing of travel lanes on the basis of excess capacity (how is that measured? This is unclear), and/or optimizing person throughput (how is that measured if you remove infrastructure that carries a high number of people to replace it with infrastructure projected to carry a fraction of that level of throughput? This is not optimization). Also missing is a link in this survey to the actual policy changes being proposed by staff, and a question not just about which policy moves "sound good," but also policies that "sound bad and should be removed".	Please do not allow removal of arterial road lanes to add bike lanes or other infrastructure that would not increase and therefore optimize throughput during the peak period. Please consider that density zoning requires supportive capacity improvements to accommodate projected growth and travel demand. It is not rational to ignore the City's own mode share projections, proposing transportation mitigation measures that rely on significant mode shift that the City says will not occur. Please urge staff to consider a reasonable, balanced approach that truly supports all modes and enhances capacity (rather than saying it should be a last resort) in order to reduce traffic congestion so that drivers, freight, micromobility services, transit, and emergency responders can reliably get around the City.
1503006	The increased focus on pedestrian and bicycle transportation makes me very happy as someone who prefers those modes of transit, as I hope we can reduce the need for motor vehicles with a walkability increase.	I hope we can reduce traffic by encouraging public transit as much as possible.	I understand it is difficult to prioritize all of the different facets of transportation planning. My main goal would be to reduce the dependency on motor vehicles as much as possible.

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1504032	Mountains to sound greenway is not applicable. A question of scale.	Recognize there may be practical limits to our growth!	Importance of our history and legacy.
1506203	More bike and high capacity transit.		Focusing on electric vehicles is a distraction from adding more transit and bike infrastructure.
1507868		<p>Old TR-2, can we change reduce to manage - congestion is a natural part of a growing city, and old policy language around managing it was appropriate. Old TR-90 should be kept - shouldn't we be looking to best practices around the country and world as we work on the ST3 alignment?</p> <p>New TR-84 should remove "neighborhood groups" and replace with residents like in other policies. Catering specifically to neighborhood groups entrenches existing power structures, and policy language can be made more consistent.</p> <p>New TR-87 should remove the "while retaining capacity for other modes". Other policies have intentionally removed language that's been deemed too prescriptive or limiting. In a growing city, sometimes reallocating existing capacity to more efficient transportation modes is the right choice for improved mobility for the whole system. With language as is, this removes this from any consideration.</p> <p>New TR-135 should remove reference to</p>	Need people with lived experience biking, walking, and taking transit in Bellevue -- including people who cannot drive --making these decisions. It does not always seem like people on the Planning and Transportation Commissions share these experiences firsthand, and that's not equitable.

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
		<p>"neighborhoods" since it already says "affected residents"</p> <p>New TR-139 should talk about reducing speeds along arterials as well - Speed management plan doesn't talk about just reducing speeds on residential streets, and as is this policy could be limiting.</p> <p>New TR-57 "Strive to" should be removed, and policy language should be strong. Vision Zero is a promise that city leaders have committed itself too. Policies around GHG emission reductions (like new EN-6) do not use "strive to" language, why should transportation policies.</p> <p>New TR-79 is too prescriptive and should be removed.</p> <p>New TR-96, what "current standards and guidelines" are being referenced here, ones from the City of Bellevue that are available in a separate document? If so, that needs to be referenced here. Otherwise, language should be included that specifically says best practices for the safety of vulnerable road users.</p> <p>There should be explicit Comp Plan language that prioritizes walking, biking, and transit mobility over that of automobile mobility, given that automobiles are already able to get wherever they need to go throughout the city but those on other modes often face significant barriers in arriving where they need to go.</p> <p>Policy language should be added that mandates the design and construction of bicycle facilities in accordance with a street's LTS targets whenever a street is repaved.</p>	

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1507893	these are all very vague. Vision Zero is good. Updates to policies related to pedestrian and bicycle projects to include other forms of transportation like wheelchairs, strollers, scooters, etc. is good	Address vehicle use. Busses are not addressed Road size is too dangerous for walkers and currently not built well.	These guys should be made to walk around the city they plan. I cannot afford a SUV and need to walk. Walking here sucks.
1507885	Old TR-2, can we change reduce to manage - congestion is a natural part of a growing city, and old policy language around managing it was appropriate. Old TR-90 should be kept - shouldn't we be looking to best practices around the country and world as we work on the ST3 alignment? New TR-84 should remove "neighborhood groups" and replace with residents like in other policies. Catering specifically to neighborhood groups entrenches existing power structures, and policy language can be made more consistent. New TR-87 should remove the "while retaining capacity for other modes". Other policies have intentionally removed language that's been deemed too prescriptive or limiting. In a growing city, sometimes reallocating existing capacity to more efficient transportation modes is the right choice for improved mobility for the whole system. With language as is, this removes this from any consideration. New TR-135 should remove reference to "neighborhoods" since it already says "affected residents" New TR-139 should talk about reducing speeds along arterials as well - Speed management plan doesn't talk about just reducing speeds on residential streets, and as is this policy could be limiting.	We need people with lived experience biking, walking, and taking transit in Bellevue -- including people who cannot drive --making these decisions. It does not always seem like people on the Planning and Transportation Commissions share these experiences firsthand, and that's not equitable.	

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	<p>New TR-57 "Strive to" should be removed, and policy language should be strong. Vision Zero is a promise that city leaders have committed itself too. Policies around GHG emission reductions (like new EN-6) do not use "strive to" language, why should transportation policies.</p> <p>New TR-79 is too prescriptive and should be removed.</p> <p>New TR-96, what "current standards and guidelines" are being referenced here, ones from the City of Bellevue that are available in a separate document? If so, that needs to be referenced here. Otherwise, language should be included that specifically says best practices for the safety of vulnerable road users. There should be explicit Comp Plan language that prioritizes walking, biking, and transit mobility over that of automobile mobility, given that automobiles are already able to get wherever they need to go throughout the city but those on other modes often face significant barriers in arriving where they need to go.</p> <p>Policy language should be added that mandates the design and construction of bicycle facilities in accordance with a street's LTS targets whenever a street is repaved.</p>		
1508335			<p>Transportation Element policies</p> <p>TR-1 Isn't the 'and' after 'planning' extraneous?</p> <p>TR-4 Driving is the dominate mode of commuting in Bellevue. Why is it appropriate for the Comp. Plan to denegrate the mode choice of most Bellevue commuters? Delete this obnoxious policy.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
			<p>Mobility Management and Technology. This is the dominate section on general transportation. Move TR-17 thru TR-38 to be before the TDM section.</p> <p>TR-20 The old TR-2 is the recent dominate policy to establish that congestion relief is an importatant high level policy. Move TR-20 to be the first poicy in this section.</p> <p>Old TR-27. This is a good policy and should be kept. Collector arterials serve the neighborhoods and need to be monitored.</p> <p>TR-27 Adding 'periodic' recduces the opportunity for neighborhood engagement. Take it out.</p> <p>TR-56 Add 'projected' to the 'excess vehicular capacity' phrase, The BKR model routinely shows locations that may currently have excess vehicluar capacity but is projected to have future congestion due to lack of then available capacity. Insert the projections into this policy.</p> <p>TR-61 This whole policy is purely aspriational and unachievable. Transit service is not now nor ever will be 'efficient useful, nor attactive to most people, to most destinations, most of the time. This policy should be drastically revised or eliminated in a functional Comprehesive Plan.</p> <p>TR-103 The Grand Connection is not a 'regional' facility. We have the funded extension of NE 6th St. with a bike facility immediately adjacent to a bike bridge that could be called the grand connection. This has not be thought thru.</p> <p>TR-111 Taking 'neighborhood' out degrades neighborhoods and does not expand the thought. Put neighborhood back in.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
			<p>TR-120 Insert 'including' in front of the listm as in the old TR135.</p> <p>TR-121 include the Climate Committment Act with gas tax.</p> <p>TR-127 Why is this here at all. The city has no responsibility nor mechanisim to 'implement' transit service.</p> <p>Travel in Bellevue is dominated by over 75% of all trips made by car. Please do not allow the advocates of the minor modes of travel dominate the wording of the Comprehensive Plan. The purpose of the policies is to allow a transportation system to be developed that will allow the tremendous growth in person trips we expect. Let the policies reflect reality that Bellevue is a car dominated city and will continue to be so. We can and should accomodate other modes, but please do not denegrate the street system that supports our businesses and residents. We like our cars.</p> <p>Vic Bishop</p>
1507988	I read through each of the TR policies in the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update: Proposed Amendments. I have specific comments on several policies, in #6 below.		<p>TR-20: "Aggressively plan, manage, and expand transportation investments to reduce congestion and expand mobility opportunities in a multimodal and comprehensive manner and improve the quality of the travel experience for all users.Aggressively plan, manage, and expand transportation investments to reduce congestion and expand mobility opportunities in a multimodal and comprehensive manner and improve the quality of the travel experience for all</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
			<p>users." My comment here is about the current "fight" between cyclists and drivers related to Bike Bellevue and removing lanes on major arterials to create a separated bike lane. I understand the need for more and connected bike lanes. I think this should not come at the expense of those of us who have to drive due to physical limitations on cycling, and the lack of robust transit in Bellevue.</p> <p>TR-56: "Allow for repurposing of travel lanes for other uses such as parking, transit or pedestrian and bicycle facilities where excess vehicular capacity exists and/or to optimize person throughput along a corridor." How are you defining *excess vehicular capacity*? I thought the analysis presented in Bike Bellevue was bull***t, contending that there is excess capacity on BelRed. I asked about this in my comments--a direct question--and have yet to receive a response. It feels like the Transportation Dept. wants to ram-rod through its Bike Bellevue plan, and presents data in support of that end. I do not trust the data presented. I strongly caution prudence that considers all transportation facility users, and that takes into consideration who is making comments, who did outreach to them..... I know there was some hanky-panky to gather many comments from cyclists, some just by clicking a button, in support of Bike Bellevue.</p> <p>TR-61: "Support planned growth and development with a bold transit vision that provides efficient, useful, attractive service for most people, to most</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
			<p>destinations, most of the time, serving maximum ridership." This sounds lofty enough but how the heck will the city attain this policy??? To me, TR-61 is pie in the sky. Bellevue would need to create and manage its own very robust transit system, to achieve TR-61.</p> <p>TR-104: "Support establishment and operation of a shared micromobility service in Bellevue." I'm not sure what a shared micromobility service means. I wish it were defined. I hope it does not mean implementation of e-scooter and e-bicycle rideshare rentals, as Seattle has, with bikes and scooters strewn all about downtown Seattle, which I frequently walk in, to and from Sound Transit busses, and the theaters I volunteer at. These bikes and scooters are an eyesore, and sometimes a tripping hazard.</p>
1508399	<p>Update to policy to focus on addressing gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian network identified in the Mobility Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Biking and walking in Bellevue is not safe nor convenient.</p>	<p>Slow down traffic from 30 MPH default to 25 MPH. Actually enforce traffic rules. Too many people driving 50 MPH like on 118th Ave SE or Bellevue Way SE.</p>	<p>Bellevue will never support diversity and small businesses and culture until it is a walkable city. Bellevue will never be walkable as long as the car lobby rules city council.</p>
1508405	<p>These were shared with me and I'm repeating them verbatim since I am in complete agreement with every one: Old TR-2, change "reduce" to "manage" - congestion is a natural part of a growing city, and old policy language around managing it was appropriate. Old TR-90 should be kept - look to best practices around the country and world as we work on the ST3</p>	<p>The city's Planning and Transportation Commissions should be required to have a diversity of experience represented on them. Diversity of renters/owners, bicyclists, walkers, heavy transit users, disabled people, non-drivers.</p>	<p>Bellevue must evolve, not stagnate in older modes of transportation and land use. Make sure that the Comp Plan is flexible enough to allow for changing the way "things have always been done in Bellevue." Be bold.</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	<p>alignment.</p> <p>New TR-84 should remove "neighborhood groups" and replace with "residents" like in other policies. Catering specifically to neighborhood groups entrenches existing power structures, and policy language can be made more consistent.</p> <p>New TR-87 should remove the "while retaining capacity for other modes". Other policies have intentionally removed language that's been deemed too prescriptive or limiting. In a growing city, sometimes reallocating existing capacity to more efficient transportation modes is the right choice for improved mobility for the whole system. With language as is, this removes this from any consideration.</p> <p>New TR-135 should remove reference to "neighborhoods" since it already says "affected residents"</p> <p>New TR-139 should talk about reducing speeds along arterials as well - Speed management plan doesn't talk about just reducing speeds on residential streets, and as is this policy could be limiting.</p> <p>New TR-57 "Strive to" should be removed, and policy language should be strong. Vision Zero is a promise that city leaders have committed itself too. Policies around GHG emission reductions (like new EN-6) do not use "strive to" language, why should transportation policies.</p> <p>New TR-79 is too prescriptive and should be removed.</p> <p>New TR-96, what "current standards and guidelines" are being referenced here, ones from the City of</p>		

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	<p>Bellevue that are available in a separate document? If so, that needs to be referenced here. Otherwise, language should be included that specifically says best practices for the safety of vulnerable road users.</p> <p>There should be explicit Comp Plan language that prioritizes walking, biking, and transit mobility over that of automobile mobility, given that automobiles are already able to get wherever they need to go throughout the city but those on other modes often face significant barriers in arriving where they need to go.</p> <p>Policy language should be added that mandates the design and construction of bicycle facilities in accordance with a street's LTS targets whenever a street is repaved.</p>		
1508401	<p>Since climate change is a burning issue, everything we do should focus on that. Without a livable environment, everything else becomes irrelevant. Providing full linkage for people to walk and bicycle with excellent public transportation options is critical. Busses needs to be more predictable and more reliable. Busses should leave park and rides only at their scheduled times, not earlier. Bus drivers should stop when they see people running for the bus or trying to flag it down. Bus drivers and passengers need to feel safe, especially from other riders who appear drugged or psychotic. Without these elements on the existing bus and train options, people will not be able to depend on our busses and trains as a safe and reliable option. Integrating public transit (bus and train) with walking and biking is also critical as it</p>	<p>Consider smaller and more frequent busses. Make ALL new construction REQUIRED to wire for electric vehicle charging. This is super cheap and easy to do while under construction and far, far greater an expense after the fact. Don't let developers save a couple of bucks now while screwing us all over later at far greater cost. The city needs to be more intelligent about setting this standard for ALL.</p> <p>Fast-track permits for electric vehicle chargers with little to no fees. Put in policies to help businesses switch small and mid-size trucks to all electric vehicles since such trucks represent maybe 30% of vehicles on the road yet contribute 70% of the pollution in cities.</p>	<p>Planning Commissioners are in a unique position. They have the power to institute change that could have a resounding impact on the future and on future generations. They need to empower themselves with knowledge on how effective they can be to affect climate change AND then they must set standards and require these changes. It's in your hands to mitigate climate change. Please do as much as possible. Thanks!</p>

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
	<p>completes the entire start-to-end trip.</p> <p>Apart from public transit options, electric vehicles are the only future. We need to be building full infrastructure to support charging electric vehicles such as requiring all new homes (especially multi-family) be wired/prepped to charge electric vehicles, fast-tracking permits for charging at existing homes and buildings, etc.</p> <p>I like the idea of testing new options such as e-bikes and e-scooters to see what resonates with the public.</p>		
1508593	Policy for enhancing Trail usage to promote health and environmental climate protection.	Collaborating with businesses to promote less usage of vehicles and increase usage of mass transit. Promote safety of mass transit options.	For those that are marginalized and underserved, having not only accessible, cheaper modes of transportation within, and between cities but also added safety to protect those who may be subject to hate crimes.
1508654	The two biggest policy moves should be related to electrifying the transportation system (busses and metro) and building more bike/walking paths that connect major locations. We need to move towards net-zero and that requires us to take steps in that direction starting TODAY. Mass transit needs to be efficient, RELIABLE, and net-zero and we need to have safe biking paths that allow people to use alternative forms of transportation to reach their destinations.	The city needs to incorporate more policies and regulations related to reducing greenhouse gasses and moving towards a net-zero society. This is vital to ensure the longevity of our city and on a broader scale, our planet.	They need to remember that in order to mitigate climate change, reduce greenhouse gases, and move towards a net-zero city, we need to take big steps TODAY and not wait 5 or 10 years down the line. We need to set the example for how cities should be planning for the future to ensure we have a safe and healthy world for the next generation to live in. I expect experts in this field to ensure that I have a greener city to live in when I graduate from graduate school and that means taking steps today to start moving in that direction.

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1508448	I am in support of creating a cycling option along the Grand Connection, which doesn't seem to have enough room for cyclists in the 106th -107th stretch, though that area is great for pedestrians.	<p>Consider using transportation related impact fees to cover costs for community electric vehicle charging, if individual buildings are not required to plan for this.</p> <p>TR-103: How will the Grand Connection be a comfortable place for active transportation, if it is used for vehicles or toll lane access, even if Complete Streets concepts are used?</p> <p>As density increases, let's ensure that local streets continue to be safe for pedestrians. CL-72 sounds scary - will neighborhood local street cut throughs be considered an option for absorbing traffic on arterials?</p> <p>TR-136 Restricted parking zones should also be used to prevent excess residential parking, not just spillover commercial parking, in order to reduce conflicts between neighbors.</p> <p>Former TR-27 was removed because volumes cannot be controlled, but this could be modified to reference traffic delays or roadway speeds.</p> <p>TR-66 ped/bike access to new transit options should be applied to existing residential areas, not just where there is a new development.</p> <p>TR-80 weird to delete Redmond from this list</p> <p>TR-117 Loading on site for all new development?</p> <p>What minimum size of project should this apply to?</p> <p>TR-120 - does this cover impact fees?</p>	
1508680	Environment	Preserve car lanes in major arterials.	

Response ID	Which of these policy moves sound good to you, and what makes you say that?	Are there any policy ideas or considerations you think are missing?	What do you want the Planning Commissioners and the members of other boards and commissions to know as they discuss these policy moves and make their recommendations?
1509044	Separate bike lanes (away from congestion) from car lanes in major arterials. The BelRed bike lane in BelRed versus BelRed Road is a good example. The effect will be greater safety cuaing increasing bike ridership, and cleaner air quality with electric cars and smoother traffic flow.	Data on ridership should reflect more accurate data. 4pm BelRed is not a peak traffic hour, for example, where the City used a video demonstrating little traffic at that time. Traffic becomes much heavier increasingly at about 4:45pm and peaking near around 5pm. Also, as BelRed and Spring district builds out, there will be increasing vehicle use. Attempting to change behaviors and making the public suffer, angers the public. The empty toll lanes, the \$15 tolls, is an example. Only those who are able to afford paying these fees can use these empty toll lanes. This is not equitable or good governing. Our taxes are being used against us...again.	Providing attractive, and safe transit may help. It still does not resolve the use of cars to transport families in a quick, efficient manner. Crime prevention is key. No one feels safe to walk alone, let alone ride the transit with drug users and insane people attacking random people. The police department isnlimited in what they can do.

Which policy moves sound good and why?

- Re: car-sharing programs -- why is bike share banned? Inhibits e-bike plan mentioned.
- Moving in the right direction. Keep focus on safety and security. Lack of safety destroys public transportation.
- Connect Eastrail with Grand Connection
- 4 police on light rail. I may take Bellevue light rail if it is safe to do so.
- Love: 1) Include wheelchair, strollers, scooters, etc. 2) support vision zero plan implementation, 3) support transition to Evs, 4) support of mountains to sound greenway in Bellevue & others, 5) policy on designing transit stations to include security, maintenance, and ge. opt.
- Thank you for supporting pedestrians. I would love more pedestrian crosswalks on Bellevue Way NE
- I like policy to support development of trails --> provides off-street transportation & recreation opportunities. Bike infrastructure is good --> needs to be consistent everywhere in Bellevue. High frequency transit important. Need to build more crosswalks!!
- Really support these.

Are there any policy ideas missing?

- Establish a capital-recovery procedure for the city transportation infrastructure (similar to the procedure used by the Utilities Dept.)
- No mention of complete network of bike paths, sidewalks, etc.
- Is there plan to build bike to access 520 from main point of different neighborhoods?
- Not enough crosswalk or skybridge for NE 8th Ave.
- Please consider adding sidewalks or bicycle "sharrows" in Pike's Peak on 122nd Pl NE
- Make Bellevue more walkable so people can park once and walk elsewhere instead of parking & driving 5 inutes to visit 3 different groceries. Some bike infrastructure feels not as safe...unless the biker is really skilled --> esp biking at night might need more lighting (Lake Hills Connector)
- Bicycle infrastructure should not be on every road.
- Bike lanes need to connect, more need to be separated from traffic, a white line is not enough!
- Require all gas stations to have at least one fast charger.
- More accomodation for bikes & pedestrians.
- Invest in transportation proportionate to use -- 97% + of trips will be in cars -- ACCOMMODATE THAT! Bikes are nice but minimal in use. Reality check!

What do you want Planning Commission to know?

- Bellevue is beautiful. It's curse is the traffic and housing prices. It would have been helpful to understand a bit more on options for transit from Maple Valley or Mill Creek to Bellevue
- The P&R structure Sound Transit build, can their faciity be shared by nearby residents? Especially after ST operation hours?
- How is bike-related and pedestrian related accidents trending in Bellevue for the past 10 years?
- Bridle Trails is underserved with bus service - 132nd & 140th Ave - 140th Ave NE with Microsoft would be helpful.

- Bike Bellevue -- Do not close down 1 lane of BelRed Road or Northup for Bikes. With the new planned density of Wilburton West Edge, we will need more East-West road lanes, not less.