

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES

September 10, 2020  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
Virtual Meeting

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Paula Stevens, Andrew Singelakis,  
Shuming Yan, Kristi Oosterveen, Michael Ingram, Eric  
Miller, Department of Transportation

OTHERS PRESENT: Councilmember Robertson

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Leitner asked to have the agenda amended to add as item 5A a staff report on the downtown I-405 access, and to add an item under New Business.

Commissioner Wu said she would like to have added to the agenda a brief discussion of the Transportation Master Plan as item 5B.

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

3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – None

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

Councilmember Robertson reported that she met earlier in the day with the Transportation Policy Board. At the meeting, the Board voted to put the regional Transportation Improvement Program out for public comment. The plan includes two projects of note to Bellevue. One is final design of the 120th Avenue NE/Northup Way Stage IV at \$1.455 million. That will take 120th Avenue NE from two to five lanes and add new protected bicycle lanes and sidewalks on both sides of the roadway. The funding is for design only; additional grant funding will be sought to advance beyond design. The second project involves \$1.282 million for final design of the Eastrail to Spring Boulevard trail link. The project entails an 850-foot non-motorized trail linking Eastrail with the new Spring Boulevard ped/bike path. An additional \$5 million or

more will be needed to advance the project beyond design. Action was also taken to amend the existing Transportation Improvement Program for the region to include the NE 8th Street overcrossing project.

Councilmember Robertson commented that given it is a budget year, the Council is looking very hard at both the capital and operations budgets, and due to the Covid-19 impacts the Council will be looking to see where the budgets can be trimmed and where the line will need to be held in order to assure the city's livability remains high.

Finally, Councilmember Robertson noted the announcement of Amazon to bring an additional 10,000 jobs to Bellevue, bringing the total expected jobs from the company to 25,000. The expectation is that those jobs will be filled by 2024. She said there will be work to do relative to transportation in order to deal with that level of growth.

Commissioner Wu asked for clarification regarding the trail project connecting to Spring Boulevard, and the NE 8th Street crossing. Councilmember Robertson said the NE 8th Street crossing project is already in the regional plan. She said some great presentations on the plan have been given to the Council. Action was taken by the Transportation Policy Board to amend the project to be consistent with the King County plans. The overcrossing is a part of the larger Eastrail project. The new updated Transportation Improvement Program includes future projects, one of which is the Eastrail project that will create a non-motorized trail linking Eastrail with the new Spring Boulevard ped/bike path.

Commissioner Wu asked if a date has been chosen for the Council's annual retreat. Councilmember Robertson said some dates are being held on the Council calendar in early October for the retreat, but until the city is in Phase III, meetings in person cannot be held with more than five people. The suspicion is that a later date will need to be selected.

## 5. STAFF REPORTS

Department of Transportation Director Andrew Singelakis updated the Commission regarding the state's I-405 corridor master program, which identifies the need for a new half diamond interchange to improve vehicle access to and from the south. He said the plan, however, is silent in regard to location. The Washington State Department of Transportation has deferred to the city to work in partnership with them in determining a location. The city's Comprehensive Plan includes a placeholder identifying that access as being at NE 2nd Street, but the issue has not been definitively settled. With all of the development that has occurred in the downtown, the NE 2nd Street alternative may have been precluded. The study will select a preferred alternative after the process is completed in early 2021. Resolving the issue will tee the city up for potential inclusion in the statewide transportation package, and will provide certainty for the development community in the downtown and East Main area. Due to the pandemic, it was not possible to conduct one of three Council study sessions on the project. The Councilmembers were briefed individually, and guidance was provided to move ahead with the study. The issue is slated to be before the Council at its last meeting in September.

Mr. Singelakis reminded the Commissioners that regional issues are the purview of the Council. The Council did not refer the study to the Commission. The Commission will be kept updated, however, as the study progresses.

Transportation Engineering Manager Shuming Yan said a new half interchange was first included in the I-405 master plan almost 20 years ago. The study identified 12 different

concepts between NE 2nd Street and SE 8th Street. In three stakeholder meetings and one public open house, seven of the 12 options have been screened out. The five remaining alternatives will be shared with the Council on September 28 in search of direction to move forward with evaluating them. The first option is the default option, which entails having no new interchange but has potential improvements to local streets. Because I-405 is an interstate facility, any new access will have to be approved by the Federal Highway Administration. One of their requirements is to look for local improvements before seeking new access to an interstate. The second option is the NE 2nd Street extension, which would provide an additional connection between the downtown and Wilburton; it does not include additional access to I-405. The third option extends SE 6th Street to Lake Hills Connector. The option would include an inside connection to the express toll lane that is currently under construction. The fourth option would also extend SE 6th Street to Lake Hills Connector, but instead of an inside connection, the option includes an all-side connection to southbound I-405. In connection with the existing northbound off-ramp to Lake Hills Connector, the option would form a new half diamond interchange. The fifth option compliments the existing northbound off-ramp to Lake Hills Connector with an opposite direction on-ramp connection to southbound I-405. The option would improve access to Wilburton and includes an element to close the westbound to southbound I-405 connection on the NE 4th Street bridge, improving the operations of the bridge.

Mr. Yan said the criteria to be used in evaluating the options are travel times; access and safety; impacts on property and development; alignment with the intended comprehensive policies; and cost, including right-of-way construction, environmental mitigations, and relocation of utilities. There will be public involvement in the process, including an open house, before a recommendation is made later in the year to the City Council.

Commissioner Wu pointed out that the Commission was not informed about the study. On the date the Commission last met, there was a stakeholder workshop. As a result, the Commissioners know nothing about the study and there has been no channel for communicating with the Council. She said the case should be made to the Council that given the diverse perspectives represented on the Commission, the Commission can be helpful to the process. Mr. Singelakis said the stakeholder workshops are for people who are potentially impacted by the project, including property owners and neighborhood groups. He said Councilmembers who have asked to attend workshops have been encouraged not to attend to avoid inhibiting anyone from speaking out. The general public has not been allowed into the meetings. Two online open houses will be conducted soon, however, and staff is willing to bring the issue back before the Commission for additional briefings.

Chair Leitner asked if the online open house originally scheduled for August has been postponed, and if the event was in fact held, what the outcomes were. Mr. Yan said two open houses are planned, and the August event did go ahead. Over 2000 people visited the site and the open house materials were presented in five different languages. More than a hundred people provided written comments. All the alternatives presented received both favorable and unfavorable comments. Many expressed concerns about the potential for increasing vehicle capacity and therefore additional traffic and increased greenhouse gases emissions. Many expressed the importance of integrating the new interchange with ped/bike facilities without negatively impacting the non-motorized modes. Concerns were voiced about potential traffic impacts on neighborhoods. The respondents were all self selected.

Commissioner Wu asked if a goal, a purpose and a priority have established for the project. Mr. Yan said the goal is to accommodate planned growth and reduce future vehicle congestion

while improving safety and complimenting other modes of travel.

Commissioner Ting asked Mr. Yan to share with the Commissioners the feedback in the form of comments for both the online session and the stakeholder meetings, and if possible to identify where the commenters are from. Mr. Yan said he would be happy to email those to the Commissioners. He added that all online responses were anonymous, but the stakeholders were all selected from within the study area.

## B. Mobility Implementation Plan

Mr. Singelakis said on September 7 the Council approved a modification to the Capital Investment Program to allow for moving forward with the Mobility Implementation Plan. A total of \$245,000 was allocated to the project, having been taken from a project that is laying dormant currently. The funding allocation falls short of the total that will be needed and an additional budget request will be made for the rest of what is needed to continue the work on in 2021. A key part of the work will be to advance the work related to multimodal concurrency, and the intent is to expand the definition of concurrency to include all modes in addition to vehicular level of service. Policy recommendations to the plan will need to be implemented through the city's Comprehensive Plan, with adoption expected by the end of 2021.

Mr. McDonald said the Mobility Implementation Plan will advance the Council's vision expressed in the Comprehensive Plan by looking at more of a multimodal approach to regulatory concurrency and long-range planning. The idea is to create a new methodology to identify, prioritize and fund programs and projects, including those that would make it to the Transportation Facilities Plan and the Capital Investment Program. The key policy direction was adopted by the Council in the Transportation Element in 2015, and the notion of a Transportation Master Plan was embedded in policy TR-37.

The Mobility Implementation Plan is intended to establish a multimodal approach to regulatory concurrency and longer-range transportation planning. Regulatory concurrency is currently a vehicle-based standard, while a multimodal approach looks at all modes of transportation to ensure the supply of mobility provided by transportation facilities of all types is sufficient to support the forecasted demand for mobility from new development during the six-year period. For longer-range planning, including the TFP and the Comprehensive Plan, a multimodal approach can help identify projects to be added to the Comprehensive Transportation Project List, which is needed to make them eligible for funding through the CIP. The benefits of the multimodal approach are a more equitable and sustainable approach to identifying, prioritizing and funding transportation system projects.

The approach is consistent with previous Commission recommendations as expressed through the multimodal LOS work completed in 2017 and in some related follow-up discussions in terms of equity, access for all ages and abilities, mode choice, safety and sustainability. In addition, the approach focused on the livability of neighborhoods, the ability to get around and between neighborhoods, and to jobs and housing. With an active transportation system, individual and community health can be enhanced with a more complete multimodal approach.

Mr. McDonald said all is on track to tackle Phase I of the project through December 2021. He said the available budget will provide the opportunity to get to multimodal concurrency, which will involve Comprehensive Plan amendments and transportation code amendments. Staff will work with the Commission to prepare a Mobility Implementation Plan document and a final report, the scope of which is still to be determined. The Commission will be involved in every

step. Phase II may be an outcome. What will come of the work remains unknown but it may lead to amending the Transportation Impact Fee program to include projects for all modes. It may include looking at the transportation demand management program to see if there are additional opportunities to reduce demand on the system. There is a supply and demand situation in play. The city is responsible for the supply side, but the demand side is tied to land use. If the demand can be reduced, the ability of the transportation system to supply mobility will be enhanced.

Mr. McDonald said the city has provided a lot of policy direction toward a Mobility Implementation Plan in terms of equity, safety, resilience and sustainability of the transportation system. There are policy initiatives embedded in the Comprehensive Plan relative to Vision Zero, Complete Streets, smart city and technology applications, and curbside management. There are modal plans adopted that have for several years been implemented, including the Transit Master Plan and the Pedestrian/Bicycle Transportation Plan and the intent is not to review the plans but rather to implement them through mobility implementation.

There is also the work the Commission did on multimodal LOS that involves a layered network approach. The focus will be on how all the various modal plans and other objectives for the public right-of-way work together, how they complement each other, and how investments are prioritized when there are conflicts. Much of the prioritization happens in the land use context. The metrics standards and guidelines approved by the Commission in 2017 factor into the work.

The staff are working with a consultant team to develop an approach to multimodal concurrency. Ultimately the Commission will be presented with a recommendation for how to incorporate a multimodal approach to concurrency as a way of kickstarting the process.

Mr. McDonald said the other input to the Mobility Implementation Plan is the Comprehensive Transportation Project List. No one currently on the Commission was involved in the creation of that list, which was adopted in 2015. The document contains the entire list of all transportation projects that have been envisioned and developed through the city's long-range planning efforts, most recently the Eastgate Transportation Study concluded by the Commission in 2019. Amending the Comprehensive Transportation Project List requires a Comprehensive Plan amendment, so the proposal is to extract the document from the Comprehensive Plan and embed it instead in the Mobility Implementation Plan, making it an administratively adaptable project list that can easily be kept updated.

The process will be fairly continuous through the next year and a half or so. There will be fairly regular meetings on the topic, and the Commission will have the lead. The Commission will hold study sessions and workshops either virtually or in person. The Planning Commission, which has jurisdiction over the Comprehensive Plan, will take the ball once the Transportation Commission has developed recommendations on policy and will process the recommendations through the standard Comprehensive Plan amendment process, concluding by the end of 2021. The Council will provide direction and of course the necessary funding.

Commissioner Ting asked what the accepted definition of multimodal concurrency is, and where the staff are thinking of taking the topic given the direction given by the Council. Mr. McDonald explained that the Commission worked on the multimodal level of service document and within it described the intended level of service for all modes of travel, vehicles, pedestrians, bicycles and transit. The document provides metrics, guidelines and context. The Commission in fact introduced several new metrics for the different modes, including the

metric of corridor travel speed. That metric was developed because it was clear to the Commission based on public comment that the V/C ratio standard does not really relate to people; people cannot participate in an average but they can in travel time along a corridor. With respect to bicycles, the Commission introduced the notion of bike Level of Traffic Stress (LTS), which is the idea that in order to provide for a level of comfort for the average bicycle rider, the speed and volume of the adjacent street must be taken into consideration. The Commission prescribed a suite of bike facility components that when matched to the speed and volume of traffic creates the intended level of service for bicycles. There are 12 or more primary bicycle corridors defined in the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan. Those corridors are intended to have a LTS 1, meaning they are comfortable for all ages and abilities.

For the pedestrian modes, the Land Use Code has a default sidewalk width, which is 12 feet with seven feet of sidewalk and five feet of landscaping between the sidewalk and the street. The Commission recognized that as not being adequate in certain locations where there is a desire to have a greater pedestrian level of service, such as along in density developments, near schools and along the Frequent Transit Network. The Commission recommended wider sidewalks in those areas. The Commission also recognized that street crossings are an important part of the transportation system and that midblock crossings are appropriate at certain spacings dependent on the land use context.

With respect to transit, the Commission chose not to make any recommendations relative to transit service given that the city does not provide the service. The city does, however, provide the rights-of-way on which those services operate, and provides access to and from those services. The Commission developed guidance with respect to the types of facilities that are appropriate in the vicinity of a transit stop, and in support of the work that went into development of the Transit Master Plan, established a transit speed standard along corridors.

Commissioner Ting asked if the multimodal LOS approach is intended to be rolled up into a score that can be used in talking about concurrency. Mr. McDonald said that is not the intent. The staff are working with a consultant to develop a methodology for looking at concurrency that accounts for the infrastructure that serves all modes of transportation. It is based on a system completeness approach. In the end it may actually be an equation aimed at making sure the supply of mobility equals or exceeds the demand.

Commissioner Wu said the approved Transportation Master Plan should identify a transportation infrastructure system and implementation plans that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Currently there is no plan that outlines what the transportation system in Bellevue looks like. Also needed are systematic strategies for facilitating modal integration and adjusting modal conflicts. The outdated Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan was adopted in 2009, and there is the Transit Master Plan; both speak for themselves but they do not go together. The concurrency process also needs to be updated to ensure the systems keep up with the growth. There is a need to adjust the impacts of regional transportation on Bellevue city streets and to incorporate the Council's regional priorities and strategies. Finally, performance measures are needed that speak to and inform various stakeholder groups in the city, including the residential neighborhoods and the business community. The city's plans are all in silos and they are not integrated. There is the Comprehensive Transportation Project List, and while some of the projects in it are from recent planning efforts, others are legacy projects from largely unknown sources. There should be an identified process for setting transportation system priorities, whether they be regional or local. With the current budget outlook, the emphasis is on planning rather than implementation. She recommended that the Commission should inform the Council that the Mobility Implementation Plan is not consistent with its policy direction.

Chair Leitner noted that on September 24 there would be an open house on affordable housing in neighborhoods on properties that are tied to faith-based organizations. That could have a huge impact on traffic, especially in neighborhoods. She asked if transportation staff would be partnering with the affordable housing discussion as it moves forward. Mr. McDonald said staff from land use and transportation will be working together on the team assembled to work on the Mobility Implementation Plan.

Commissioner Teh asked how the Mobility Implementation Plan differs from the Transportation Master Plan. Mr. McDonald said his study of transportation master plans from inception to implementation, including in Redmond and Tacoma, has found that they essentially start from scratch and develop a robust project list that is current for all modes of transportation. The projects are all integrated into a single document so that they can be evaluated against each other, prioritized and implemented in a way that makes sense. The intent of the modal plans is to have them serve as an inventory of projects and as a toolkit for implementing them. The Mobility Implementation Plan is intended to integrate all of the separate modal plans, all of the policy direction that is embedded in the Comprehensive Plan, and the current Comprehensive Transportation Project List in a single document so that prioritization and equity lenses can be applied to the projects so that their implementation makes sense given the scarce resources both in terms of dollars and land.

Mr. Singelakis said the adopted plans will not just be taken as they are. Rather, the plans will need to be updated with new data as part of the Mobility Implementation Plan process.

Commissioner Wu stated that the Transportation Master Plan is a blueprint that outlines what the future will look like. That is the ultimate system with all of its components. There is also (inaudible... Comprehensive Plan(?)) where the city is going, and that is the all-important policy direction. Third is the implementation component, which builds on the known future and the known directions and serves as the strategies for how to get there. She said as things stand, the city is not ready to develop an implementation plan.

Commissioner Marciante said she did not disagree with Commissioner Wu but said she also understands the Council perspective. She agreed with Mr. Singelakis that the plans should not simply be taken and implemented as originally planned. There needs to be some understanding of the process by which the existing plans will be taken and translated into what is being called a Mobility Implementation Plan. The Commission is actively trying to understand how each mode integrates with each other, and the multimodal LOS approach is a good way to ensure that all modes are balanced. There is additional work to be done to update the plans, incorporating new data, and understanding an updated vision for the future. The process for updating the plans will need to be robust.

Mr. McDonald said he expected the topic to be before the Commission monthly through the end of 2021. The process likely will roll out in October or November. He clarified that the adopted mobility plans, like the Transit Master Plan and the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan, has had value added to them by the Commission through the multimodal LOS work done a couple of years ago. For instance, for the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan there are a lot of lines on the map and a lot of project descriptions that were done ten or twelve years ago, but the Commission added value to them by looking at those lines to see if they make sense given the current land use context. The Commission has provided guidance for how to implement the projects described in the older documents. A wholesale update of those adopted plans is therefore not needed as part of developing the Mobility Implementation Plan. What is needed is an expansion of the

range of tools and designs that are appropriate to implement those projects.

Commissioner Marciante said she did not want to discount any work already done by the Commission. She also said she did not want a repeat of the process used to review the bike lane project which was based on community information and very little data, putting the Commission in a position of creating policy. That process is partly what inspired the need for a mobility plan. Mr. McDonald agreed that the Mobility Implementation Plan should not take the Commission down the road of deeply being involved in the implementation of specific projects. The Mobility Implementation Plan will, however, provide the toolkit needed to make those decisions and data-driven rational tradeoffs between alternatives.

A motion to send to the Council the approved Transportation Master Plan transmittal letter to remind the Council of their direction and to give the Council the opportunity to refine its direction was made by Commissioner Wu. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ting.

Commissioner Ting asked for clarification of what is to be communicated to the Council. He asked if the intent is to seek further guidance from the Council, and what the intended result of the motion is. Commissioner Wu said the motion is to send back to the Council the direction provided by the Council to remind them of the direction given to the Commission. The Mobility Implementation Plan should ultimately be consistent with the direction given by the Council. Commissioner Ting noted that the Council has given specific direction to the Commission and he asked what outcome is desired as a result of the motion. Commissioner Wu said she wanted the Council to be reminded that whatever comes their way must be consistent with the direction given by the Council.

Chair Leitner called for the vote. Commissioners Teh, Ting and Wu voted in favor of the motion. Chair Leitner and Commissioner Marciante abstained from voting. Chair Leitner declared the motion approved.

Councilmember Robertson recommended sending a communication to the Council specifically clarifying what the Commission wants the Council to do. Chair Leitner said she would work with staff to ensure that the communication reflects the sentiment and intent of the motion. Commissioner Wu asked to be involved in that work.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. 2019 Transportation Concurrency Report

Mr. Yan noted that the 2020 concurrency report was based on 2019 conditions. He explained that the report provides an assessment of the performance of the existing transportation system. It takes the approved development, the approved proposed development, and all funded projects in the plan into consideration. The report is required by the Growth Management Act and by the city's Traffic Standards Code. The Traffic Standards Code has two performance metrics, the volume to capacity ratios and congestion allowance by the 14 Mobility Management Areas (MMA). Each MMA has different standards thresholds. Because the downtown and the Bel-Red areas have high development densities, either existing or anticipated, they have relatively high volume to capacity ratio thresholds. Neighborhood areas have relatively low volume to capacity ratios.



The BKR traffic model, which was developed in coordination by the cities of Bellevue, Kirkland and Redmond, takes the transportation system, land use and people into account in predicting what traffic conditions may look like. The Traffic Standards Code calls for focusing on the PM peak period, which is from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. Improvements to the BKR model were made and initiated in 2020 and that has led to more realistic results.

Land use is a big piece of the concurrency model. The year 2019 was active relative to development and about 4.5 million square feet of commercial development was approved, along with almost 2500 residential units. On the supply side, there were projects funded via the CIP and the neighborhood congestion levy. Some WSDOT projects also were counted in the modeling, including East Link light rail and the HOV lane on Bellevue Way from the park and ride lot to I-90.

Mr. Yan said the city remains in concurrency. With the funded CIP projects implemented, and with all the improved developments constructed, the city will maintain concurrency. In the past the East Bellevue area has teetered on the edge of the standards thresholds, and it remains in that condition under the recent analysis. He shared with the Commissioners a map indicating which intersections are meeting their standards comfortably, which are meeting the standards but are close to exceeding the threshold set for the MMA in which they are located, and which do not meet the threshold. He noted that the failed intersections are largely grouped along 148th Avenue SE in East Bellevue and Eastgate, though some are in the downtown.

While it is true that 148th Avenue SE is not the most congested road, it still has failing intersections because of the lower threshold in East Bellevue. The East Bellevue threshold was set for a neighborhood community, yet 148th Avenue SE is a regional arterial serving traffic between Bellevue and Redmond.

The results for the model showing 2025 conditions with all funded projects and approved developments in place are similar to the 2020 conditions. That is primarily due to the funded projects so that even with an additional 4.5 million square feet of commercial development and 2500 new dwelling units.

Mr. Yan said as development is proposed, the model will be run to determine if it meets the concurrency test. The model is a major tool used in the development review process. If a proposed development causes any of the performance standards to fail, the project must be downsized or have mitigations identified to bring the project back into concurrency or the development will be denied.

The current standard methodology was developed almost 30 years ago at a time when Bellevue was more of a typical bedroom community. The city has evolved significantly into a major regional employment center, and from a auto-dominated transportation system to a multimodal system. The current methodology is silent on modes other than autos and as such does not accurately reflect a full picture of the transportation system. The approach, if continued, will not be sustainable. The methodology needs to be updated.

Commissioner Marciante asked if the concurrency analysis yields any information about the types of projects that need to be done to ensure future development will not cause traffic. Mr. Yan said the current methodology, which is based on vehicular volume to capacity, dictates seeking intersection capacity improvements in order to stay concurrent. In the past the analysis was contributed to identifying reasonable improvements, particularly along 148th Avenue using levy congestion relief funds. Once the funded improvements are implemented, however,

there will be fewer and fewer options for avoiding exceeding the standards without getting into very expensive and environmentally costly solutions. Moving to a multimodal system measurement will allow for explicitly accounting for transit improvements, bicycle improvements, and other aspects.

Commissioner Ting asked Mr. Yan to keep the Commission informed with regard to how the LOS numbers are calculated. He said he likes the idea of having multiple options beyond just focusing on cars. Going forward it will be very important to figure out how those options are used by residents. If options are provided that are not actually used, nothing will be accomplished in terms of moving the number of people who need to move through the city.

#### B. Transportation Facilities Plan 2022-2033 Update

Senior Transportation Planner Michael Ingram said city code specifies the development and periodic update of the Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP), and the Transportation Commission is designated as the body in charge of overseeing the plan and recommending updates to it. A key feature of the TFP is that it is financially constrained. Only projects the city can afford over the 12-year span of the plan can be included.

The TFP serves three key purposes: it serves as an intermediate-range tool for prioritizing projects; it includes an environmental review with each update of the plan; and it is an important element of the impact fee structure.

The city has a number of long-range facility plans that have been developed over the years. Often they are focused on subareas and identify project needs in those areas. The projects identified through those studies go into the Comprehensive Transportation Project List. In addition there are modal plans, such as the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan and the Transit Master Plan. The TFP represents a first effort at taking all of the identified needs and desires and prioritizing them into what can be afforded over the 12-year planning horizon. The TFP serves as a first-cut of projects to be included in the city's seven-year Capital Investment Program (CIP), which is updated every two years. The environmental review looks ahead at the anticipated growth in land use and the associated transportation demand for the horizon year, which for the current update is 2033. Other environmental conditions associated with the horizon year are also analyzed, such as air quality and noise levels. The subset of projects in the TFP, those expected to be built and on the ground by the horizon year, can be counted against the new development expected to occur. Thus a portion of the cost of those projects can be assessed against new development, and the revenue collected via impact fees feeds back into the CIP and helps pay for the projects.

Mr. Ingram said there are 51 projects in the current TFP. Forty of them have actual designated funding allocations associated with them. There are another 11 ped/bike projects that have scored well in the evaluation process but which have been determined to be better prioritized through other ongoing efforts of the city, including the Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative. Eleven of the projects with funding allocations are anticipated to be either started or completed by the end of 2021. Completed projects will not be included in the update to the TFP, but those started but not yet completed will be carried over. Of the 11 ped/bike projects, five are expected to be significantly advanced, including the 108th Avenue bicycle improvements currently being constructed through the downtown; 112th Avenue NE to the north of the downtown; and an element of the Mountains to Sound Greenway project where it crosses Factoria Boulevard. Of the 51 projects, 19 have placeholder funding at the nominal \$300,000 level. An example is the intersection of 116th Avenue NE and NE 12th Street just

north of the hospitals. The analysis shows there may be a problem at that location in the future, but exactly what the solution is remains unknown pending additional analysis. The placeholder funding is a recognition that work needs to be done in terms of a preliminary design. Another type of placeholder funding is associated with where the city recognizes the need and importance for a project for which the city will not necessarily take the lead in implementing it. An example would be 124th Avenue NE at SR-520, a WSDOT interchange that currently has access to and from the west. WSDOT has in its long-range plan the need to add access to and from the east. The city also recognizes the need and that is why placeholder funding has been included in the TFP.

Within the current TFP there are three funding reserves. One is the Pedestrian and Bicycle Implementation Initiative reserve which has \$24.7 million. The second is for transit infrastructure improvements totaling \$4 million. The third is for the Levy congestion reduction projects. The overall Levy raises about \$ 7 million annually, \$2 million of which are designated for congestion reduction. There is a separate process for evaluating projects associated with the Levy. There is \$24 million in the congestion reduction reserve, \$2 million for each of the 12 years of the TFP.

Turning to the revenue side, Mr. Ingram said the current 2019-2030 TFP adds up to a significant sum. The reality is, however, that the amount to work with in the TFP process is quite a lot less. Funding comes from the general CIP and funds dedicated to transportation projects either by law or city policy. Funds also flow into the TFP from the TIFIA loan, a federal loan the city received to advance the implementation of major projects in the Bel-Red area. That money will be largely spent in the coming years and the city will have to start paying it back. The levy and the impact fees are also revenue sources, and money is also received from grants. More than half the projected income is already constrained in the adopted CIP.

Mr. Ingram shared with the Commissioners the draft TFP update timeline. The chart identified the key steps in the process and the Commission's role in each step. He noted that a preliminary TFP project list would be in hand by April 2021 and an endorsement of the list will be sought from the Commission. The list will then be shared with the Council and the Council's endorsement will be needed before proceeding with the environmental analysis, which requires about five months. Later in the year the results of the environmental analysis will be shared with the Commission and the Commission will be requested to recommend the final draft of the TFP to the Council for adoption before the end of the year.

The Commissioners were told that during the remainder of 2020 staff would be before the Commission with the public involvement strategy, the staff-proposed candidate project list, a review of the modal project framework and prioritization criteria, staff's scoring of the projects, and the relationship of the TFP with the ongoing levy and project implementation.

Commissioner Marciante asked how the process will change once there is a Mobility Implementation Plan in hand. Mr. Ingram said that is a topic of ongoing conversation. There will be an evolving landscape for the transportation planning framework as the TFP update work moves forward. The reality is the code will not be change for the current update work, though the direction things are headed can be anticipated. There will not be any significant changes until there are code updates. It can be expected that the next time the TFP is updated, the process will look quite a bit different, and the Mobility Implementation Plan can be expected to provide a lot of direction as to priorities and how to evaluate them.

Commissioner Wu commented that the pandemic has changed the way people work and move around the city, and that will continue for some time. That will have implications for transportation demand management and the modeling work. She asked staff to keep that in mind and to the degree possible take the approach to the data into account. Mr. Ingram said his team tends to look to the modeling group for what to expect in the horizon year forecasts. The model is updated annually based on current conditions, so it will incorporate the evolving transportation landscape as it happens.

Commissioner Wu asked if there are bridges in the city that are maintained by the city, or if all the bridges in the city are under the control of WSDOT, and she asked if the city's maintenance program in the TFP is adequate. Mr. Ingram said the ongoing maintenance programs will be addressed during the work to update the TFP. He added that the ongoing programs absorb a fair amount of the available resources.

Commissioner Ting said he would like staff at a later date to provide the Commission with an update on how the impact fees are changed by the new framework, both in terms of how the fees are collected and how they are distributed. Mr. Ingram said the impact fee structure will be addressed through a separate initiative. It will largely follow the update of the TFP.

Implementation Planning Manager Eric Miller said the impact fees are governed by a set of city codes. Any changes to the impact fees to incorporate a multimodal approach will occur in the second phase of the overall process which is currently scheduled out beyond 2021. The current impact fee program will continue for the current TFP update cycle. He said he would keep the Commission up to date as the process evolves. He stressed that there will be a review of the program under the current code given that the roadway capacity projects in the TFP form the basis for the current impact fee program.

Commissioner Wu said going forward she would like to know how much funding has been assigned to each of the funding buckets. Mr. Ingram noted the request.

## 8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

### A. June 25, 2020

Commissioner Ting referred to the first paragraph on page 11 and said the second sentence should be amended to read "He noted that likely scenario projected by the Puget Sound Regional Council is 20 percent EV adoption by 2040 and that the King County aggressive adoption rates are 25 percent by 2031 and 100 percent by 2050 and asked if the numbers were based on business as usual, especially for the likely category."

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

## 9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

## 10. NEW BUSINESS

Chair Leitner announced that she had tendered her resignation from the Commission effective next week. She said she and her husband have faced a lot of changed due to Covid-19. She said her husband, who is an airline pilot, has had his job significantly impacted. Accordingly, the family has had to make some significant life changes, including the decision to move out of

Bellevue. She said she was grateful to have had the opportunity to serve on the Commission and to learn, grow and share her point of view. She said she would miss being a part of the Commission.

Councilmember Robertson said she was heartbroken to hear the news. She said Chair Leitner has been a wonderful addition to the Commission and has ably led the Commission through a difficult time. She said she appreciated the work of Chair Leitner on the Commission and with Congregations for the Homeless and wished her all the best.

Commissioner Ting thanked Chair Leitner for her hard work and said it had been an honor serving with her, starting at the same time. He said he greatly admired her level-headed thinking, clarity of thought and articulate words.

Commissioner Wu said it was sad the pandemic has impacted the Leitner family so much. She said it had been a privilege to have worked with Chair Leitner and to benefit from her wisdom.

Chair Leitner said she intended to remain employed by Congregations for the Homeless, a journey embarked on many years ago. She said her focus has been on seeing a permanent shelter built in Bellevue that will be beautiful, successful and a great addition to the community. She thanked everyone for their kind words.

## 11. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

### A. Upcoming Agenda Items

Mr. McDonald briefly reviewed with the Commissioners the calendar of upcoming meetings and agenda items. He noted that at the October meeting the Commission will need to select a new Vice Chair and elevate Vice Chair Marciante to the role of Chair.

Note: The City Attorney's Office has determined that an election for Chair will be required. The Vice Chair serves in the temporary absence of the Chair, but does not automatically assume the permanent role in the event of the Chair's resignation.

## 12. ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Marciante. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Teh and the motion carried unanimously.

Chair Leitner adjourned the meeting at 8:56 p.m.

---

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

---

Date