

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

September 27, 2018
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Wu, Commissioners Bishop, Chirls, Lampe, Teh, Woosley

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Marciante

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Department of Transportation

OTHERS PRESENT: None

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Teh, who arrived at 6:36 p.m., and Commissioner Marciante, who was excused.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Cory Ricktrop, 6629 119th Avenue SE, said he has lived in Bellevue for 15 years and is a business agent of Amalgamated Transit Union Local 587 whose members drive King County Metro buses, LINK light rail and local school buses. He said earlier in the day it was presented to Local 587 that South Bellevue is an underserved area for transportation, and that King County intended to start a pilot program to shuttle people from certain neighborhoods, including Somerset, to the Eastgate park and ride. The work is to be contracted out. The concern of the union is that the people who will be employed will not be paid a livable wage. The city should put pressure on the county to make sure they pay a livable wage to the people they employ.

Commissioner Woosley noted that he and Commissioner Bishop received an email earlier in the day from Michelle Wannamaker who had a couple of questions she wanted to see asked. The first question was "Does the BKR model take into account the development going on in Issaquah, where there are currently 980 homes currently under construction, and Newcastle." The second question was "On page 6 of the 2018 concurrency materials, it says traffic in Eastgate is going to improve due to WSDOT's shoulder running project. I get that that will be the case when it is complete, but an email I received from WSDOT four months ago says the project will not be completed until the third quarter of 2021, so how is this improving the concurrency in Eastgate in 2018 and 2019?"

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Commissioner Woosley said he had the opportunity to participate in the first of three scheduled meetings by the Bellevue Downtown Association's transportation committee on their downtown access strategy. He noted that Department of Transportation Director Dave Berg and Principal Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald also were in attendance to provide some background information. Once the process is completed, the Bellevue Downtown Association will be sharing its thoughts about how to improve access in the downtown.

Commissioner Lampe reported that he attended the recent Washington State Good Roads and Transportation Association meeting in Spokane. He said the recurring theme was that the funding being provided is for maintenance and preservation of the state road system, but it is only about half of what it needs to be, which is leading to a continued deterioration of the road system, including bridges. The group is aiming to see legitimate funding reinstated.

Commissioner Bishop said he attended the Eastside Transportation Partnership meeting on September 14 at which Professor Tobar from the Ruckleshouse Foundation made a presentation about their investigation and evaluation of the question of whether or not the 1991 Growth Management Act should be reopened, reevaluated and reassessed. The bottom line was that anything the state legislature has passed a law on is on the table. That is incredibly broad and if it occurs will be a huge deal that will have wide-ranging impacts. The conversation about the Growth Management Act could happen within the next five years.

5. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. McDonald reported that per the request of the Commission on September 13 there will be a study session focused on multimodal LOS with a subcommittee of the Commission. Staff and the consultant will be present to offer support.

Mr. McDonald said the Commission has been asked to provide a briefing and check-in with the City Council at its November 5 meeting during communications from boards and commissions.

With regard to the request previously made by the Commission to move a change in the agenda to move item 11, public comment, ahead of item 8, draft minutes review/approval, Mr. McDonald said in consultation with the City Clerk, it was confirmed that the Commission's adopted by-laws establish the order of the agenda. To change that order would require changing the by-laws. As circumstances warrant, however, the agenda can be amended to move items forward or back, and protocol calls for any change to the agenda be made during item 2, approval of agenda.

The Commissioners were informed that since the questionnaire regarding the 108th Avenue NE demonstration bike project went live, over 500 people have responded. He said staff was willing to provide a report at the Commission's November meeting.

Mr. McDonald said the Commission retreat would be rescheduled, possibly to a date toward the end of October.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. 2018 Concurrency Update

Chair Wu asked if a briefing or a memo would be shared with the Council regarding the concurrency update. Assistant Transportation Director Paula Stevens said the Council looks forwards to occasional updates from city boards and commissions as a way of staying informed. A report on what is happening with the BKR model and concurrency could be provided at a regular Council meeting during reports from boards and commissions. She said if the Commission wants to do that, staff will provide support, particularly if the Commission uncovers some important takeaways it wants the Council to know about.

Commissioner Chirls suggested adding a brief item to the agenda for the October 25 Commission meeting to discuss what should be included in the briefing to the Council on November 5.

Transportation Engineering Manager Shuming Yan explained that a concurrency report is an assessment of the performance of the existing roadway system. It includes how the system is anticipated to perform in six years when all currently approved developments and funded projects are implemented. The concurrency report is required by the Growth Management Act.

Mr. Yan said there are two performance metrics for intersections in each Mobility Management Area (MMA), specifically the V/C ratio and the congestion allowance, which is the number of intersections that are allowed to fall below the established standard. The concurrency standards were reviewed in 2015 but no [major](#) changes were made [except some minor boundary adjustments](#). Mr. McDonald said the last time the concurrency standards were changed was in 2009 when the Bel-Red MMA was changed from 0.90 to 0.95.

Calling attention to the downtown MMA, Commissioner Bishop said he did not understand how nine intersections could be allowed to violate the 0.95 standard and have the MMA deemed to be in compliance with the standard. Mr. Yan said the measure is either/or in terms of the V/C ratio and the congestion allowance. The standard is considered violated if either/or both exceeds the limit.

Commissioner Woosley said a policy choice was made to determine which intersections within each MMA are labeled system intersections. The modeling and evaluations are based on the system intersections. He suggested the Commission should review and revise which intersections should be deemed system intersections.

Mr. Yan said there are 99 system intersections citywide that are designated in the Traffic Standards Code. For concurrency purposes, each of them must be analyzed. Most system intersections are signalized; only a few are not. The definition of system intersections was created very early in the development of the Traffic Standards Code and there have been only minor changes over time. If the Commission wants to conduct a review of the system intersections, it is allowed to do so.

Mr. Yan said the tools for determining concurrency are the BKR model and LOS analysis tools that were developed in-house by the city. The inputs are the existing transportation system, existing development, approved development that has been permitted, and funded CIP projects. The analysis period is the evening peak period, which is between 4:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. on a typical weekday.

Mr. Yan confirmed for Commissioner Woosley that there can be a lag of up to six years between the construction of a building and the roadway improvements needed to maintain the LOS. He said that is why the concurrency analysis is done annually.

Commissioner Bishop asked how staff converts the model results to a two-hour peak period timeframe. Mr. Yan said the city collects one-hour and two-hour counts. The BKR model yields a single hour and a factor is applied to bump it up to two hours. Commissioner Bishop asked if another factor is applied to bump the results up to 24 hours and Mr. Yan said that is not done for the concurrency analysis.

Mr. Yan stressed that traffic modeling and analysis are not exact sciences and fall somewhere between science and art. Steps are continually being made to improve the methodology to ensure that it makes sense. The most recent Highway Capacity Manual ~~data~~ method is always used. The method for accounting for pedestrian crossings has been refined, and signal timing improvements implemented in 2017 are now reflected in the model. The impacts of known bottlenecks at several locations are factored in, and a program bug in the V/C analysis program has been corrected.

At the end of 2017, the number existing and permitted multifamily units in the city exceeded the number of existing and permitted single family units for the first time, representing the increased densification of the city.

Commissioner Teh asked about the approximate square footage of dwelling units. Mr. Yan said single family is typically between 2000 and 3000 square feet. Multifamily units are typically around 1000 square feet or less. The model utilizes total units rather than square footage because that has more of a direct relationship to the number of trips.

Mr. Yan shared with the Commissioners a matrix showing the capacity projects that are included in the analysis. The model assumes the projects as being finished within six years.

Commissioner Bishop called attention to the Bellevue Way/112th Avenue SE “Y” to I-90 project and pointed out that it will not be funded within six years. The design work on the project has been put off for five years in the TFP. Ms. Stevens explained that when the list was developed and the work was under way to update the concurrency report, the work the Commission did with the Council to zero in on what the project would look like had not yet happened. That is why the project appears on the list. The concurrency analysis is done annually and updated information in regard to funding for the project will be used in the next iteration.

Mr. Yan shared with the Commission a map showing the analysis results for the 2017 existing conditions. The intersections were color coded to indicate whether they were exceeding the standard, just barely exceeding the standard, well above the standard, and not analyzed.

Commissioner Bishop observed from the map that 148th Avenue has a number of intersections that exceed the standard, as does 150th Avenue SE in Eastgate. Mr. Yan said those corridors were being given focus by the traffic and design staff. He also showed the Commissioners the analysis results showing the year 2023 with the approved development and CIP projects completed. ~~He allowed~~ The results indicate that the 148th Avenue corridor would be slightly ~~was~~ worse.

Commissioner Woosley asked if development in adjacent communities is considered when conducting the forecasts. Mr. Yan said that issue has been frequently discussed by staff. He said the answer is both yes and no. The model includes all regional development that been constructed, but for the approved developments, only those in Bellevue are included. He said if approved development from one jurisdiction is included, it would be necessary to include approved development in all jurisdictions, something that would be very challenging. Additionally, ~~Bellevue~~ it would not be possible for Bellevue to halt development in its borders simply because development in some other jurisdiction is overwhelming.

Chair Wu suggested that the source of the land use data in the model is relevant. She asked if any of the data comes from the Puget Sound Regional Council. Mr. Yan said data relative to existing data is drawn from the county tax assessor's office. He reiterated that only approved projects in Bellevue are included and stressed that the modeling work has consistently been done using those parameters.

Commissioner Woosley said there is historical precedent relative to interlocal agreements, particularly between Bellevue and Redmond. The Bel-Red/Overlake Transportation Study (BROTS) was an agreement for the two jurisdictions to work together on the understanding that what happens in each jurisdiction impacts the other. The agreement is no longer in place but it showed it is possible for jurisdictions to work together.

Mr. Yan stressed that concurrency is only one tool in the city's tool chest. There also 12-year and 20-year plans, both of which take a broader look at land uses, including in adjacent jurisdictions. The concurrency analysis is only for development review purposes.

It was noted that the current concurrency analysis determined that the existing roadway system meets the city's traffic standards. All MMAs are within the average V/C ratios allowed, and all MMAs meet their congestion allowances. The concurrency platform is used to test proposed development to help determine if proposed projects should be approved, approved with mitigations, or denied.

Commissioner Chirls suggested the concurrency analysis is necessary but insufficient. It does not take into account approved projects in adjacent jurisdictions, and there are other city plans that take a broader view. It is the results of the concurrency analysis, however, that informs the staff who make permitting decisions. Microsoft in Redmond could be approved to build a 30-story tower that will trigger a substantial increase in trips on 148th Avenue in Bellevue, and Bellevue could not use that development to halt a proposed development on 148th Avenue in Bellevue. Mr. Yan allowed that it would be a difficult call to deny development in Bellevue based on development in another jurisdiction. The good news is that the Department of Development Services takes into account more than just the concurrency analysis. It collaborates with adjacent jurisdictions. The concurrency analysis is one of the ~~a single~~ factors used by Department of Development Services in making permitting decisions.

Commissioner Bishop called attention to MMA 10, Eastgate, and said it is a classic example of the confusion and problems Bellevue's neighbors have. He said the MMA has a standard of 0.90. The Commission has heard often over the last couple of years about the terrible traffic congestion in Eastgate, yet the 2017 existing valuation indicates a V/C of 0.72. Mr. Yan explained that the 0.72 value is the average of all the system intersections in MMA 10. Between a 0.72 and a 0.90 there is ample room for growth. Commissioner Bishop suggested growth would have to be dramatic in order to get to a 0.90, yet the people are screaming under the current 0.72 conditions. There are seven system intersections in MMA 10. One of them,

150th Avenue SE at the off-ramp to I-90, in 2017 fails with a V/C of 1.01, and fails in the 2018 base with a V/C of 0.99. A V/C of 1.01 is evidence of gridlock that lasts for a long time, yet the concurrency analysis says MMA 10 comes in at 0.72 with room for more growth. He said his view was in fact the system is dramatically failed. The approach in use is something the Commission should put on the list to talk to the Council about. The approach simply does not relate to people's experiences on the ground.

Commissioner Chirls suggested what Commissioner Bishop was questioning was the concept of Mobility Management Areas which describes an area rather than a single intersection. The MMA concept should be called into question because under the approach any given intersection can be intolerably congested even where the average of the area works out to be perfectly okay. On its face, the approach is ridiculous. The Commission should be asking the staff to consider alternative approaches.

Commissioner Lampe asked how the V/C ratio analysis can result in a number greater than 1.0, which by definition means there is more volume than capacity. Commissioner Bishop said it is a failure of the capacity calculation. The nuances that go into figuring capacity are slightly wrong. It is possible to have a future projected V/C that exceeds 1.0, but it is not possible in practice to have an existing V/C ratio that is greater than 1.0.

Mr. Yan said the approach outlined in the 1990s was very impressive. He noted that over the last 24 years or so, the population of the downtown has more than quadrupled and employment has more than doubled. Even so, the traffic counts have essentially remained flat. Concurrency management is required under the Growth Management Act, and the focus is on managing growth and avoiding moratoriums on growth. The focus on managing growth is also why the city is moving toward the multimodal LOS approach. The issues are far more complex than just the V/C ratio.

Mr. McDonald said the Commission long ago recognized that the V/C ratio at intersections does not represent what people experience as they move through an area. The Commission's recommendation relative to multimodal LOS included introducing a corridor approach in acknowledgement of people's corridor experiences. Where travel speeds along a corridor are slower than the established guidelines, the need to study the corridor is triggered. Corridor travel speeds thus play into development review and the development of potential CIP projects.

Commissioner Woosley commented that staff have in the past and continue to do a great job of following the rules as they have been set out at the highest level of the city. The frustration the Commission has, however, is that the current standards and the way they are measured do not really reflect the concerns voiced by citizens about the congestion problem. The move to measure more of the overall traffic experience is a step in the right direction. He asked how the Commission can take up the issue of the standards, whether they are appropriately identified and if they should be revised. Mr. McDonald said at the very beginning of the multimodal LOS process the Commission took a look at the standards and decided to retain the MMA approach and the standards as they are established for each area. However, in the course of the conversation the Commission recognized that while the MMA approach may have been ahead of the curve in the 1990s, they may no longer represent the right configuration, geography or metrics. The Commission chose not to change them, but that does not preclude the Commission from seeking to change them in the future.

Commissioner Bishop said he had no argument with the MMA concept, the point of which is to allow for different standards in different parts of the city. However, it makes no sense that so

many intersections along 148th Avenue are failing yet the standard for the area is not violated. It is evidence of the fact that the system is not working.

Commissioner Chirls said he had a problem with the concept, primarily because it is applied incorrectly. It makes perfect sense to have different standards for the urban downtown and the suburban areas of the city. Unfortunately, the standard is comprised of an average of different intersections. If an MMA is defined as an average of multiple intersections, the definition will fail when one intersection causes great consternation while others operate just fine. The implication is that there are design flaws in the transportation system that trigger system failure when implemented. The Commission should schedule a full discussion around options that would work better.

Commissioner Bishop pointed out that the issue is huge and complicated and is not something that can be dealt with adequately in a single session. It is also not something the Commission should tackle without the Council understanding the concerns. The issue should be included on the list that will go to the Council in November.

B. New Bellevue/Kirkland/Redmond (BKR) Travel Demand Forecast Model

Mr. Yan explained that a travel forecast model is a computerized tool that uses land use and transportation network data and other assumptions as inputs. The model generates educated estimations relative to where, how and when people are likely to travel on typical weekdays; which routes they are likely to take; and traffic volumes and travel times, speeds and delays. Modeling is not an exact science, rather it melds both the subjective and the scientific.

The BKR model was first developed some 20 years ago through an interlocal agreement between the jurisdictions of Bellevue, Kirkland and Redmond. Bellevue was designated to serve as the lead agency in developing the model for all three jurisdictions to use.

Commissioner Bishop commented that it is often very difficult for people to understand how traffic forecast modeling is done. The work does not simply involve taking existing conditions and projecting them into the future, rather it involves taking into account where people live and where the jobs are. It focuses on analysis zones that were painstakingly developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council for the entire four-county region. The PSRC model serves as the basis for the BKR model. Where the PSRC model is focused on very large areas, the BKR model focuses on much smaller zones. For downtown Bellevue, every block is a separate zone in the model.

Mr. Yan said the BKR model is used in developing the 20-year Comprehensive Plan, the 12-year Transportation Facilities Plan, and the six-year CIP. The model is integral in conducting special studies, such as the Downtown Transportation Plan and the Downtown Livability Initiative, and the Wilburton Commercial Area study. It is relied on to determine development impacts for purposes of concurrency; conducting impact fee analyses; light rail station area planning; roadway closure and construction impact analyses; and in developing grant applications.

While the model has over the years been tweaked as necessary, there was a need to develop a new model given that new and more robust modeling techniques have been developed and tested around the country. Additionally, the existing model zones are relatively large and can be refined to improve forecasts. The existing BKR model does not include all important travel modes, such as walking and biking, and there is new regional survey data available. The

expectations behind the development of a new model include a focus on multiple modes of travel and the need to be sensitive to changes in land use densities and mixed use development; travel options and transportation technologies; congestion; and transportation policies, such as tolling and parking costs.

Commissioner Bishop commented that in the 50 years he has been involved in transportation planning, the basic format for how to build a traffic forecast model has not changed. He asked if the approach proposed for creating a new BKR model represents a systematic change in how modeling is done. Mr. Yan allowed that it does. Commissioner Bishop said the new model will allow for doing much more significant things, like multimodal, which the old model could not do. Mr. Yan agreed.

Mr. Yan explained that staff first briefed the Commission about the need to update the BKR model in February 2016. A peer review panel of experts from around the nation was put together that same month to help decide what type of model should be developed proportional to resources and need. Based on their input, the decision was made to go with a transformational model design, which was approved by the Council in July 2016. The Commission was briefed again in October of that year. It was originally estimated that development of a new model would cost around \$500,000, which is far less than was spent pioneering the model in the first place. Ultimately, it took less than that amount in part because some of the work was done in-house. Financial contributions from Kirkland and Redmond were more than sufficient to cover the cost of the consultants. Development of the new model was completed on schedule and under budget, and it meets or exceeds most of the expectations.

Senior Transportation Engineer Hu Dong shared with the Commissioners a matrix comparing the components in the new model, called BKRCast, with the components in the existing model. He pointed out that the items marked with a blank circle are not included in the current model. The items marked with a black circle are in BKRCast, and the items marked with half-white/half-black circles are included to some degree in BKRCast. HOVs, tolls and parking price all see big improvements in the BKRCast model. The BKRCast model includes more travel modes and job categories.

Commissioner Woosley said it appeared to him the BKRCast model is more sophisticated and will be more accurate. He noted the number of modes was increased from four to eight and he asked what the modes are. Ms. Dong said they are SOV, HOV-2, HOV-3, bike, walk, school bus, transit walk access and transit ~~other auto~~ access. Commissioner Woosley commented that pedestrian growth is anticipated to be the second highest mode growth in the transportation plan and he asked if the model accounts for that. Mr. Dong said the walk mode is one that is accounted for to some degree in the BKRCast model. The model includes estimates for the number of people who will walk and for what purpose, but those walking trips are not assigned to the network. Bike trips will be assigned to the network. The model does include a modeshare for both bike and walk.

Mr. Yan added that the approach utilized in the BKRCast model represents the most advanced practice in the modeling community. Pedestrian travel is accounted for, but not down to the level of estimating the number of pedestrians on a particular sidewalk. The model predicts how many pedestrians will go from one zone to another, but the fact that there is currently no pedestrian congestion means there is no need to estimate the number of pedestrians on a given sidewalk.

Commissioner Bishop stated that when the downtown plan was developed four years ago, it

was necessary to monkey around with the walking volumes to avoid having the model assume that a walk trip from one superblock to another was a vehicle trip. An adjustment was included to account for that throughout the downtown. Mr. Yan said the BKRCast model does not require that adjustment given that it accounts for pedestrians trips internally.

Commissioner Teh asked if the BKRCast model outputs are comparable to benchmark studies in other regions or if they are localized to Bellevue/Redmond/Kirkland only. Mr. Dong said the calibration elements of the BKRCast model have been compared to both regional metrics and BKR local metrics.

Mr. Dong explained that the BKRCast model is more sensitive to land use types and density, and it is more responsive relative to parking price, tolls and congestion as well as to new technologies. The model components include data regarding transit pass ownership.

Commissioner Woosley asked if the model includes data involving vehicle licenses and how of frequently transit is used by those with transit passes. Mr. Dong said the model predicts activity for each individual person around the modeling area relative to typical daily activities. The work includes predicting preferable modes. Those with bus passes are more likely to use transit, and those using transit are less likely to drive for additional local daily trips given their lack of access to their vehicles. Those who commute by car are less likely to take a bus for additional local daily trips.

Chair Wu asked if the model is focused only on the evening peak. Mr. Dong said it is a 24-hour model. Chair Wu said that is a significant difference that should be made clear. Mr. Dong agreed.

Commissioner Woosley allowed that the BKRCast model will be a useful tool for planning transportation investments. He stressed, however, that the transportation investments need to be focused on where they will matter the most, which is the evening peak period. Mr. Dong said the model includes the evening peak and generates a report for that period as well as for a morning peak.

Commissioner Chirls asked if the model will help to predict an expansion of the evening peak period beyond the traditional 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. as people chose to travel either earlier or later in order to avoid congestion. Mr. Yan allowed that it will and in fact will do so better than the current model.

Mr. Dong said the BKRCast model has been calibrated from different perspectives. A screenline is a virtual line running either east-west or north-south across the modeling area. Data is pulled from the model for the areas the virtual line crosses. The traffic counts across the screenline are referred to as the screenline count. All of the model volumes across the screenline are collected and called screenline volumes. The screenline counts are charted on the X axis and the model volumes are charted on the Y axis, yielding individual dots for the screenlines. An analysis called R^2 is done to determine how close the model prediction is to the actual traffic counts. Under perfect conditions, the lines would all line up in a straight line and R^2 would be 1.0. In practice, however, R^2 works out to be 0.9825, which is very good.

Commissioner Bishop stressed that the calibration effort involves looking back at a base year for which there is known data. He said an R^2 value of .98 is very good. Mr. Yan said anything over .9 is considered to be good.

Mr. Dong said an analysis called a Backcast was done as well. He explained that the calibrated model was used as a starting point and the jobs and population data was modified to reflect 1995. The same target year was input for roadways and operating costs. When the model was run, the volumes produced were compared to the actual 1995 traffic counts. The result was an R^2 of .9.

Commissioner Bishop asked if the model could be run with a cordon drawn around the downtown. Mr. Yan said the model could be run in that way but absent actual traffic counts to compare against, the results would not mean anything. He said he could look into it. Commissioner Bishop suggested the flat lines on a 24-hour basis have some basic errors. For one thing, NE 10th Street is not included. There may be other places like that. The only way to get to that would be to draw a cordon around the downtown and have the model compare changes over time. Mr. Yan said one important aspect contributing to the fact that traffic has not grown on the existing roads is that the city has continued to add in capacity projects over time.

Mr. Yan stressed that a model is only a model. In the dynamic world, much is changing all the time in terms of new technologies and new modes of transportation. The model will need to be kept updated as things change and as new data becomes available. The model is primarily a tool that is useful in comparing alternative scenarios. A model cannot be used to predict exactly what will happen.

Mr. Dong noted that the current model can be run in 45 minutes, whereas the BKRCast model takes nine hours to run.

Commissioner Bishop asked how long it will take to phase in the new model. Mr. Yan said the transition period will be between one and two years during which both models will be utilized.

Chair Wu suggested that to the degree data is or becomes available relative to pedestrian activities, the model should be tweaked accordingly. Additionally, given that the 2014 PSRC survey served as a primary data source in regard to modesplit, and given that much has changed since then, going forward the most reliable modesplit data should be used in the model. The impacts to traffic flow patterns caused by shared services such as Uber should be considered as well.

Commissioner Woosley said he would like more information about and the ability to comment on the assumptions that are built into the current model given that they drive the accuracy of the results. Mr. Yan said he would share with the Commissioners a link to a document that includes that information.

Commissioner Bishop commented that the old model determined a trip to be between Point A and Point B, such as from home to the gas station, and a trip from the gas station back home was determined to be a second trip and so forth. Noting that under the new model the collective trips are combined into what is called a tour, he asked if the individual Point A to Point B trips are calculated as part of the creation of tours. Mr. Dong said tours are calculated based on individual trips so that vehicles can be assigned to the network. Tours are used to control the most likely mode of travel. In the existing model the individual trips are not linked, therefore it is entirely possible that someone could take a bus from Point A and Point B and then drive from Point B to Point C, even though in reality that would not be possible because the person would not have their vehicle after having ridden on the bus. The BKRCast model is smart enough to know that and thus knows to limit the modes of the individual trips in a tour.

Commissioner Chirls pointed out that he could take a bus from Point A to Point B and then call Uber to travel to Point C. Additionally, a bike share could be used to travel from Point B to Point C. Mr. Dong said neither the new model nor the existing model has an input for taxi or Uber as a mode of choice.

Commissioner Lampe commented that when the Downtown Livability Initiative was put in place, taller and skinnier building forms were allowed but no significant adjustments were made that would trigger an increase in density. Commissioner Chirls pointed out that for certain areas of the downtown, density was allowed to increase.

Commissioner Woosley added that the larger density increases allowed were closer to I-405. He said the way the city's traffic analysis works is it does not look at full build out, rather it looks at the market demand over the next 20 years and how that will affect the system. There is enough capacity to accommodate the projected growth and demand, and the study done concluded that because the areas in which density was allowed to increase will be more attractive for redevelopment, traffic in the downtown will improve even with the upzone actions. While true over the short term, in the long run the upzoning will result in worse traffic.

8. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW/APPROVAL – None

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

12. COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. McDonald briefly reviewed with the Commission the calendar of upcoming meetings and agenda items. He noted that the Commission would not meet on October 11.

Commissioner Bishop pointed out that in the past the Commission has had discussions regarding the CIP to allow for providing input to the Council ahead of their adopting the budget. Ms. Stevens said the current cycle had not played out as it has in past cycles. She said she was not sure why. Commissioner Bishop suggested that where the money goes relative to the systems the Commission has worked so hard to prioritize is something about which the Council would enjoy some opinion from the Commission.

Commissioner Chirls allowed that the process involved a certain degree of error in scheduling. However, he suggested the point could be made to Council liaison Lee but said the Commission should not complain to the Council about it.

Ms. Stevens said the error is not one that can be attributed to the Council. The responsibility falls to the staff, and there have been conversations at the staff level about how the process transpired. Going forward, staff will work to make sure information gets to the Commission in a more timely fashion, as it has in the past.

13. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by

Commissioner Chirls and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Wu adjourned the meeting at 8:55 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission Date

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission Date