

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

December 13, 2018
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Jeremy Chin Department of
Transportation

OTHERS PRESENT: Councilmember Lee; Chris Brieland, Fehr & Peers; Tony
Woody, Concord Engineering

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.

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

Ms. Michelle Wannamaker, 4045 149th Avenue SE, brought to the attention of the Commission that the meeting materials showed the 148th Avenue SE and 150th Avenue SE corridors as having a speed limit of 30 mph. She clarified that north from SE 28th Street the speed limit is in fact 35 mph.

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

Councilmember Lee wished the Commissioners a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year. He also noted that the recent Transportation Commission retreat was wonderful. He voiced appreciation for the Commissioners and the staff, all of whom did a great job and good work. There was some clarification and direction between the Commissioners and the Council. He said he was looking forward to a great new year.

Commissioner Bishop reported that he attended the I-405 executive advisory group meeting on December 11. He said the organization, which was created by WSDOT, has representation from all of the cities up and down the I-405 corridor. Their meetings are held quarterly. Process reports

were provided by WSDOT and Sound Transit relative to bus rapid transit. King County Parks was also present to talk about the Eastside Rail Corridor project which will include a multiuse path for its entire length. WSDOT will build the Renton end and the new crossing over I-405 as part of the Bellevue to Renton project. King County Parks has identified the Wilburton trestle project and the NE 8th Street bridge structure for inclusion in the 2019 King County Parks levy proposal. It is great news for Bellevue that the project is close to being fully funded.

Commissioner Woosley reported that along with Commissioner Bishop and former Transportation Commission chair Ernie Simas he has recently had meetings with some Councilmembers and Department of Transportation director Dave Berg regarding a proposal to accelerate the construction of the NE 2nd Street overpass in conjunction with replacement of the Main Street overpass. Unfortunately, there is not time to do the environmental review for the project and there is no funding identified in the current state package for it. The good news is the city is planning to do a full analysis of the different I-405 access configurations and their cost benefits beginning in mid-2019.

5. STAFF REPORTS

A. Bike Share Pilot

Principal Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald called attention to the report included in the packet from Transportation Planner Andreas Piller on the bike share pilot project. He noted that a full and comprehensive report will be released in the spring of 2019 on the project.

Commissioner Woosley said he hoped that the full report would cover compliance of the bike share companies with the permitting conditions. Mr. McDonald said that would be reasonable to expect.

Commissioner Marciante said she was impressed with the fact that the program began with 200 bikes and is already up to 400. She noted the numbers to date indicate there have been 5800 users and 28,000 trips. She said she would like to know how those figures track with programs in other cities.

Commissioner Bishop called attention to page 4 of the report and the plan to do a very broad community survey in the spring of 2019. He asked how the staff planned to get the non-bicycle community to participate in the survey, and if the responses from those who do and do not use the bicycle facilities will be separated out. Mr. McDonald said the intent is to come back in June 2019 with a full analysis of the pilot project, which by then will have been in operation for almost a year.

Commissioner Chirls said he would like to see some comparative data, even though it may not be fully comparative given topography differences. In regard to the numbers, he said he would like some information about how they stacked up against the program objectives.

Commissioner Lampe said he had asked staff for some information about what is deemed to be an economic amount of usage for the bike share companies in order to remain viable. He said the response he received was that Lime wants to see three uses per day per bike but is currently experiencing a little less than one. That the reason they will be scaling back operations somewhat during the winter months.

Commissioner Teh said in addition to compliance he would like to see information regarding

safety and how the bike share company is addressing the wearing of helmets. He said he also would like to know what is being done about bikes that are left in various places.

Commissioner Bishop said he did not view 250 bike riders per day as being large in light of the city's 1.4 million daily trips. He said he would like to see separated out trip length in the downtown versus trip length in the rest of the city.

Commissioner Woosley noted that if bike share providers want to use private facilities from which to operate, it is their responsibility to make those arrangements. The city's Land Use Code does not contemplate that, however. He said he has submitted a request to the planning department to consider a Land Use Code amendment to allow private entities to lease space for the use and he said he would like to know if the city intends to pursue that. Mr. McDonald said the city will not be taking that approach.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Eastgate Transportation Study

Mr. McDonald explained that the objective of the study session was to describe a set of evaluation criteria to be utilized as projects to address congestion relief in the Eastgate area are identified for further analysis and to see concurrence from the Transportation Commission .

Mr. McDonald took a moment to thank Commissioner Bishop for taking the time on December 10 to meet with staff and the consultant team to seek an understanding of the fundamentals of the modeling, the underlying assumptions and how the model is validated.

Chair Wu asked if the hypothetical application will serve to evaluate multimodal LOS. Mr. McDonald explained that in accordance with direction from the Council, the primary objective is to look at projects that will provide vehicle congestion relief. That, of course, cannot be provided in a vacuum; all modes of getting around must be considered. As a first cut, the modeling will suggest what congestion relief projects might be worthy of consideration. As a second cut, all other modes of transportation will be looked at using the metrics, standards and guidelines approved by the Commission for those modes. It will all then be layered together with an eye on the implications for cost, benefit, right-of-way and environmental impacts.

Chris Brieland, consultant with Fehr & Peers, explained that the hypothetical element is new given that it represents an example of the evaluation framework. He said it would walk through it as part of the presentation.

Mr. McDonald said the direction from the Council with respect to the project included looking at congestion relief projects in the Eastgate and Factoria areas, primarily for the evening peak but also the morning peak for a few corridors and intersections. The Commission is the advisory body to the Council for the project.

The Commissioners were reminded that they had been instrumental in drafting recommendations for all of the policies as part of the 2015 Comprehensive Plan update. There is specific policy direction, including in policy TR-2, to look at congestion reduction and improving overall mobility. However, since the Comprehensive Plan was updated multimodal LOS policies have

been adopted along with Complete Streets and Vision Zero, adding to the comprehensive approach to mobility in Bellevue.

Senior Transportation Engineer Jeremy Chin said a number of projects are under construction in the study area or are set to begin construction in 2019. They include the Newport Way sidewalk project between Somerset and 150th Avenue SE. WSDOT has two large projects that will affect the area significantly, including the SR-900 corridor improvements and the I-405 express toll lanes between Bellevue and Renton.

Mr. McDonald provided the Commissioners with an aerial view of the study area and noted that the study will look at the performance of the intersections as well as the arterial corridors for both morning and evening peak periods. The primary objective is to identify congestion relief projects that will serve to meet the adopted vehicle level of service standards and guidelines while also employing a multimodal mobility and a Complete Streets lens.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Marciante, Mr. McDonald confirmed that the existing study scope does not include alternatives to decrease vehicle volumes, rather the study will focus on accommodating the volumes the travel demand model indicates can be expected.

Mr. Brieland reiterated that the scope of the work involves identifying congestion relief projects, documenting costs and benefits, determining the feasibility and effectiveness of multimodal LOS elements, and evaluating the overall projects costs versus benefits to mobility. Attention will be paid to avoiding making a fix at one intersection by simply pushing the problem on to another intersection; making sure there is availability of right-of-way; evaluating the impacts to the natural and built environments; and the readiness of the project concepts.

Continuing, Mr. Brieland said there are planned transportation network projects that need to be considered and are built into the modeling and evaluation framework. The congestion relief projects already on the books need to be considered because they will affect other project concepts that might emerge. The modeling work will indicate where vehicle LOS standards and guidelines are not being met, and from there traffic congestion relief projects will be identified to help improve traffic flow. Following the initial identification of congestion relief projects, the focus will turn to the notion of the Complete Street, which is where multimodal LOS will come into play. With the impacts identified relative to the Complete Street objectives, alternatives can be considered. There may need to be accommodation for pedestrian and bicycle projects built into the vehicle congestion relief projects to meet MMLOS standards and guidelines. Ultimately, the project concepts will be packaged into a variety of alternatives to allow for weighing the pros and cons.

Mr. Brieland offered as a hypothetical example a segment of SE 36th Street near 150th Avenue SE. The hypothetical assumed that the traffic modeling indicated the need for a traffic congestion relief project where the roadway approaches 150th Avenue SE. In considering a project, all planned transportation projects for the area must be taken into account, along with a multimodal LOS analysis, to determine how all of the components fit together. SE 36th Street currently has a planted area up against I-90 on the north side of the street, a shoulder, a westbound travel lane, a mix of median and turn lane in the middle, a travel lane heading eastbound, an eight-foot sidewalk and another planted area on the south side of the street. The planned Mountains to Sound Greenway Trail includes a 12-foot multipurpose path on the north side of the street, with some buffers that vary in width to accommodate the existing right-of-way. The plan for the project includes shifting SE 36th Street to the south, which will pinch the south side buffer. Congestion relief could be achieved by providing more eastbound capacity in the form of an

additional lane approaching the intersection. A LOS 1 bicycle facility is called for, which the trail will accommodate. There is no Frequent Transit Network in the area and thus there is no transit LOS to accommodate. The street is an arterial and thus has a sidewalk standard of 12 feet, inclusive of both the sidewalk and the buffer. There is, however, insufficient right-of-way in which to accommodate the sidewalk standard. Accordingly, alternatives must be identified, such as reducing the length of the turn lane; choosing to have a less-than-standard sidewalk width; or choosing to expand the footprint of the road, which would impact properties and retaining walls in the area.

Chair Wu said she could see the strengths offered by the framework. She pointed out that the projects that have been planned and that are on the books were designed at some point in the past and may not address current travel patterns. Land use certainly affects travel patterns and should be taken into consideration in evaluating projects.

Commissioner Marciante suggested the hypothetical example missed the big picture. The policy guidance includes striving to reduce congestion and to improve mobility. That is a very broad statement that does not necessarily mean that each intersection must have a certain level of service. The current levels of service in the area are appalling, and there is limited right-of-way space to work with. The process could identify new turn lanes and other elements that might yield some valid improvements, but the starting line involves a very narrow and prescribed solution framework. Somehow the bigger picture needs to be taken into account, including all of the new technologies that are coming online, including autonomous vehicles and new ways to share rides.

Commissioner Bishop pointed out that the Eastgate Transportation Study project was launched with very specific direction from the Council. The study concept being promoted by staff is way ahead of that specific direction. The Commission spent three years developing multimodal LOS standards and guidelines that to date have not been seen or discussed by the Council, nor have they had input from the public. In November the Commission went before the Council with a proposal for an LOS impact fee and got chastised for jumping ahead of the Council. He suggested that the direction from the Council clearly defines the primary purpose of the Eastgate Transportation Study, which is simply to identify and evaluate potential traffic congestion relief projects. The project in fact is being paid for with neighborhood congestion relief levy funds. The Commission should not move beyond what it has been charged with doing by including multimodal LOS standards that the Council has not yet seen.

Commissioner Woosley concurred, noting that the direction provided to the Commission in June it was stated that by unanimous vote the Council directed the Commission to prepare a recommendation for projects intended to ease congestion. That is the cutoff the Commission should be using for the study.

Commissioner Chirls said a lot of things have been discussed in Commission meetings that the Council has not seen, nor are they expected to see them. That is one of the reasons they created the Commission. In the current case, the Council may be directing the Commission to solve an automobile traffic problem. He allowed that while he personally is an advocate for alternative means of travel, the Commission should be practically minded and ask what the Council was asking the Commission to do. He pointed out that the Council had not specifically directed the Commission to avoid taking into account any other mode of travel in directing the Commission to find ways to make cars move faster, though that might in fact be what the Council had in mind. He proposed asking the Council liaison to help the Commission understand exactly what the Council wants to see done through the study. The Commission has been discussing the bigger

issues for several years. He said the proposal outlined by staff did an admirable job of trying to integrate some of the policy issues, but even that may be going farther than what the Council has in mind. Guidance is clearly needed.

Chair Wu agreed with the need for clarification from the Council. She added that there are many solutions to vehicular congestion. Different modes may conflict with each other, while in other cases they may offer mutual benefits. No successful transportation study will result from parsing out vehicles only. King County Metro service is not infrastructure but it is a solution to relieving congestion. During the noon hour, people walk to restaurants and to run errands; if they all drove, congestion would be much worse. The Commission should be open minded in considering what is going on in terms of emerging trends and issues.

Commissioner Woosley suggested the unanimous vote on the part of the Council in giving direction to the Commission makes it clear that the Eastgate study is about vehicle level of service for congestion relief. A key outcome of the study will be the identification of neighborhood congestion relief projects to be funded by the levy. The framework for what the Commission is supposed to be evaluating is fairly narrow given the Council's direction.

Chair Wu said the language from the Council is clear in terms of vehicular congestion. However, the priority must be given to congestion relief. The framework cannot simply involve looking at cars at intersections.

Commissioner Bishop agreed that land use is a driver. He said the travel forecast model indeed takes that element into account in making projections for the future.

Commissioner Marciante said ignoring transportation technology will result in focusing only on a very old type of model, namely just measuring vehicle level of service. While it may be the case that there are not yet good methodologies for understanding what the future of travel will look like, it is also true that there is already a low-speed autonomous shuttle operating in the city of Columbus that takes people from areas where there are lower parking prices to areas where there are higher parking prices, and it is successfully reducing the number of vehicles on the streets. To seek to reduce congestion by focusing on only one solution will be too narrow-minded and could miss the boat on a lot of other potential congestion relief options.

Traffic Engineering Manager Chris Long said staff and the consultants have not completely ignored other modes and other solutions in the area. There has been a lot of previous work in addressing them. The area was originally studied in 2012 and the project identified multiple transit and bike improvements, many of which were subsequently refined through the Bicycle Rapid Implementation Program process and then implemented. Part of the Eastgate Transportation Study will be to make sure the previous work is not squashed. The same is true on the transit side. In 2019 construction will begin on the Route 245 improvements that will change the pick-up and drop-off areas near the 142nd Avenue SE overpass, and improve pick-up areas on Eastgate Way. A year ago the city participated along with Metro in the community connections process that involved reaching out to all area businesses. The focus was on determining how more people can be attracted to transit. The city is also working with Metro on a mobility hub vision project for the Eastgate park and ride. That project includes looking at emerging technologies that will support the Ride To program. The Eastgate Transportation Study is intended to take the land use and transportation study from 2012, which included a very high-level look at traffic, and narrow it down through microscopic evaluations to identify the projects that will make a difference in the corridor to support the Council goal of reducing congestion.

Commissioner Marciante said she would like to see reference going forward to how those other parallel processes and elements will inform the process as it moves along.

Mr. Brieland agreed that there is no desire to undo what has already been planned by having too narrow a scope for the study. He pointed out that future land uses are assumed in the model, as are modal changes that take into account future travel changes. He allowed that there are many unknowns in terms of the degree to which people will react to different technologies as they come online. Those scenario tests can certainly be folded into the modeling if so directed.

Commissioner Woosley commented that Eastgate already has a fairly robust shuttle system. In addition to the park and ride, the Crossroads Bible Church functions as the city's third largest park and ride through a private contract to shuttle T-Mobile employees to the Newport Corporate Plaza. T-Mobile intends to invest another \$160 million in improving that system to fit in more people to meet the demand. The Land Use Code amendments that were adopted call for a relatively significant increase in densities. Even with the modesplits, there will be more trips rather than fewer trips in the Eastgate area. More infrastructure capacity will be needed since the majority of the trips will be by motorized vehicle.

Mr. McDonald noted that the first item on the evaluation criteria is to use the model to see what the vehicle capacity demands will be in 2035 and figure out how to accommodate it through congestion relief project concepts. The criteria that address other modes follow after that element.

Commissioner Bishop agreed with the notion of not undoing anything relative to other projects. He said what he objected to was applying standards that have not been approved by the Council.

Commissioner Marciante agreed it would be useful to have clarification from the Council as to whether or not the study should include the multimodal LOS standards. She said it is clear the study area needs additional vehicle capacity. However, in looking at each congestion relief project, the work that is being done may be undone if the multimodal LOS standards are not used. Those standards point out what the transit and sidewalk levels of service are and they are being utilized in the plans for other projects. Plowing ahead with a focus only on vehicular congestion will certainly negatively impact those projects that have already been designed. There must be some validation, which cannot be accomplished without multimodal LOS.

Chair Wu asked if there were a way for staff and the Commission to seek validation from the Council for the multimodal LOS methodology within the time span of the study. Mr. McDonald said a check-in with the Council is slated for January 28. The discussion will include a comprehensive overview of multimodal LOS and will seek direction from the Council about how to proceed to implementing non-motorized projects through development review. He pointed out that to a large degree the MMLOS document shared by Commissioner Bishop is the aggregation of standards and guidelines that are already adopted. A couple of new concepts have been introduced, including the bike level of traffic stress, but that metric is based on the adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan. The transit corridor travel speeds are part of the Transit Master Plan that was approved in 2013. The sidewalk and buffer width requirements are included in the Land Use Code. By and large, the Council has seen and approved nearly every metric and standard that is in the document and it would be reasonable to assume the study should consider those metrics and standards in looking at mobility in Eastgate.

Commissioner Bishop said he was comfortable with the individual pieces in the document prior to the document coming out with everything in one place. He said that was when he realized the

document did not outline what he thought he had bought into. He said if the Council approves the document, he would support it, but the Council has not done that.

Commissioner Chirls said it appeared to him the study aimed to use the filter for other modes of travel as part of the evaluation of automobile-specific projects. It would appear, however, that that is not something the Council has asked for. Clarification of that point from the Council would be very helpful.

Commissioner Marciante noted that one of the first steps in the evaluation framework was to consider whether or not the elements of a Complete Street are present. She asked if the Complete Streets guidelines have been approved by the Council. Mr. McDonald allowed that a Complete Streets ordinance has been adopted by the Council and that Complete Streets policies are embedded in the Comprehensive Plan. Commissioner Marciante said if there is insufficient right-of-way for a project, having a Complete Street in that location cannot be achieved and tradeoffs would need to be identified. The process to date has not gotten to the point of identifying how tradeoffs will be made. There is nothing in the framework to say vehicle capacity must be sacrificed in order to build a wider sidewalk. Multimodal LOS is simply a way to identify and measure the tradeoffs where it is not possible to build a Complete Street.

Commissioner Woosley said as originally presented, the multimodal LOS standards were a more sophisticated way to maximize the overall throughput of the transportation system. To the degree that multimodal LOS does that, it is fully consistent with the Eastgate Transportation Study. It is the components of multimodal LOS that compete with maximizing the overall throughput that present potential conflicts. The question is which element is to take precedent. The Council direction for the Eastgate study is clear in its focus on vehicle capacity. What is needed is confirmation from the Council in regard to the intended purpose of the study. Mr. McDonald said the locations that will be identified for project concepts will be the ones the model says have traffic congestion problems in 2035. The model will also provide some clues as to how to resolve the traffic congestion issues via project concepts that provide additional lane capacity, more throughput, or more turn lane capacity. Strictly focusing on vehicle capacity may foreclose or actually reduce the level of service for other modes, thus the evaluation process will attempt to lay out the tradeoffs. It will be up to the Commission to decide how the evaluation criteria should be used in making a recommendation to the Council. The process will not look at things like bicycle level of service independently, rather it will look at where bicycle level of service overlaps with an identified vehicle congestion project. That will be directly responsive to the Council's direction. The Commission must also be responsive to the Council in regard to policies that are adopted in the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Wu pointed out that ultimately the transportation system is a multimodal network. That is clear in the Comprehensive Plan and from all kinds of perspectives. She said she could not see any policymaker asking the Commission to only look at vehicle capacity when considering congestion relief.

Commissioner Woosley reiterated the need to seek clarification from the Council given that the written direction from the Council specifically calls out vehicle capacity. Chair Wu pointed out that in fact the direction from the Council refers to congestion relief, not vehicle capacity.

Mr. McDonald said the outcome of the study will be a prioritized project list with some early implementation projects at the top. The study will also determine the longevity of the projects in terms of providing congestion relief, and the modes that are related. Projects that flow from the process will go into the Transportation Facilities Plan and will then have to undergo another

evaluation process with respect to all other important projects in the city.

Commissioner Chirls said the more he listened to what the staff had to see about the process, the more comfortable he was with the fact that the first cut will only seek to solve a vehicular congestion problem. To understand the impact the study projects will have on other modes will require a separate process. Each of the projects can be debated as they are raised with the Commission relative to their overall impacts and the level of improvement they provide for vehicular traffic. He said he no longer saw a need to seek clarification from the Council.

Chair Wu pointed out that it takes very little time for project plans to become outdated, at least in part. She said she was initially concerned the study would not consider emerging issues and needs and would not involve major stakeholders such as T-Mobile, Factoria Mall, Bellevue College and property owners and developers. She noted, however, that she was relieved to know that city staff has been doing both all along. Even so, the direction from the Council is to focus on congestion relief, not on vehicle capacity. She advocated in favor of developing a more open-minded project list, one that looks at projects provided by partners such as WSDOT and considers transportation services that also relieve congestion.

Commissioner Woosley suggested that approach would go beyond the defined boundaries of the study.

Commissioner Chirls commented that while the model will consider land use changes and other issues that are broader than initially thought, the result will not necessarily be an outcome that suggests something like the operation of a shuttle.

Mr. Brieland said the background assumptions had been well articulated. The model assumes a set of evolutionary changes to land use and technology, but it does not assume more aggressive transportation demand management programs. Those could be projects sponsored in part by the city that could suppress trip making more than what the model assumes. That is a potential item that could be considered.

Commissioner Marciante said it was her understanding that the model will reveal locations where capacity needs to be improved, but that the assumptions will modify how the capacity gets allocated. Mr. Brieland said that was a fair assessment. For congestion relief, capacity can be increased or demand can be decreased. The model will have a slight tendency to decrease the demand per unit of development, but it must be kept in mind that there is much more development to come. There are transportation demand management programs that can reduce something like five percent fewer trips per capita. That is not likely to solve the problems, and the question would be what additional capacity projects would still be needed. A scenario of that sort could be run through the model.

With regard to her comment about a more open-minded project list, Chair Wu said the approach of looking at intersections where the problems occur is very focused. Traffic, however, does not start or stop at intersections. The study should look beyond just intersections and consider other things, like transit services and rideshare options.

Commissioner Woosley pointed out that the study as outlined goes beyond merely looking at intersections to include how a change in one location might affect another location. He voiced concern about changing the assumptions in the modeling, however. He said he was particularly concerned about trying to prescribe a desired outcome over having the outcome be as accurate as possible. There will be ample opportunity to decide what to do with the outcomes. He said the

study as proposed goes in the right direction.

Commissioner Bishop agreed that the assumptions should remain unchanged in the travel demand model. The Council certainly has not directed the Commission to seek to change the modeling process that is updated on a regular basis and which attempts to include all modern technologies. The model is a true balance of science and art and it returns a list of projects to work with.

Commissioner Marciante said the assumptions are only assumptions, and there are things that will vary. She said she would like to see some different scenarios of ways things could play out as part of the list of study outcomes.

A motion to define “project” for the study as congestion relief infrastructure projects at intersections and along segments; services that effectively reduce vehicular demand at intersections and along segments; and infrastructure and service projects by partners that help with congestion relief.

Commissioner Lampe called a point of order, noting that the presentation was slated to be for information and discussion only, with no call for action on the part of the Commission. He asked if taking action was in fact appropriate. Mr. McDonald said the desired outcome before more work can be done was to get concurrence on the evaluation framework that was included in the Commission packet. He said concurrence does not require a vote, only consensus to proceed as proposed.

A motion to concur with the project concept development and evaluation framework, and to defer discussion of creative alternatives to future meetings when specific projects are proposed was made by Commissioner Chirls.

Chair Wu pointed out that she had made her motion first. Commissioner Chirls asked if anyone wished to second her motion and no one did. Accordingly, he declared that the motion died for lack of a second. He then moved his motion again. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Teh.

Commissioner Marciante sought to amend the motion by calling attention to item 1 on page 3 of the agenda memo and asking to have it revised to read “Use transportation modeling tools, specifically transportation demand management scenarios, to identify the traffic congestion relief projects that would be needed to meet 2035 vehicle LOS standards and guidelines.” Mr. Brieland said that would essentially be the proposal made by Chair Wu.

Mr. McDonald suggested the motion could include deferral of the project concepts, including demand management, to subsequent meetings. He said the approach could be embedded as part of the motion, thus making it part of the project delivery to the Council. Commissioner Marciante said she specifically wanted the framework to include the scenarios.

Commissioner Woosley stated that the BKR model relies on adopted city policy and as such is influenced by such things as transportation demand management. If the motion were to be revised as outlined by Commissioner Marciante, it would be stepping outside of adopted policy, outside the scope of the contract, and outside the scope of the work. Mr. McDonald explained that BKR is a travel demand model. It generates travel demand by the type and arrangement of land uses within the study area. For an office use of a given square footage, the model will return the number evening peak hour vehicle trips. Within the trip generation module of the model,

things like available transit services and other mobility options, including travel demand management, is embedded, all of which suppresses what would be an unconstrained amount of demand based on the mobility programs and services that are available. In some areas, there are not many programs and services available, and for those areas the trip generation numbers are higher. In the downtown where there are many such programs and mobility options, the trip generation per square foot is lower. Some areas of the Eastgate area have good programs and services, while other areas of Eastgate do not have them, and the model takes all of that into account.

Mr. Woody said one thing that could be done would be to include some demand sensitivity testing. That would take into account certain services. It would require a set of assumptions associated with some level of travel demand to be run alongside the capacity analysis.

Chair Wu pointed out that Commissioner Marciante's motion to amend had not been seconded.

Commissioner Chirls said he was not willing to accept the amendment. The way to handle what Commissioner Marciante proposed is to include some sensitivity testing in the modeling. He said that was the reason he included in his motion deferring discussion of demand management and other issues related to specific projects that come out of the model to later meetings.

Chair Wu asked Commissioner Chirls for clarification of what he was talking about. Commissioner Chirls said it could be that Project X would be proposed, and that in discussing it the Commission might think it possible that with a shuttle or some other form of demand management approach traffic could be reduced by some amount. The question would then be asked if those approaches had been taken into account in the modeling, and staff and the consultants could respond appropriately.

Commissioner Woosley agreed with the procedure and approach identified by Commissioner Chirls. He added that the Commission was given the opportunity to learn more about the modeling assumptions at a special meeting and although he was not able to attend that meeting, he trusts that the BKR inputs reflect adopted policies. However, he said the Commission's discussion and motions about changing the inputs and assumptions in the modeling did not fit with his understanding of what the process, including decision making, would be. He suggested that in the future if a similar approach is going to be taken, it should be announced and time allowed for a full discussion.

With regard to the motion, Commissioner Woosley said so long as it includes a component of ensuring consistency with the specific Council direction on what is to be evaluated, he would support the motion.

Commissioner Marciante said her concern was under the motion a sensitivity analysis would not be taken into account as solutions to congestion. It is one thing to come up with a list of project concepts and then evaluate them, it is a different thing to take into account potential solutions without varying the assumptions. To come up with a broader project list that is more encompassing requires integration into the framework of analysis.

Commissioner Chirls disagreed. Where there is an uncertain demand management program, be it shuttles, vehicles that are fully automated or technologies as yet unknown, they should be put into a category, specifically demand management. It makes no sense to first imagine the solutions and try to model them. He said the point was well taken that that gets to the validity of the model, but he added that the staff and consultant team undoubtedly know more about that than he does.

No one claims that modeling is completely accurate, nor can it be. The sensitivity analysis will take into account whatever creative solutions are identified, following which questions can be asked about the impacts and whether or not the project list should be changed as a result.

Commissioner Marciante stressed her desire for the sensitivity analysis is used in prioritizing the project list, not just in analyzing specific projects.

Commissioner Bishop said he would vote against the motion. The proposal jumps ahead of the Council. The framework is intended to use a set of multimodal LOS guidelines and standards that for a project that the Council said is primarily for traffic congestion relief. The Council guidelines say nothing at all about multimodal LOS; that was added by the staff.

Mr. McDonald suggested the wishes of the chair and Commissioner Marciante could be addressed by adding a point to the evaluation framework that includes identifying potential non-infrastructure solutions that may provide some congestion relief benefit.

A motion to amend the evaluation framework to include non-infrastructure projects was made by Commissioner Marciante. The motion to amend was seconded by Commissioner Chirls.

Commissioner Woosley suggested deferring any kind of concurrence or recommendation until the next Commission meeting, allowing staff to be specific about the language the Council used to help define the scope of the project. He said he continued to believe as proposed the project goes beyond what the Council has directed the Commission to do. He said he would vote against the amendment and the motion.

Mr. McDonald agreed that the original intent of the study was to look at congestion relief. The funding source, the levy, is intended to provide for neighborhood congestion reduction. However, in the scope of work for the consultant contract, which was reviewed and approved by the Council, has embedded within it a more comprehensive review of mobility. It calls for identifying some of the multimodal options and tradeoffs that might occur in looking at congestion relief projects. In determining the Council's direction, it is necessary to include the bigger picture of the agenda memo and the scope of work for the consultants.

Commissioner Marciante restated her amendment to the motion to include non-infrastructure solutions in the evaluation framework.

The amendment to the motion carried 4-3, with Chair Wu and Commissioners Marciante, Chirls and Lampe voting for, and Commissioners Teh, Bishop and Woosley voting against.

Commissioner Chirls restated his motion.

Commissioner Woosley said the amended motion exceeds the scope of what the project was originally supposed to do, and it is not consistent with the intent of the funding source for the study.

The motion as amended carried 5-2, with Chair Wu and Commissioners Teh, Lampe, Chirls and Marciante voting for, and Commissioners Bishop and Woosley voting against.

Mr. Woody said the land use and transportation network assumptions in the model are from the BKR travel demand model. The BKR model takes in the whole of the city as well as Kirkland and Redmond, so it encompasses an area wider than the Eastgate study area. The list of

transportation network projects that are embedded in the model assumptions include the CIP vehicle capacity projects, the Mountains to Sound Greenway trail, and projects and services by WSDOT, King County Metro and Sound Transit.

The BKR model is managed by Bellevue and the forecast year is 2035. The main purpose of the model is to forecast future vehicle demands on particular roadway networks. The intersection vehicle capacity analysis and the traffic microsimulation model are tools that are operational and are used to test different capacity projects under different demand scenarios. The outputs of the travel demand forecasting model are in fact the inputs to the intersection vehicle capacity and the traffic microsimulation tools.

The intersection vehicle capacity analysis tool uses a software program called Synchro. It measures performance at intersections in terms of the volume to capacity ratio. The traffic microsimulation tool is a software program called VISSIM. It looks at corridors, systemwide operations and the interaction between vehicles.

Mr. Woody explained that microsimulation modeling requires extensive model calibration. The intent is to get as close to existing conditions as possible by modifying the underlying parameters of the model. Getting the underlying parameters is important when it comes to generating confidence in the model forecast. It is done by utilizing a set of industry standard state and federal guidelines. Once the modeling performance for existing conditions matches data collected from the field, the model is calibrated. That work has been accomplished and the next step will be to forecast future traffic operations.

The study involves 27 intersections, 15 of which are MMA system intersections. The focus of the study will primarily be on the two north/south corridors of Richards Road/Factoria Boulevard and 148th Avenue SE/150th Avenue SE. Also included will be the roadways parallel to I-90 of SE 36th Street and Eastgate Way. Both the morning and evening peak hours will be analyzed, 20 intersections for the morning peak hour of 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m., and 27 intersections for the evening peak hour of 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. The disparity in the number of intersections to be studied in the morning and evening periods is the result of the travel patterns that vary during those times.

Mr. Woody said the microsimulation modeling will be applied at the corridor level. While there is some overlapping, the work will involve a subset of the 27 intersections along the predominant corridors. The purpose is to capture traffic congestion that exists through multiple intersections.

Chair Wu commented that while the model calibrations are good, the model is slightly more optimistic than field conditions. If after plugging field conditions data into the model the graphics show the same pattern, the modeling results can be relied on. Otherwise the field data is more accurate. Mr. Woody said the point was well taken and noted that is why the guidelines are in place. He asked the Commission to keep in mind the real purpose of the models is to forecast future conditions. A certain demand can be set in place and held constant while testing various capacity scenarios.

Mr. Woody said intersection performance is measured using the volume to capacity ratio standard. Each of the 15 MMA intersections has an adopted standard. Each of the different MMA's can have a different V/C standard depending on their nature. The study area involves four MMA's and the standards range from 0.80 in MMA 11 south of I-90 to 0.95 in Factoria, MMA 13. The V/C ratio for an intersection is determined by averaging every approach to an intersection.

Commissioner Bishop clarified that the determination as to whether or not an MMA complies with its adopted standard is determined by averaging all of the system intersections within the MMA. Mr. Brieland said that is the approach used to determine concurrency. The study will take a more conservative approach by determining whether or not each individual intersection meets the standard. While the average of the intersections may not show an MMA to be out of compliance with concurrency, the study will flag those intersections that exceed the standard. Mr. Woody added that the study will look at more intersections than just system intersections.

Commissioner Woosley commented that the system intersections were identified some 20 years ago, and the list of intersections in each MMA is not necessarily comprehensive or logical. As a result, a less-than-accurate picture of congestion levels is returned. It can be argued that for certain MMA's, using only system intersections to determine concurrency understates the actual levels of congestion, and land use decisions are then made based on that. He said he hoped that at some point the Commission would look at refining the approach to more closely reflect what will be done in the study.

The Commissioners were shown a map of the intersections within the study area, with the non-system intersections grayed out. The morning and evening peak hour V/C results were shown for each of the system intersections. It was noted that in the morning peak, 14 of the 15 intersections do in fact meet the standard, while in the evening peak 13 of the 15 meet the standard. The Eastgate Way/148th Avenue SE intersection does not meet the standard in both the morning and evening peak hours, while the intersection at Newport Way/150th Avenue SE intersection does not meet the standard during the evening peak hour only.

At 9:00 p.m., a motion to extend the meeting by 20 minutes was made by Commissioner Marciante. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe and the motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Woody said the segment speed analysis looks at the posted speed and develops a typical urban travel speed, which is defined as 40 percent of the posted speed limit. Those are compared against actual travel speeds for the peak periods. He noted that for Richards Road/Factoria Boulevard, even though the V/C standards are met at the intersections, the travel speed on the segment between SE 38th Street and SE 26th Street is only 3.9 mph. during the evening peak, which is does not meet the guideline and therefore is shown as a red line. For the segment of 148th Avenue SE/150th Avenue SE between SE Newport Way and SE 24th Street, the northbound morning peak travel speed is shown as a green with an average speed of 12.8 mph, indicating that is meets the typical urban speed per multimodal LOS guideline of 12 mph. The southbound leg, however, experiencing more congestion and has an average travel speed of only 7.2, which is shown as a yellow line.

Commissioner Woosley noted that there are proposals to expand the capacity of 148th Avenue SE to the north of SE 24th Street. He asked if the study will analyze that opportunity. Mr. McDonald said that will not be an outcome of the study, but the model will load vehicles into the segment within the study area and thus will anticipate future development along the corridor.

Mr. Woody shared with the Commissioners a series of photos of a bus traveling through and beyond the intersection of 150th Avenue SE and SE 38th Street. The photos indicated the progress made by the bus at one minute, two minutes and three minutes. It was pointed out that after three minutes the bus had not reached the intersection of SE 37th Street. He said congestion at the individual vehicle level is what can be captured with the more extensive VISSIM analysis.

The Commissioners were shown an animation created through VISSIM modeling showing existing traffic flow at the intersection of Newport Way and 148th Avenue SE. Another animation showing the 3600 block of Factoria Boulevard was also shared with the Commission, and it was noted that the southbound queue contributes largely to the congestion there. Mr. Woody said the animations are a good example of the level of detail the tool brings to the study.

Chair Wu commented that the Synchro results provide the perception that congestion is not too bad, with the exception of a few intersections. She said if presented as an indicator of existing conditions, some people will wonder about the disconnect. Commissioner Marciante agreed and said it just does not feel right, leading to the conclusion that the standards in place are bad.

Commissioner Woosley asked what the intersection performance is at the intersections shown in the photos in which the bus did not make it between SE 38th Street and SE 37th Street in three minutes. Mr. Woody said per the MMA standards, both of those intersections meet the v/c standard. He stressed that is why it is also necessary to look at the corridor level.

Mr. Brieland said when going to the public, it will be good to frame the intersection information somewhat differently.

Mr. Woody said the operational results of the modeling would be discussed at the next meeting. He said the forecast will look at 2035 as the long-term horizon, and 2024 as the intermediate horizon, the latter of which will be used to inform the priority and phasing of projects. The land use and network assumptions will be taken from the adopted land use plan forecast for 2035 which indicates the highest growth in the study area will occur in MMA 10. The assumptions also include all CIP projects in the future network. All of the trips generated in a particular MMA or zone will be assigned to the transportation network as part of the modeling exercise.

Commissioner Marciante asked if the modeling assumes all zoning will get built out. Mr. McDonald said the model is based on a market forecast for the planning horizon year, not full build out.

Commissioner Bishop stressed that that is a critical point. Rather than basing the assumptions on full build out of the Comprehensive Plan land uses, they are predicated on what the city has projected will occur by 2035 in terms of population and employment.

Commissioner Woosley pointed out that a large amount of new development on the Microsoft campus and the Redmond side of Overlake that will generate trips that will directly increase demand on 148th Avenue. Mr. Brieland said the Microsoft master plan as adopted by Redmond is assumed in the model, as is growth in Redmond's Overlake area.

Mr. McDonald said the topic will again be on the Commission's agenda for January 24, 2019. That meeting will be held at the South Bellevue Community Center.

At 9:20 p.m., a motion to extend the meeting by ten minutes was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marciante and the motion carried unanimously.

8. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. September 27, 2018

B. October 25, 2018

A motion to approve both sets of minutes as submitted was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Marciante and the motion carried unanimously.

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

12. COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. McDonald briefly reviewed the Commission's calendar and upcoming agenda items.

Commissioner Bishop asked if the Commission will have a role to play in the January 28 meeting when the Council discusses the multimodal LOS issue. Mr. McDonald said the Council will be presented with the multimodal LOS metrics, standards and guidelines document, and direction will be sought from the Council regarding the path going forward relative to developers helping to pay via an impact fee program for off-site non-motorized transportation projects. The Chair and the Vice-Chair may participate in the discussion to represent the commission.

Commissioner Bishop said he wanted to but would be unable to convey his strong opinions about multimodal LOS to the Council at the meeting on the 28th. He asked what the appropriate process would be for him to share his thoughts to the Council as a Commissioner. Mr. McDonald said statements made on behalf of the Commission must be approved by the Commission before any communication is made with the Council. Commissioners are free at any time to share their personal viewpoints with the Council. The Commission has approved the multimodal LOS approach. What will be sought from the Council is direction on how to proceed with the metrics, standards and guidelines.

13. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Lampe. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Woosley and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Wu adjourned the meeting at 9:27 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

Date