CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

October 8, 2020 Bellevue City Hall
6:30 p.m. Virtual Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Chair Marciante, Commissioners Beason, Klutznick, Ting, Wu
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	Commissioner Teh
STAFF PRESENT:	Kevin McDonald, Andrew Singelakis, Michael Ingram, Eric Miller, Kristi Oosterveen, Paula Stevens, Department of Transportation; Michael Austin, Department of Community Development
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 Commissioner Marciante who presided.

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Teh, who was excused.

A. Introduce New Commissioners

Commissioner Marciante took a moment to welcome the new Commissioners Christina Beason and Matthew Klutznick. She noted that a third new Commissioner would be appointed on October 19.

Commissioner Beason said she has lived and worked in downtown Bellevue for over ten years. She said she was looking for a way to give back to the community while supporting the vision for the future of Bellevue. She said it was an honor to appointed a member of the Commission.

Commissioner Klutznick said he also was excited to be a member of the Commission. He said he has lived and worked in downtown Bellevue for four years. He said he has a lot at stake in terms of the future of transportation in the city and was excited to be able to provide input.

The other Commissioners and the staff took a moment to introduce themselves to the new Commissioners.

B. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

Principal Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald facilitated the election of the Chair, noting that in accord with the Commission's bylaws the Commission must select a new Chair in the event of the resignation of a Chair. He noted that he had offline invited the Commissioners to nominate a Commissioner to serve as Chair and that that exercise yielded only one nominee,

Commissioner Marciante. He sought from the floor any additional nominations for Chair and there were none.

Absent additional nominations, Mr. McDonald declared nomination for the position of Chair closed. With only a single candidate having been nominated, he declared Commissioner Marciante to be elected as Chair.

Chair Marciante facilitated the election of Vice Chair, noting that offline a single nomination for the position had been made, namely Commissioner Teh. She called for any other nominations from the floor and there were none.

Commissioner Wu asked if Commissioner Teh had accepted the nomination to serve as Vice Chair. Mr. McDonald said he had not spoken directly with Commissioner Teh about the nomination. He said it certainly would be better to have Commissioner Teh formally accept the nomination before the vote.

There was consensus to postpone electing a Vice Chair until the Commission's next meeting.

C. Decision to Add Oral Communications to Zoom Agenda

Chair Marciante noted that on June 25 the Commission voted to temporarily suspend the provisions of the Commission's bylaws Article 6 paragraphs D.4 and D.11 which allowed for public comment to be provided only in writing during virtual meetings. The City Council now is receiving oral communications from the general public at its regular meetings and the City Clerk has authorized that boards and commissions may do the same. A motion and a vote is necessary to restore the provisions that were temporarily suspended.

A motion to reinstate the provisions of the Commission's bylaws, Article 6 paragraphs D.4 and D.11, to allow for written and oral public comments at virtual Commission meetings was made by Chair Marciante.

Commissioner Wu asked by way of point of order if the Chair is allowed to make motions. Councilmember Robertson said it is not normal procedure for the Chair to make motions. However, under Roberts Rules of Order it is not out of order for small, relatively informal bodies.

Chair Marciante restated the motion which was then seconded by Commissioner Beason. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. McDonald clarified that oral communications would be allowed beginning in November.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

Mr. McDonald noted that prior to the meeting he confirmed with the City Clerk's office that it was not necessary to vote on allowing the use of video by Commissioners and staff during virtual meetings. He said he would work to make the option to use video available at the November meeting.

3. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Marciante noted the receipt of one written comment regarding the Transportation Facilities Plan.

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

Councilmember Robertson added her welcome to the new Commissioners and confirmed that a third appointment would be made by the Council on October 19, bringing the Commission back to full strength. She said the city's budget process is under way. The City Manager will release his proposal during October and the final budget hearing will occur in November. The Council is scheduled to take action the first Monday in December. It appears there will be cuts of about eight percent across the board, though the cuts will not necessarily be made evenly.

Commissioner Wu voiced her appreciation for the dedication of Councilmember Robertson to the Commission. She asked if the Council has scheduled a retreat. Councilmember Robertson said the Council was originally slated to hold its retreat on October 1-3, but until allowed to gather in a larger group in King County, the Council will not be holding a retreat. Retreats cannot be done well on Zoom.

5. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. McDonald said regulations regarding the use of foot scooters in Bellevue will be before the Council on January 19. Under the current code, it is unlawful to use a scooter on the sidewalks. With the rising popularity of e-scooters, direction will be sought from the Council on how to proceed, including on how to engage the community and the Commission in developing a set of regulatory amendments that may allow for the use of scooters on sidewalks. The issue may end up being a work program item pending Council direction.

Commissioner Wu asked if staff would be focused on how to allow scooters on sidewalks or if direction would first be sought from the Council as to whether or not scooters should be allowed on sidewalks. Mr. McDonald said the issue involves two parts: first should they be allowed and then how to allow them.

Assistant Transportation Director Paula Stevens said staff will first seek an answer to the should they be allowed question. The how question will be raised only if the Council agrees scooters should be allowed on the sidewalks. If the Council approves, the Commission will work with staff to determine the options for allowing scooters on city sidewalks. A third question, which remains to be answered, is whether or not a scooter share program should be launched in the community.

With regard to the NE 12th Street multipurpose path project, Mr. McDonald reported that on October 5 the Council approved the construction contract for the project on the north side of NE 12th Street. The 12-foot path will be located between the bike lanes on 108ths and the multipurpose path that extends across I-405 to the Spring District. Construction should begin soon and be completed by the first or second quarter of 2021.

Mr. McDonald said that project ties in nicely with the opening of Spring Boulevard, which occurred on October 6. The half-mile of new roadway took approximately four years of

construction. It includes travel lanes for vehicles and a multipurpose path on the north side that runs all the way into the heart of the Spring District and serves the light rail station. There will in the future be additional extensions of Spring Boulevard further to the east.

Senior Transportation Planner Michael Ingram said there was a ribbon cutting grand opening for the Crossroads trail on September 22. The trail runs from Northup Way on the north end to NE 15th Street on the south end, connecting the neighborhoods to the north, Interlake High School and other schools, to the Crossroads commercial area, Crossroads Park and the community center. The connection has been used for many years by people and the city has enjoyed public access rights to most of the length. Once the last piece was acquired, the city was able to fully develop the trail as an improved facility. The trail will appeal broadly to the people in the community.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Grand Connection Design Guidelines

Senior Planner Michael Austin explained that the Planning Commission is the steward for the Grand Connection project. He said the presentation to the Transportation Commission was intended to keep the Commission up to speed.

Mr. Austin said the Grand Connection is being referred to as an interactive, connected experience that runs through the heart of Bellevue. It is a signature project that links all major civic, cultural and commercial elements together. In particular it will link the waterfront area to the future Eastrail.

Sequence One of the Grand Connection runs from the intersection of 100th Avenue NE and Main Street in Old Bellevue through Downtown Park, along Bellevue Way and cuts over onto what is referred to currently as the pedestrian corridor on NE 6th Street. The scope of work actually terminates at 110th Avenue NE at the transit center. Sequence Two will carry the work further to the east to Eastrail and will encompass the civic center, the potential I-405 lid concept, and the Wilburton area.

Mr. Austin explained that the Grand Connection project is headed by the departments of community development and development services. The core team includes representatives from those two developments as well as the parks and transportation departments. Mr. McDonald represents transportation as a core team member. The team structure also includes a list of subject matter experts. The adoption of the Sequence One and Sequence Two Grand Connection framework plan a few years ago set the stage for all of the implementation efforts aimed at moving the vision forward. The framework plan acts as the guiding vision that all the various elements fall under, including activation strategies, intersection improvements, wayfinding plans, and the I-405 lid concept feasibility study. While the framework plan functions as a high-level vision, it is not regulatory in nature and provides multiple tools for implementation. The standards and guidelines in its most basic form an update of the Pedestrian Corridor and Major Public Open Space guidelines. It is a regulatory document and serves as a single tool for implementation. It deals with language in the Downtown Code and supports the standards and guidelines projects located along the route of Sequence One.

The Grand Connection is talked about as one long effort, but it is acknowledged that it is

broken up into different unique elements referred to as rooms. The rooms serve as unique character zones that create different elements of interest for those who walk along the route. There are common elements that form a cohesive look overall, but unique elements to each of the rooms.

The Commissioners were informed that staff conducted an audit of all existing guidelines and principles. In addition, a number of precedent studies from jurisdictions across the country were carried out with a particular eye on design guidelines and principles best practices. Attention was given to reducing the number of redundancies that exist in the code and to incorporating the outreach comments gathered over the last few years in regard to the Grand Connection itself. The Pedestrian Corridor and Major Public Open Space design guidelines is a separate document on top of the existing downtown code guidelines, so anything that can be done to streamline the process will be beneficial. The staff have worked to merge the stand-alone content in the Pedestrian Corridor and Major Open Space design guidelines into the body of the downtown Land Use Code, and have worked on drafting a new Grand Connection section to be housed within the downtown Land Use Code for easy reference.

A number of supporting diagrams will be developed to illustrate how the design guidelines and standards could be achieved. They will serve as a quick reference for design teams by illustrating the intent of a space. They will not be intended to design a space for a design team, nor will they be intended to be suggestive of what a design outcome should be. The Commissioners were shown the draft illustration for the Transit Central room. It was noted the illustration was all about creating a multimodal experience, primarily serving pedestrians but also tying into all the other modes serving the downtown. Creating an exceptional experience for pedestrians will be of key importance for the room.

There will be language in the documentation about having an embedded wayfinding component throughout the Grand Connection. The proposal is to go with embedded materials within the sidewalk element. Consideration has also been given to having a signature Grand Connection color embedded within different elements to alert pedestrians they are on the Grand Connection route. A double allée of trees will be encouraged to help steer pedestrians along the route. Open or forest spaces along active retail edges will be encouraged as a way of supporting active downtown experiences.

The Garden Hillclimb room is a sloping segment formerly known as the cattle chute. The wayfinding element will be continued, spilling down the series of steps on the site. Much more lush landscaping treatments will be encouraged to build on the notion of a garden experience. For the Plaza as Street room, which is the segment between the Bellevue Arts Museum and the Bellevue Collection and Compass Plaza, is envisioned as having more of a curb-less experience that merges auto usage and pedestrian experiences on the same level. The key elements for the room will be active uses that will create a lively experience. Opportunities for artist-designed benches and seating will be encouraged along with playful features.

Mr. Austin said the staff are still working to complete the internal review of the draft standards and guidelines. The city is fortunate in that it is able to partner with and learn from active projects along the corridor, including 555 108th and Bellevue 600. Staff have been able to work with the design teams to test the language of the design guidelines. All of the feedback garnered from the external stakeholder testing will be carried back to the Planning Commission later in the fall and into the winter months for review.

Commissioner Wu said she is very excited about the project. She thanked Mr. Austin for the

information and pointed out that transportation and land use go hand in hand. She asked for clarification of the relationship between the framework plan and the various elements. Mr. Austin explained that what started as the Grand Connection initiative kicked off in 2015. With it there was the development of the framework plan which was separated into Sequence One and Sequence Two. Many of the visuals were created in partnership with the landscape architects firm Balmori Associates. There are various ways to make the vision a reality when moving the project into the implementation phases. One is through private development which requires design guidelines to help inform how something should look. Other ways include things like project improvements that take place in the right-of-way, such as the exceptional intersections program. The activation pilot study conducted in 2019 was done in conjunction with the Bellevue Downtown Association. The project included having seating located along the Grand Connection along with lanterns that were hung to give people an idea of the route. The standards and guidelines are like the code and policy elements that will inform private development that falls along the Grand Connection.

Commissioner Ting asked if the term "people-oriented" as used in the materials means pedestrian-oriented, or if also includes things like bicycles. Mr. Austin said much of the work involves tying in the various mobility related plans that exist and using them to inform what could be folded into the downtown Land Use Code. In the case of the route itself, parts of it are located only along different sidewalk features which could include bicycle access comingled with pedestrian access. There is a guideline aimed at ensuring there will not be conflict areas. There are also areas along the corridor that involve automobile traffic and pedestrian traffic where bicycle activity could also be allowed even though there is no official bicycle path for the area.

Commissioner Ting asked if the Grand Connection could serve as an opportunity to create another bicycle corridor. Mr. Austin said the question is a good one. He said there have been a lot of discussions around what areas could facilitate a little more bicycle access. What it comes down to is the allocation of the limited space.

Commissioner Wu noted that the Bellevue 600 development project is under way, which has opportunities for the transit center segment. With regard to the Garden Hillclimb segment, she asked if opportunities are being seen to make something happen there. Mr. Austin said the 555 108th project was permitted before work began on developing the design guidelines. Projects do take a long time, however, and Vulcan, Site Workshop and BBJ have continued to meet with staff to discuss ways to weave the Grand Connection identity into their project. That is evidence that everyone is excited about wanting to make the Grand Connection vision a reality.

B. Transportation Facilities Plan, 2022-2033

Senior Transportation Planner Michael Ingram explained that the Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) is required by city code, and the Transportation Commission is designated as the body to oversee and ultimately recommend updates to the plan to the City Council. A key feature of the plan is that it is financially constrained, which means there must be projected revenues to cover all of the projects in the plan. The challenge, then, is determining what the priorities are and what the city can afford.

The TFP fills three key purposes. First, it is the city's intermediate-range planning tool. The long-range facility plans and the functional plans identify various project needs which are then incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. The TFP is a first cut at taking the collective needs and determining the real priorities that can be afforded. The TFP serves as the foundation for

the Capital Investment Program (CIP), which is part of the city's budget and which outlines which projects will actually be funded for implementation. The second purpose of the TFP is the environmental review. Each time the TFP is updated, there is a look ahead at the expected growth and development over the 12-year term of the document. That look includes projecting where the growth is expected to happen and the related transportation demands. Third, the TFP serves as a key element of the city's impact fee program.

Mr. Ingram said the preliminary list of candidate projects serve as the starting point for the TFP update process. The list is drawn from the current TFP, which has about ten projects that will be built by the time the plan update occurs; some 40 projects will not be completed by then, and by default those projects become candidates for the plan update. There are a number of ongoing efforts focused on the needs and opportunities for smaller-scale projects in various areas of need, including congestion reduction which is funded through the transportation levy at $2 million per year. The levy program has its own process for identifying and evaluating projects. Some of the projects that will be funded through the levy will be default be brought into the TFP. Projects identified through the levy process will become candidate projects for inclusion in the new TFP. There are similar types of efforts going on in terms of ped/bike projects. There are programs that fund such projects from the regular city budget, and of course the levy funds and supplements them as well. Each of those programs has its own process for identifying and evaluating projects, many of which make for good candidates for the TFP update.

Another key category from which projects are drawn is the Comprehensive Transportation Project List. That document houses all of the projects that have been identified by subarea plans. The projects on the list that have not been funded and built are included on the preliminary candidate project list. Projects on the candidate list identified as "new" are those that have been identified by staff and the public.

Mr. Ingram shared with the Commissioners a map showing the location of projects in the existing TFP. He noted that they fall into the categories of capacity projects, which benefit vehicle or transit mobility, and non-capacity ped/bike projects. Some projects are fully funded while other are only partially funded, such as 120th Avenue NE to the north of Spring Boulevard where preliminary work has been done and additional design work is under way. There is also a roadway project by Bellevue College that is primarily for the benefit of transit; it is shown as a capacity project though it is not fully funded for implementation. The sidewalk project on SE 34th Street leading to West Lake Sammamish Parkway is an example of a fully funded non-capacity project. The Mountains to Sound Greenway trail is another non-capacity project that is fully funded only in segments.

Capital Facilities Planning and Programming Administrator Kristi Oosterveen said the Neighborhood Sidewalk Program serves as a source of non-capacity projects. She shared with the Commissioners a map showing some of the candidate Neighborhood Sidewalk Program projects. She highlighted some projects in the Northwest Bellevue neighborhood, particularly three projects that ranked high in the prioritization framework of the Neighborhood Sidewalk Program and which are fully funded for implementation in 2022. Funding from the levy is leveraged to facilitate building some sidewalk segments.

Mr. Ingram said another source of candidate projects are the bike network projects. He noted that work is ongoing to analyze the opportunities and needs on the bicycle side under the Bicycle Rapid Implementation Program. The effort builds on work done earlier to update the city's Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan, which identifies priority bicycle corridors that span the city.

The current work is focused on enhancing bicycle mobility by addressing the gaps and making bicycling more comfortable for all ages and abilities. The multimodal LOS work done over the last two years has served up a toolkit for better analyzing projects. The idea is to look holistically at the needs and opportunities within the subareas rather than targeting particular corridors.

Transit mobility improvements have also been identified on the candidate project list. The seven projects listed according to the key points in Bellevue that they connect. One example is the Downtown-Crossroads transit connection. The B Line frequent route serves that purpose using as its main corridor NE 8th Street. The Transit Master Plan identifies corridors used by transit as well as opportunities for improving transit speed and reliability in key locations. In project terms, the needs are flagged by corridor. Through the multimodal LOS framework, the target is an average functioning operating speed of 14 miles per hour for transit in the Downtown-Crossroads corridor.

Mr. Ingram said the Comprehensive Transportation Project List houses all of the needs and projects identified through the various planning efforts. To the extent they have not been implemented, the projects have been included on the candidate project list.

The project evaluation process will be discussed in more detail at the Commission's meeting in November. The anticipation is that there will be a very thorough evaluation of the roadway and intersection projects, of which there are many on the list. The work will include a scoring exercise using criteria that has been used in the past. The levy programs have their own project evaluation processes that will be relied on for choosing the top candidates. While the levy and the city's various programs can sustain projects up to a certain level, there are also projects with higher costs than can be addressed from within the levy or specific program. One example is the Newport Way project from Somerset Boulevard to 150th Avenue SE which carries a price tag upwards of $10 million. It is listed as a standalone project in the TFP and in the CIP.

The final step in the TFP update process will be to develop a prioritized list of projects that span the various modes.

Ms. Oosterveen said the public involvement strategy for the TFP update will involve monthly meetings with the Commission; a webpage dedicated just to the TFP that will be kept updated as the process moves forward; an online open house that will include a survey and an interactive map showing the candidate projects; announcements in various publications, including *It's Your City and Neighborhood News*, press releases, notices on Nextdoor, and an email listserv. She said staff will gather all of the information and put together a report summarizing all of the outreach activities and compiling the feedback received.

With regard to the process timeline, Ms. Oosterveen shared with the Commissioners a spreadsheet highlighting the issues to be addressed by the Commission at its monthly meetings through the summer/fall of 2021.

Commissioner Wu called attention to project TFP-211, the NE 6th Street extension, and asked if the extension will run to 120th Avenue NE as noted in the project description or only to 116th Avenue NE. She noted that 120th Avenue NE is essentially the Main Street in the Wilburton commercial area. It does not have a large capacity and leading freeway traffic to 120th Avenue NE may not be the best idea. Mr. Ingram said the project will be reviewed as part of the TFP update process, and the project definition could change. He allowed, however, that the TFP may not be the correct process for determining what the east terminus of the NE

6th Street extension should be. The Wilburton planning process will be starting up again soon and that would be a better venue for making a terminus recommendation. The TFP description for the project could be drafted to indicate the roadway could terminate at either street.

Commissioner Ting asked how to determine which projects on the candidate project list are funded by the levy and therefore subject to different criteria. Mr. Ingram said the projects are grouped to reflect those that come via those programs. For example, the congestion relief program capacity projects are listed in their own category. The Neighborhood Sidewalk Program projects are also in their own category. Commissioner Ting said it would be helpful if the chart or commentary highlighted which projects are associated with the levy.

Commissioner Ting asked how the number of dollars in the bucket of funds earmarked for ped/bike projects was determined. Mr. Ingram said while it was partly leftover funds, there was also a recognition that a chunk of money needed to be allocated to ped/bike projects. There was nothing scientific about the $21.7 million number, but it certainly recognizes that some of the projects are quite costly. If progress is going to be made on some of the heavy lift projects, a meaningful amount of money will need to be set aside. With regard to the Transit Master Plan Metro Connects reserve of $4 million, there was discussion at the Commission level about that amount. The recommended amount initially came from staff but there was also research done to determine what King County Metro had in terms of their capital plans and what Seattle was proposing to spend on transit mobility. The Commission settled on the $21.7 million.

Commissioner Wu called attention to 128th Avenue SE and commented that the project on the west side of the street is relatively new and it has proven to be a great addition. She asked staff to highlight for the Commission similar projects. Ms. Oosterveen said the project mentioned was a Neighborhood Sidewalk Program project. The program was able to complete four different sidewalk sections in the area, including 128th Avenue SE from SE 7th Street to NE 2nd Street, and NE 2nd Street from 128th Avenue SE to 124th Avenue SE, as well as the pathway in front of the new Wilburton school and a portion on 118th Avenue SE on Main Street that filled in a missing gap. Some traffic calming elements were also installed. She also pointed out that the Neighborhood Sidewalk Program is supplemented by the levy. The five projects included on the candidate list are similar in nature to the project on 128th Avenue SE.

Commissioner Wu said if there are significant projects in addition to the five on the list, the Commission should be told about them. She said one example she was thinking about was a segment on 156th Avenue NE to the south of NE 8th Street where there is currently no sidewalk. Ms. Oosterveen said the Neighborhood Sidewalk Program has over 120 candidate projects that are not yet funded. The levy is a very important tool for addressing the backlog.

Answering a question asked by Chair Marciante, Ms. Oosterveen said the projects included on the candidate list are those for which there is a good sense about their cost and for which there are plans about building them. There are other projects that have not been vetted out to the level of specificity needed for inclusion on the TFP candidate list. There can only be so many projects on the TFP given the limited number of dollars projected to be available.

Mr. Ingram noted that the list of Neighborhood Sidewalk Program projects is large, the budget to implement the projects on the list is not. He said one option would be for the Commission to voice the opinion that implementing one or two projects per year is not enough and that there should be an extra allocation for the program. Realistically, neighborhood-level small-scale sidewalk projects do not score well on a citywide basis, and that is why they must be addressed through programs like the Neighborhood Sidewalk Program.

Commissioner Ting said it would be helpful to have the projects on the list grouped into themes. It might make sense for some separate projects to execute together rather than serially. For example, having an east-west bike corridor would make the most sense of all associated projects were brought online together, creating a contiguous route. He allowed that the financial constraints may make the all-at-once approach impractical. Mr. Ingram said for a number of years the contiguous projects needed to complete corridors was the focus. Funding was, however, the issue and progress was slow, which is why there are only a couple of connected corridors across the city. The focus has since changed to lower-cost, rapid-implementation opportunities which, if they work, can later be improved.

Commissioner Wu said she would like to see projects grouped by destination A to B. She said she would take her answer offline.

Commissioner Wu also noted that the city's intent is to build bicycle facilities that are comfortable for all ages and abilities, yet the projects on the list primarily are five-foot bike lanes which. Unless a project has been fully analyzed and it has been shown that a five-foot bike lane is the best for all ages and abilities, the project description should be left open to avoid preconceptions. Mr. Ingram said the point was well made. He added that the project descriptions shown came out of the current TFP and the various source documents. By next month the staff hope to have the list marked up with suggestions for how the project descriptions should change.

Commissioner Wu called attention to project TFP-222, the intersection of Bellevue Way and NE 4th Street. She asked if that project is coordinated with the Grand Connection project. Mr. Ingram allowed that it is.

Commissioner Wu referred to project TFP-268, the Bellevue Way HOV lane, and asked about the status of the other segments. Mr. Ingram said there was work done several years ago to assess the corridor. It was determined that the greatest benefit would flow from adding an HOV to the southern part of the roadway from Winters House south to the station at 112th Avenue SE. The northern sections were deemed to have significant costs and less benefit.

Implementation Planning Manager Eric Miller said the southern segment is partially funded. The current CIP has funding for design and an allocation for right-of-way.

Commissioner Wu referred to project TFP-273, Lakemont Boulevard/Forest Drive intersection signal improvement, and asked if a signal is the best way to address the issues at the intersection. Chair Marciante suggested staff should provide that answer offline.

Commissioner Wu stressed the need to make sure the projects on the list are aligned with King County Metro's plans. Mr. Ingram said a lot of coordination went into developing the original transit plan.

Chair Marciante asked the staff to come to the next meeting prepared to explain and discuss at what level of planning design the projects on the list are at, and what additional processes the projects will be subject to going forward toward implementation. She said she would also like to hear about how quickly the smaller projects can be turned around.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. September 10, 2020

Commissioner Wu asked Chair Marciante to clarify at the next meeting whether it is necessary to have a motion on the floor before offering suggestions to change the minutes, or if changes can be made first and then have a motion brought to the table to approve the minutes as changed. Chair Marciante said she would do that.

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Ting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wu.

Commissioner Wu called attention to the fourth paragraph on page 7 and suggested the third sentence should be revised to read "There is also strategies and directions where the city is going to implement the vision, and that is the all-important policy direction."

The motion to approve the minutes as amended carried unanimously.

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Draft Transmittal memo – Transportation Master Plan

Commissioner Wu commented that in June 2019 the City Council approved a recommendation from the Commission regarding the Transportation Master Plan. The recommendation was the result of the Commission's work with staff on the last go-around of the TFP. During the process the Commission discovered that the city was out of date in terms of its transportation planning process. It was highlighted that the city has many modal plans that are outdated, including the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan which was adopted in 2009. The Commission recommended the development of an integrated multimodal Transportation Master Plan. It was also recognized that there was a need to have high-level strategies for dealing with modal conflicts, and a need for a robust community involvement process.

Continuing, Commissioner Wu noted that last month staff provided the Commission with a presentation on the Mobility Implementation Plan. No written materials were provided at that time. It was felt that some of the primary features were missing from the Mobility Implementation Plan. Staff also spelled out some transportation priorities and indicated that there are a hundred or more transportation policy statements in the Comprehensive Plan, making it challenging to indicate which priorities are the top transportation priorities.

A motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes was made by land use. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ting and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Wu said the staff explained that the Mobility Implementation Plan is equivalent to the Transportation Master Plan as approved by the Council. The Commission at its last meeting was concerned that the Mobility Implementation Plan is off the direction and passed a motion to bring the issue to the attention of the Council and to ask the Council to weigh in on corrective actions. Staff has since provided a response to the transmittal letter, and she said had difficulty in making sense of it. She said she subsequently spoke with the transportation department director to better understand the staff response.

Department of Transportation Director Andrew Singelakis said the staff carefully reviewed the motion of the Commission that was transmitted to the Council during the meeting about the TFP. In the opinion of the staff, the Mobility Implementation Plan only differs from the

proposed Transportation Master Plan in its title. He allowed that other departments were confused about Transportation Master Plan versus the Comprehensive Plan. Given the budget restraints, the work needs to be finished by the end of 2021 so that multimodal concurrency can be put in place.

Commissioner Ting asked for clarity on the timeframe of the scope and deliverables of the Mobility Implementation Plan, adding that it appeared it was 20 to 30 years. He asked if it would also include tradeoffs in the strategies that will derive from the Comprehensive Plan but serve as a layer between the Comprehensive Plan and the actual implementation policies. Mr. McDonald said that is one of the primary objectives of the Mobility Implementation Plan. The Comprehensive Plan and the modal plans have a long list of projects, all of which are prioritized within each group and type of project. The Mobility Implementation Plan is intended to integrate those projects in a layered network so as to identify priority projects between modes by looking at the projects in the context of the type of transportation system they create, and then working to identify a more comprehensive approach, either on a corridor basis or within neighborhoods to implement the project list. The Mobility Implementation Plan will be a rolling process and will be periodically updated as new information comes in. It is intended to be a living document outside of the Comprehensive Plan. The Mobility Implementation Plan will not have a specific time horizon. It is intended to describe what the complete transportation system looks like, independent of time horizons that are defined in the TFP and CIP processes.

Commissioner Wu pointed out that the Transportation Master Plan is intended to create a long-term vision looking out 30 or 40 years. She said the response of staff mentions that the Mobility Implementation Plan will include all objectives in the Transportation Master Plan. The Commission, however, has not had a chance to review the scope given that the project is just ramping up. She said it was her understanding that staff intends to involve the Commission. She suggested the Commission should be provided with and then review a project scope along with an outline of the community involvement process. The Commission and the community should also weigh in on the overarching priorities for the transportation system. Mr. Singelakis said developing the scope of work is usually something handled by the staff. He said staff be bringing back to Commission an outline of what is in the scope and what the public involvement plan looks like, but it would not be a good idea for the Commission to determine the scope of work that will be sent out to the consulting community. The Commission will be very involved in the work as it progresses, and the public will be involved as well. The department is under a very tight timeframe to complete the work by the end of 2021 with only a limited budget.

Commissioner Wu suggested the content of the transmittal letter is not necessary. However, the Commission might want to send an information piece to the Council to let them know that the Transportation Master Plan will be called the Mobility Implementation Plan going forward. Mr. Singelakis said the Council approved a CIP item for partial funding of the Mobility Implementation Plan, so they are already aware of the name change. He agreed that the Council should be kept updated throughout the process.

Chair Marciante noted the Commission had previously discussed providing the Council with a quarterly report. Mr. McDonald said some of the city's boards and commissions have more issues before the Council more frequently. Given that the Transportation Commission more frequently has items before the Council, a quarterly report is not as necessary. For that reason, he said he has not been religious about scheduling meetings with the Council on a quarterly basis.

A motion to extend the meeting by five minutes was made by Commissioner Ting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wu and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Ting said if the Council has been informed that the Commission is working on the Transportation Master Plan, for which they gave approval, a change in direction, such as renaming it the Mobility Implementation Plan, should be relayed to the Council.

Chair Marciante asked Councilmember Robertson if the Council is aware that the Transportation Master Plan is now called the Mobility Implementation Plan. Councilmember Robertson said the Council is aware of that. Staff made it very clear when they came seeking funding in September, and the Council approved the funding with that understanding.

Commissioner Wu said she would be comfortable asking for a motion to rescind the Commission's previous motion regarding the transmittal letter. Chair Marciante proposed in the interest of time holding that off until the next meeting.

Councilmember Robertson said motions to rescind are only in order at the meeting immediately following the meeting at which the motion was made. She said the direction given by the Commission to the staff would be sufficient and that rescinding the motion was not necessary.

A motion to rescind the previous motion to send a memo to the City Council about the Transportation Master Plan was made by Commissioner Ting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Wu.

A motion to amend the motion to say the Commission rescinds the motion to send a memo to the City Council about the Transportation Master Plan based on the conversation with staff during the meeting, that staff will provide further information on the Mobility Implementation Plan at future meetings, and that the Transportation Commission will make a recommendation regarding the Mobility Implementation Plan to the Council in the future, was made by Commissioner Wu.

Councilmember Robertson weighed in by pointing out that the motion to rescind and the motion as outlined by Commissioner Wu are separate issues. She suggested acting on the motion to rescind and then at the next meeting to take up the issue of how the Commission will ultimately make a recommendation to the City Council.

The motion to rescind the previous motion carried unanimously.

A motion to extend the meeting by five minutes was made by Commissioner Ting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beason and the motion carried unanimously.

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – None

12. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. McDonald took a moment to review with the Commissioners the calendar of upcoming meetings and agenda items.

13. ADJOURNMENT

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

Chair Marciante adjourned the meeting at 9:26 p.m.

_____ _____

Secretary to the Transportation Commission Date