

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

January 9, 2020
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Wu, Commissioners Bishop, Leitner, Tropin,
Marciante, Teh, Ting

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Marciante

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Franz Loewenherz, Andrew
Singelakis, 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 Leitner who was excused.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Sue Amorosi, 547 11th Avenue West, Kirkland, voiced strong support for Vision Zero and noted her appreciation for the work done by the Commission.

Ms. Claire Martini with the Cascade Bicycle Club, 7787 67th Avenue NE, Seattle, said Vision Zero is very important. It is more than just a bicycle issue, but the cycling community is disproportionately impacted by traffic deaths and serious injuries. The issue is timely given that the longer it takes to move from the planning stage to the implementation stage, the more people on Bellevue's streets who may be killed or seriously injured. Vision Zero is achievable as evidenced from the news recently out of Oslo, Norway, where they have experienced a full year with no traffic deaths or serious injuries.

Mr. Steve Fantle, 4722 130th Avenue SE, said he recently met with a husband and wife team in Los Angeles who are Vision Zero consultants, though they are not engineers or technical people, rather they are artists who are working with the city of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County doing hands-on things. An organization there called Los Angeles Walks is training and mobilizing the residents to be advocates for and take care of themselves, working from the ground up. The organization acts as a catalyst and is working with seniors to identify safe

walking routes that are largely barrier free. Families for Safe Streets is another initiative under way in Southern California. That group is also working from the ground up primarily as a support organization for people who have lost loved ones to death or serious injury collisions. Their Healthy Families initiative recently hosted a workshop attended by over 200 where best practices were shared and where challenges and successes were highlighted. Out of that effort came their Safe Streets Healthy Families book.

Ms. Precia Caraway, 12920 38th Street SE, said she has moved several times during her life. She said the statistics indicate that as traffic slows down, real estate values increase and revenues from retail sales go up. Working to avoid traffic fatalities and serious injuries also helps the economy, the streets need less maintenance, the population is healthier, and the community becomes tighter knit.

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

Councilmember Lee wished the Commissioners a Happy New Year. He noted that the Council recently elected a new Mayor and Vice Mayor. The Council continues to appreciate the work of the Commission and the staff.

5. STAFF REPORTS – None

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Vision Zero Action Plan

By way of disclosure, Principal Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald pointed out that the desk packet materials and the information staff would portray on the screen reflected some minor changes offered by Commissioners since the packet was published.

Principal Transportation Planner Franz Loewenherz said the Vision Zero process started when the Council endorsed getting to zero by 2030. He said the safe systems approach and strategies serve to clarify the steps to be taken to achieve the goal. The intent is to deliver the package to the Council on March 2, following which staff will gear up to develop the Vision Zero action plan. Staff is committed to briefing the Commission on the entire action plan once it is completed. Additionally, when it comes time to implementing the 88 actions, staff will come back to the Commission to seek guidance on those items that are not of an administrative nature.

Commissioner Ting voiced his wholehearted support for Vision Zero. He noted his appreciation for staff promising to keep the Commission informed as the process moves forward and as details get worked out. He thanked the staff for their work.

Commissioner Bishop said he was pleased the initiative was coming in as it was. He stressed the importance of taking the next step of creating policies, strategies and actions to accomplish the goal. The city has done a very good job relative to traffic safety according to the data. Bellevue is very well situated relative to its peer cities. There is a robust system within the transportation department for identifying high-accident locations and making fixes. The subject

of reducing collisions is not new to the city and has in fact been worked on by the city for a long time. However, the notion that establishing a new set of policies will magically move the needle to zero over the next ten years is nonsense. The language to be put into the Vision Zero document should reflect that. Care should be taken to avoid setting up expectations for things that will not be done.

Commissioner Tropin expressed his full support for Vision Zero. Even though Bellevue is doing better than its peer cities, there are still deaths and serious injuries happening and there is more that can be done. The draft strategies are good, but there should be more said about how to decrease speeds through roadway design, and there should be more said about crosswalk design and operation.

Commissioner Teh added his support for the Vision Zero program. From a high level view, the proposed strategies are comprehensive. He said he looked forward to hearing more about the details.

Chair Wu pointed out that even though the city compares favorably to peer cities, things have stood relatively still for the last ten years. She said the new and more comprehensive approach based on the best practices of other jurisdictions is to be welcomed. She said she was looking forward to implementation of the action plan and to hearing about the performance measurements down the road.

Commissioner Leitner thanked Chair Wu and the staff for the level of detail in the documents. She noted her support for the Vision Zero approach and said it will add some formal structure to approaches that have already been in place. The structure provides accountability, is aspirational and is achievable.

Turning to the safe systems approach and strategies, Commissioner Bishop said he was basically supportive of Commissioner Ting's revision to the leading message except for the word "ensuring," a word that shows up several times in the overall document. He said the word implies making certain that something shall occur or be the case. He proposed replacing "ensuring they" with "encouraging them to." The Commissioners and staff indicated their support for making that revision.

With regard to the SP1 strategy, Commissioner Ting asked for an example of a citywide campaign and how the strategy would be different from what has been done in the past. Mr. Loewenherz said there is a 20-page document outlining actions. For the education campaign, it identifies a total of 12 actions. The staff core team is committed to working to determine which will make the most sense and should be given the highest priority. He said there have been campaigns in the past focused on safety, but none of them have had the same programmatic and comprehensive focus.

No comments were made in regard to SP2. Referring to SP3, Commissioner Ting asked why pedestrians were not included in the statement. Mr. Loewenherz said pedestrians are referred to elsewhere but agreed it would be appropriate to include them in SP3. There was consensus to make the change.

With regard to SP4, Commissioner Bishop asked if the issue of driver's ed is covered anywhere. Mr. Loewenherz said there are numerous instances nested within the strategies that refer to creating collaborations with the school district. For many of the actions, there is no pre-determined outcome. Driver's ed specifically is a private sector issue.

Commissioner Leitner asked if the driver's ed question is intended to refer to student drivers or to all new drivers, including adults who move to the city from another country and who may not have driven before. Mr. Loewenherz said there are identified actions that speak to new arrivals. He said during his consultations at the North Bellevue Community Center it became apparent to him that there were instances in which people had been hit by drivers who were carrying counterfeit driver's licenses. While such activities occur in other parts of the world, there is a clear desire to make sure people who show up in Bellevue know the rules of the world.

Commissioner Bishop said the city's safe walk to school program identifies the best routes from neighborhoods to the various schools. Mr. Loewenherz said that is captured in the document. He said Bellevue has a longstanding commitment to safety that the safe systems approach does not seek to completely reinvent.

No comments were made regarding SP5. Mr. Loewenherz noted that an errant period had been removed from SP6.

Turning to the lead-in statement for the safe streets strategy, Commissioner Bishop called out the word "significantly" in suggesting that while Vision Zero will do good things in terms of reducing fatalities and serious injuries, the improvements will not be statistically significant. He proposed deleting "significantly" from the statement to avoid creating unrealistic expectations.

Commissioner Ting noted that the word "significantly" had been carried over from the original text. He highlighted the need to be aspirational and to drive toward exceeding the goals. He agreed, however, with the need to be realistic in setting expectations. The tone of the document should reflect being both aspirational and realistic.

Commissioner Leitner suggested that if "significantly" is removed from the statement it should be replaced with another word that will be just as bold. Chair Wu concurred, as did Commissioner Tropin who highlighted the need to send a strong message that the city is being serious about reducing fatalities and serious injuries.

A motion to delete the word "significantly" from the safe streets lead-in message was made by Commissioner Bishop. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ting.

Commissioner Ting reiterated the need to have the language of the document be aspirational.

The motion failed 1-5, with Commissioner Bishop voting for and all other Commissioners voting against.

With regard to SS1, Commissioner Bishop said it was his understanding that Vision Zero applies to all modes of travel, not just pedestrians, bicyclists and transit riders. As drafted, the strategy does not mention drivers. Chair Wu pointed out that SS2 is specific to drivers.

Commissioner Ting questioned why SS1 specifically calls out comfort and accessibility, noting that the document is all about safety. If the references to comfort and accessibility were removed, SS1 and SS 2 could be combined with a focus on safety for all people. Mr. Loewenherz stated that when assessing something like the demonstration bikeway, the focus is on efficiency, safety and livability. Before the public will use such facilities, they will need to

feel comfortable. SS1 was drafted to capture that sense, which would be missed if the focus were solely on safety. Commissioner Ting said if he had to choose between comfort, safety and accessibility, he would choose safety. Comfort and accessibility are secondary considerations that are not necessarily part of Vision Zero.

Commissioner Tropin pointed out that if the roads are uncomfortable for bicyclists, they might end up riding on the sidewalk, making it less safe for pedestrians. Additionally, if crosswalks are not comfortable for pedestrians to use, they might end up jaywalking. Commissioner Ting suggested that in both of those examples the real issue is safety. Commissioner Tropin said a lack of comfort can result in a change of behaviors that will result in less safety.

Mr. McDonald pointed out that when doing the multimodal level of service work, the mantra for all of the modes of travel was comfort, safety and access. The distinction in SS1 is that the comfort, safety and access for people walking, biking and getting to and from transit is applicable to the most vulnerable users. Enhancing the comfort, safety and access for drivers are separate actions, which is why SS1 and SS2 are spelled out separately.

Commissioner Ting suggested bicycling would be much more accessible if there were no requirement for riders to wear helmets. No one, however, is in favor of that. Comfort and accessibility should be looked at through the lens of whether or not an action will increase safety. By themselves, comfort and accessibility do not stand at the same level as safety.

Chair Wu said she could agree to combine SS1 and SS2.

Commissioner Leitner said she was comfortable including comfort, accessibility and safety in the strategy, and said she would prefer to keep SS1 and SS2 separate given that they will entail different actions.

Commissioner Bishop suggested that comfort for drivers in terms of less congestion will result in safer conditions. There is a comfort element that is tied to safety for drivers just as there is for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Commissioner Teh agreed with Commissioner Ting's suggestion to put the emphasis on safety.

Commissioner Ting said so long as it is understood that comfort and accessibility is tied to safety, he would be okay leaving SS1 and SS2 as they are.

A motion to word SS1 to read "Implement projects citywide that make it safer (comfortable and accessible) to walk, bike and take transit" was made by Commissioner Teh. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Leitner.

A motion was made to amend the motion to have SS1 "Implement projects citywide that make it safer to walk, bike, and take transit (and where relevant to make it more comfortable and accessible.)" was made by Commissioner Tropin. The motion to amend the motion was seconded by Commissioner Ting.

The motion to amend the motion carried unanimously. The main motion as amended carried unanimously.

Commissioner Bishop proposed wording SS2 similarly to the newly reworded SS1.

With regard to SS2, Mr. Loewenherz commented that although the vulnerable road users are involved in a relatively small percentage of all collisions, they represent a disproportionate percentage of the fatal and serious injuries. Accordingly, it was felt that the comfort and accessibility factor should be bolstered, which lead to the wording of SS1. The same conditions do not apply to drivers.

Commissioner Bishop reiterated that where there is less congestion and driving conditions are more comfortable, the system will be safer. He said that is the concept that should be included in SS2.

Turning to SS3, Commissioner Ting asked if there were a way to increase the overall safety of bicyclists and pedestrians by having them in a separated space. That would mean that in some areas, such as freeways, they would not be allowed. The idea would be to create a commuter and recreational bike network that is both complete and safe in the sense that in areas where there are a lot of accidents, priority would be given either to bikes or cars with systems that are either dedicated to bikes or cars.

Commissioner Bishop voiced support for the clarification offered by staff to create public spaces where pedestrians and bicyclists are given priority greater than or equal to motorists to increase safety, but said he would delete the portion about strategically redirecting pedestrians and bicyclists to safer routes. There are lots of examples in the city where cars are specifically prohibited from operating, including the NE 6th Street pedestrian corridor, the Grand Connection concept, the Eastside Rail Corridor, the Mountains to Sound Greenway, and the SR-520 trail.

Mr. Loewenherz suggested drafting SS3 to read “Create public spaces that are safe and attractive for people walking and bicycling.” The Commissioners agreed with the revision.

The Commissioners accepted SS4 as drafted.

Looking at the lead-in for the safe speeds strategy, Commissioner Ting proposed using either “educate” or “publicize” to communicate the intent. Commissioner Bishop said “educate about” would be better.

Commissioner Tropin said missing from the lead-in message is the notion of redesigning roads. Mr. Loewenherz said the notion of redesigning streets to be safe is part of the safe streets strategy.

Commissioner Bishop said his comment with regard to SSP1 was not just to manage speeds but to manage speeds as appropriate for the intended use. Mr. Loewenherz said staff would agree to wording to that end, and the Commissioners concurred.

With regard to SSP2, Commissioner Bishop said he wanted to see added to it “based on applicable data.” He said speeds should be assessed and evaluated based solely on data, not on what feels good. Mr. Loewenherz commented that the word “data” can be broadly understood. He said the traditional thinking has been to aim for the 85th percentile but there is a lot of work being done at the national level that is focused on making adjustments based on intended outcomes for the surrounding area. He agreed that adding a reference to applicable data would encompass that notion.

There was agreement to add the qualifier wording.

Commissioner Bishop suggested the reference in SSP3 to getting a ticket was not appropriate language for a policy document. Mr. Loewenherz allowed it could be deleted in favor of “enforcement action”

No revisions were made to SSP4. With regard to SSP5, Commissioner Ting asked if there was any data showing automated red light cameras increase safety. Mr. Loewenherz said there is ample research. One report from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration that indicates fixed speed cameras reduce injury crashes by 20 to 25 percent. The ITE webpage on speed management cites multiple other references. The police department is currently undertaking a comprehensive review of the automatic speed enforcement program but that data is not yet in hand. Commissioner Ting asked if speed enforcement cameras are the same as red light cameras. Mr. Loewenherz said they are not the same and he clarified that SSP5 speaks only to automated speed enforcement cameras.

Turning to SSP6, Chair Wu asked if there has been any Council direction to implement other speed enforcement strategies to help fund Vision Zero efforts. Mr. Loewenherz said crafting a complex document inevitably encounters oversights. He said SSP6 should read “Employ High Visibility Enforcement actions to increase compliance of safe speeds.” The Commissioners agreed with the proposed revision.

With regard to the lead-in message for safe vehicles category, Commissioner Tropin suggested revising it to read “Adopt and implement improvements...” Commissioner Bishop questioned the authority of the city to adopt improvements to vehicle designs and technology.

Commissioner Tropin proposed having the statement read “Implement, influence and use improvements to vehicle design and technology to reduce risk of injury to people inside and outside the vehicles.” Mr. Loewenherz suggested that wording was a bit awkward. The conclusion reached was to use the staff-proposed revision reading “Implement and influence improvements to vehicle design and technology to reduce risk of injury to people inside and outside the vehicles.”

There was agreement not to revise SV1 or SV2. In regard to the clarification column for SV3, Commissioner Bishop noted and asked about the reference to a shared micromobility permit agreement. Mr. Loewenherz pointed out that the specific action items give consideration to the shared micromobility permit. SV3 has two specific actions, the first of which is to develop an agreement requiring shared mobility companies to record and share data related to crashes and vehicle safety and maintenance. That could include both Uber and Lyft around which there is research showing they contribute to a lot of crashes. The second specific action is to establish right-of-way conditions regulating the operation of car sharing services in Bellevue.

No changes were made to SV3. On SV4, Commissioner Bishop pointed out that the city has done some important work evaluating near misses in conjunction with Microsoft. He asked if that is covered. Mr. Loewenherz said it is though it is not spelled out in a prescriptive manner. There are other technologies nested in the strategy, including the use of unmanned aerial systems in support of crash scene investigations.

No changes were made to SV4, SV5 or SV6.

With regard to the lead-in statement relative to the leadership category, Commissioner Bishop questioned what was meant by the word “organization” and whether the word referred to

departments within the city or the city itself. Mr. Loewenherz said the intent was to refer to the city and allowed that could be made more explicit. There was agreement to replace “organization” with “the city.”

Moving to L1, Commissioner Bishop commented that “to achieve zero traffic fatalities and serious injuries” is more than aspirational, rather the language in fact sets a goal. That is not what the Comprehensive Plan amendment said or what the Council directed the Commission to do, which is to strive for zero. There was agreement to replace “achieve” with “strive to.”

No changes were made to L2. For L3, there was agreement to change “A Vision Zero...” to read “The Vision Zero....”

Commissioner Ting asked for clarification as to whether or not L4 is intended to be an absolute statement. He said it was not clear to him what the actions will be in order to achieve prioritizing safety over conflicting transportation goals. Mr. Loewenherz said the embedded actions under L4 included evaluating existing transportation safety funding sources and seek additional sources; prioritize Vision Zero safety criteria and local funding decision making; strive for full staffing in the police traffic unit and determine whether to grow their numbers to assist in enforcement and education; and establish a staff team to identify candidate safety projects and apply for state and federal grant dollars to implement them. Commissioner Ting commented that so long as there is the ability to have a conversation about the potential actions, the text makes sense. He said his concern was that the strategy would be taken as an absolute.

Chair Wu proposed deleting “...over conflicting transportation goals.”

Commissioner Bishop said he also was very concerned about the wording of L4. He said simply deleting the last four words would not satisfy his concerns and noted that there are always conflicting transportation goals. To have a flat statement prioritizing safety over everything else would be wrong. Some prioritization would be appropriate if properly qualified.

A motion to accept the proposal of Chair Wu to replace “...that prioritize...” with “...to prioritize...” and to delete “...over conflicting transportation goals.” The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tropin.

Commissioner Ting said he would support the motion so long as it is clear the statement is not absolute and that it must be considered in the context of specific situations. So long as there is further review between staff and the Commission, the appropriate actions will be taken.

Commissioner Bishop said his position was that when the Commission works to prioritize capacity projects, safety should not be held up as the number one issue. That approach would destroy the entire capital budget of the city. He said he would vote against the entire safe systems approach if the wording of L4 was not changed.

Commissioner Tropin said his reading of the strategy was that safety is a priority but not the only priority. Commissioner Teh agreed and suggested the city would not throw common sense out the window when applying the statement.

Commissioner Bishop disagreed and said he has seen how words can be taken and applied to the next level in a way that means the primary thing in the city, congestion relief, will be hurt.

Commissioner Leitner suggested one very important point was being overlooked. The overarching statement driving the strategy commits all levels of the city to always keep learning, refining skills and expanding the toolbox. As drafted, the strategy defines priority within the leadership context, not the overall program. It will not be the case that safety will be prioritized over absolutely everything else.

A motion to amend the motion to have L4 read “Decision-makers and system designers advance projects and policies that keeps safety as a key priority” was made by Commissioner Ting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bishop and the motion to amend the motion carried unanimously.

The motion as revised by the amendment carried unanimously.

No revisions were made to the Culture lead-in statement. With regard to C1, Commissioner Bishop proposed changing the wording to read “Encourage city staff to fully embrace the goal of striving for zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2030.” His suggestion was accepted by all Commissioners.

Commissioner Bishop suggested C2 should focus on all people and not just walkers and bicyclists. He proposed replacing “for people walking and bicycling” with the word “all.” Mr. Loewenherz said he could accept that revision and the Commissioners concurred.

Commissioner Bishop pointed out that C3 was the third place in the document where the word “ensure” was used. He suggested revising the strategy to read “Strive for enforcement, outreach and education that is equitable across the city’s diverse populations.”

Chair Wu commented that the city is in a position to do more than just strive. The city is in a position to be able to ensure an equitable approach. The strategy reflects an effort not an outcome. The Commissioners agreed with Chair Wu and the wording of C3 was left unchanged.

No revisions were made to C4.

With regard to the lead-in statement for the partnerships category, Commissioner Bishop asked if the word “interdepartmental” referred to entities outside of the city. Mr. Loewenherz said it is a reference to departments within the city organization. He allowed that “the broader Vision Zero community” refers to external organizations. He offered to revise the statement by deleting the word “interdepartmental.” The Commissioners agreed.

Focusing on P1, Commissioner Ting asked if the city partners with other cities in sharing data. Mr. Loewenherz said that is the case.

No changes were made to P1, P2 or P3.

No changes were made to the lead-in statement for the data category. D1 was revised to reflect the change included in the matrix.

Commissioner Bishop said he found it strange that the new term “safety interventions” is introduced in D1. Mr. Loewenherz said he would be okay with using the term “actions” instead of “interventions.” The Commissioners agreed to make the change.

With regard to D2, Commissioner Tropin suggested it would be useful to include a reference to near misses along with crash data. Mr. Loewenherz pointed out that reference is implied in D3, adding that one of the specific actions for D3 speaks directly to near miss data.

Commissioner Bishop asked why the word “crash” was being used instead of “collision.” Mr. Loewenherz said crash and collision are both acceptable and commonly employed in transportation language. It is the word “accident” that has been avoided. He agreed to be consistent throughout the document.

No revisions were made to D1, D2 or D3.

A motion to recommend to the Council the Safe Systems Approach and Strategies as revised was made by Commissioner Ting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Leitner and the motion carried unanimously.

The Commission gave its attention next to the transmittal memo. Chair Wu proposed revising the last part of the second sentence of the first paragraph to read “...strive to achieve zero traffic deaths and serious injuries on Bellevue streets by 2030....” There was agreement to make the change.

Commissioner Ting asked to incorporate the changes he submitted in writing in regard to the last sentence of the first page under AT73. He noted his proposal was intended to increase the clarity of the structure and did not make any substantive change. The Commissioners agreed to make the change.

Commissioner Ting stressed the need for the Commission to be kept updated as the staff develop specific actions. Mr. Loewenherz pointed out that in the Next Steps section there was a statement indicating the Commission looks forward to periodically evaluating the approach and monitoring performance. Commissioner Ting proposed using his suggested language and the Commissioners agreed.

With regard to AT74 on the second page, Commissioner Ting proposed including a definition for “KSI.”

Commissioner Bishop referred to the last sentence of the third paragraph of the Commission’s recommendation and argued against use of the word “dramatic.” He said the word raises high expectations that will likely not play out. He suggested deleting “dramatic decrease” and replace it with “reduction.” The Commissioners supported the proposal.

With regard to the second paragraph of the next steps section, Mr. Loewenherz noted as drafted there is the suggestion of a sequencing that starts with the collection of data and then moves to discussing Comprehensive Plan policy changes. He said in fact the timing of discussing what likely will be modest modifications to the Comprehensive Plan would ideally be in the near term. It will take time to finalize the action plan and start collecting data, which will not actually be informative to the Commission’s deliberations on policy.

Commissioner Tropin suggested the policy and data collection processes should move ahead in parallel. Mr. Loewenherz said that is the approach staff is recommending.

Commissioner Bishop said that would mean starting work on revising Comprehensive Plan

policies ahead of the development of the action plans. Mr. Loewenherz said that work would actually be done concurrent with the development of the action plans. He said the next step will be to package together a document that incorporates the work done by the Commission, the approach, the strategies and the 88 actions, include some of the data being finalized for 2019, and present it all to the Council, probably in the March or April timeframe. Finalization of the action plan is expected to occur in the April or May timeframe.

Commissioner Ting said it made sense to him to proceed with the two processes concurrently. He said if there were reasons to hold off on the Comprehensive Plan policy work, they should be articulated. Commissioner Bishop said one clear issue is that some data might trigger different thinking on the part of the Commission. Accordingly, there should be some flexibility allowed.

Commissioner Leitner suggested the parallel process would allow for updating the Comprehensive Plan policy work as data is collected. Mr. Loewenherz said that was a fair assessment. He reiterated that any changes are likely to be fairly modest.

There was agreement on the part of the Commissioners to revise the transmittal memo paragraph to read “Concurrent with staff finalizing the Vision Zero approach, strategies and action plan, the Transportation Commission requests Council direction to review the Comprehensive Plan to determine if any updates, revisions or additional policies are warranted to support the Safe Systems approach.”

The Commissioners urged staff to globally change “collisions” to “crashes” throughout the document and the transmittal memo.

A motion to approve the transmittal memo as revised was made by Commissioner Bishop. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Leitner and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Wu said she and Commissioner Leitner would present the document to the Council on March 2.

Chair Wu thanked the community members who chose to spend their time in contributing to the process. She also thanked Councilmember Lee for his guidance, Department of Transportation Director Andrew Singelakis for his leadership, Mr. Loewenherz and his team for their passion and persistence, and Mr. McDonald for making sure everyone works together.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. December 12, 2019

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

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – None

12. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. McDonald reminded the Commissioners that the Commission would meet next on January 23. He also briefly reviewed with the Commissioners the list of upcoming agenda items. He specifically said at the February meeting the Commission would be asked to provide feedback on a concept for a transportation master plan scope of work to facilitate staff in creating a budget proposal for 2021-2022.

Commissioner Bishop commented that the city is involved in an analysis of access to I-405 with the modeling group as it relates to NE 2nd Street and Main Street interchanges and potentially another ramp from Lake Hills Boulevard to southbound I-405. He asked if the Commission could be provided with a briefing on that work. Mr. McDonald said as soon as there is a deliverable, it will be brought forward to the Commission. Commissioner Bishop said he did not want to wait until the work is done to hear about it.

Mr. Singelakis clarified that the work being done is not being done in a black box. There are currently issues related to staffing shortfalls in other departments. Approval will be needed from the City Manager's Office before some of the work can be done.

Chair Wu said a staff briefing on autonomous vehicles will be provided to the Commission in June unless a gap in the Commission schedule shows up earlier.

Mr. McDonald said he would work with the City Attorney's Office to schedule a briefing on the Open Public Meetings Act.

13. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Tropin. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ting and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Wu adjourned the meeting at 8:52 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission

Date