

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

March 11, 2021
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Virtual Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Marciante, Commissioners Beason, Klutznick, Stash, Teh, Ting

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Andrew Singelakis, Eric Miller, Kristi Oosterveen, Michael Ingram, Department of Transportation; Chris Breiland, Don Samdahl, Fehr & Peers

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 Marciante who presided.

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

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Michelle Wanamaker, a resident of the Eastgate area, noted that the Commissioners had previously expressed concern about the City Council tweaking things to increase growth when there truly was not the capacity to do so. That should be expanded to include staff having the same issue. Eastgate was annexed into the city in 2012 and it doubled the size of the neighborhood. One of the reasons for changing the size of an MMA or system intersection is an annexation, yet nothing was done until in 2016 one of the system intersections on the border, SE 38th and 150th Avenue SE, was removed from the Eastgate MMA and placed into the huge MMA to the south that had no shortage of system intersections. No good reason for why that was done has ever been given. Where such changes are made, the Commission needs to hold the staff accountable. She suggested Newport Hills should be looked at to determine if there are any intersections there that meet the criteria to be a system intersection. Currently, nothing in that area is being measured.

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

Councilmember Robertson noted that recruitment for the open Commission seat was

completed and a total of 18 applications were received. Each application will be vetted in the days ahead. She also reported that the Council held its annual retreat recently at which the Council updated its priorities and Council vision. Once the final version is printed, staff should provide the Commission with copies.

Chair Marciante asked if the Council priorities have horizon dates associated with them. Councilmember Robertson said the vision entails how the Council wants to see the city grow over the next 15 to 20 years, and the priorities are the short-term steps for achieving the vision and usually look out two to three years.

5. STAFF REPORTS – None

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. 2022-2027 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Update

Capital Facilities Planning and Programming Administrator Kristi Oosterveen reminded the Commissioners that the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) is mandated by the state to be updated annually. The six-year plan is not financially constrained and includes all projects that could be accomplished within that time period if the funding and resources were available. The TIP starts with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan which includes the long-range facility plans and the functional plans, which feed into the 12-year Transportation Facilities Plan and from there the seven-year Capital Investment Program. All of those feed into the TIP along with other programs or initiatives and other regional projects in which the city may wish to participate. Once compiled, the TIP is forwarded to the Regional Transportation Improvement Program, which is managed by the Puget Sound Regional Council, and to the State Transportation Improvement Program, which is managed by the Washington State Department of Transportation. All that must be completed by the mandated date of June 30.

Ms. Oosterveen explained that the projects in the TIP are divided into four sections. In Section I are the projects included in the adopted 2021-2027 Capital Investment Program. Section II are the projects in the current 2019-2030 Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP). Section III has other unfunded projects identified through the Comprehensive Transportation Project List or scoped by completed alternative analyses and planning or pre-design studies as well as the 2022-2033 TFP candidate projects. Finally, Section IV has regional projects and projects led by outside agencies in which the city may wish to participate. The update proposes adding 13 new projects to Section I, removing six, and transferring three to other sections. For Section II, two project descriptions have been revised, one project has been removed, and one project is proposed to transfer to a different section. Seven new projects are proposed for Section III, but no changes are proposed to Section IV.

Commissioner Ting asked how the average Bellevue resident can understand the TIP and TFP and provide feedback. He noted that the documents include a lot of technical information and he asked how the public can offer feedback given their technical nature. Ms. Oosterveen pointed out that the TIP and TFP processes are completely separate. They do not work hand-in-hand as far as the feedback element goes. The TIP is different in that it includes all projects the city could possibly want to see accomplished. There is a TIP webpage that describes the process and contains all pertinent information. There will be a notice sent out through the normal channels ahead of the public hearing.

Commissioner Teh asked if there are criteria for prioritizing the TIP projects. Ms. Oosterveen said the TIP projects are not prioritized in any way. Projects are simply added to the correct section in numerical order.

Commissioner Stash asked if there are projects that do not make it into the TIP. Ms. Oosterveen said projects that have not been through a process and do not have a project description are not included. There must be some basis for understanding what a project will be.

Commissioner Ting asked if any controversial projects have been removed from the TIP project list. Ms. Oosterveen said there were two such projects removed from the TIP in the last couple of years. One was the concept of a subsurface arterial on NE 6th Street that came from work during the Downtown Transportation Plan. The project never made the final list for any plans, but it remains in Section III of the TIP. The other project was a SR-520 project that was not particularly active but the Commission wanted to see it continue to have a presence on the list.

There was consensus to schedule a public hearing for the TIP for April 8 with the list as proposed.

Ms. Oosterveen said after the public hearing the Commission will be asked to finalize and approve the list and forward a recommendation to the City Council. The issue is tentatively scheduled to be before the Council on May 10.

B. 2022-2033 Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) Update

Senior Transportation Planner Michael Ingram noted that staff in January presented to the Commission the results of the evaluation of the roadway and intersection projects according to the scoring criteria. Since then staff has undertaken a prioritization process and an online open house event was held from January 25 to February 15.

Ms. Oosterveen said the open house was hosted on the city's *Engaging Bellevue* platform. There were 382 unique visitors to the site, and 86 people responded to the survey. In all, 187 project comments were logged. The project remains open online so people can continue to go back and look at the information. While additional comments cannot be made, the public is free to interact with staff via written communications. The process was deemed successful in allowing the public to have a voice and express their opinions on the projects.

Mr. Ingram said staff were continuing to develop the cost estimates for the projects. That work, once completed in the next couple of weeks, will inform the funding allocation process and it will be shared with the Commission in April along with the revenue projections. The preliminary project list will be finalized in April.

With regard to the overall project prioritization process, the score ranked list of roadway and intersection projects will be subjected to a number of qualitative factors. Both the staff and the Commission will engage in prioritizing the projects. Not all projects in the ped/bike and transit categories will get prioritized given that the TFP is not the best mechanism for doing that. The project list included in the packet has all of the transit projects grouped together and the anticipation is that a collective bucket of funding will be recommended for capturing all seven of those projects.

The work done to get the preliminary project list involved more than two dozen staff across all functional groups in the Transportation Department as well as representatives from the Department of Community Development, the Department of Development Services, the Department of Parks and Community Services, and the Utilities department. The participants were each asked to review the project list and identify what they consider the higher priority projects and the lower priority projects. Their input was compiled to see if there were any evident patterns, which there were. The staff involved then were asked to voice any concerns about projects listed as high priority and projects listed as low priority. The TFP project team then shared with the various department representatives its initial take and then further refined the assignment of projects to categories. Management then vetted the list and offered no concerns.

Mr. Ingram said there are four new projects on the list. The Vision Zero road safety projects along high-injury network corridors project addresses the city's commitment to Vision Zero. The Council endorsed the project for the CIP and it is thus appropriate to consider it for the TFP for additional funding, especially in the out years beyond the CIP.

Chair Marciante asked how the high-injury network corridors were determined. Mr. Ingram said the map was drawn from ten years' worth of data. He said the red locations on the map were the roadway miles where 80 percent of all serious injury and fatality collisions occurred. Some are obvious given their traffic volumes, but others are less obvious in terms of why they stood out. Chair Marciante asked if the next step will involve a study to understand the numbers, or will there be a design process resulting in specific projects. Mr. Ingram said the Council has earmarked \$2.5 million spread across the seven-year CIP. The anticipation is that things will start with a study and it will become something that in operational terms will function like a program.

Commissioner Ting asked what the anticipated outcome will be from the allocated \$2.5 million. Mr. Ingram said the expectation is that improvements will be made on the ground, beginning with cheap and easy wins followed by larger projects. The funding will kick off the initial work of project development.

Ms. Oosterveen said the CIP description for the project says the plan is to help staff design, cost estimate and prioritize some of the priority safety corridors, including NE 8th Street east of Downtown, Factoria Boulevard, Bellevue Way south of Downtown, Bel-Red Road in the Overlake area, and 116th Avenue NE in Wilburton.

Mr. Ingram said another new project is in the Downtown on 108th Avenue NE between NE 4th Street and NE 8th Street and it is called the 108th Avenue NE Downtown Spine. He noted that 108th Avenue NE is a priority bicycle corridor running north-south from Main Street to NE 12th Street. The segment between NE 4th Street and NE 8th Street is used by every transit bus accessing the transit center, and there is intense development on either side creating a need for vehicles to gain access to garages. Because of the multiple demands on the key corridor, staff from development review, community development and transportation operations concluded the need to take a closer look at the roadway segment and think through how it should best function. The Downtown Spine concept is admittedly complex but does provide for transit priority and accommodates bicycles at a high level of quality. The key reason for including the project in the TFP is the development that is on track to occur along the east side of the roadway. The conversations between staff and the various project representatives have been constructive and there is a general acceptance of the corridor plan, but in order to execute it

some modest amount of additional width along the frontages of the projects, and accordingly that needs to be incorporated into a plan. The proposal includes no implementation money but rather seeks to facilitate and accommodate the future vision for the roadway segment.

Commissioner Ting asked if there any downsides, negatives or losses anticipated as a result of the project. Mr. Ingram said he was not aware of any. He said there clearly are some upsides.

Chair Marciante said she imagined the project will result in very little through traffic on the roadway. Mr. Ingram said he could not say that with any degree of certainty. It is already a challenge to exit the garages along 108th Avenue NE and that is not expected to get a lot better over time. The plan is cognizant of that challenge and seeks to best balance all the modes.

Mr. Ingram said the third project is on 124th Avenue NE between NE 8th Street and NE 12th Street. The need is for a bicycle facility that is not currently addressed in the TFP. There are bicycle facilities on 124th Avenue NE to the south of NE 8th Street, and there are planned facilities on 124th Avenue NE to the north of NE 12th Street funded in the CIP. There will be a resulting gap between the facilities to the south and the facilities to the north. That weak link will dissuade a lot of potential bicycle riders. An interim improvement is happening on the segment to enhance pedestrian conditions, but unfortunately that project does not widen the roadway to include bicycle facilities. The recommendation is to include the middle bicycle facility element in the TFP as a placeholder project. Technically, because the project was previously in the TFP, it is not a new project.

Mr. Ingram said the fourth new project is on 143rd Avenue NE between Bel-Red Road and NE 20th Street by the Highland Community Center. Currently there is a stub-road that comes off of Bel-Red Road into the community center and park. The proposal is to extend that road as a through connection to NE 20th Street and have it serve as a collector arterial. The project was in the TFP several cycles back. A conceptual design was developed awaiting the opportunity to implement the connection. That opportunity now exists given a large multifamily development happening on the parcel to the north of the park and the requirement for the developer to build out the west side street improvements. The corresponding redevelopment on the east side will result in the buildout of the east side of the new roadway. A public investment will be needed to connect the private development improvements with the stub road to the south, as well as the need for intersection improvements at Bel-Red Road and NE 20th Place.

Mr. Ingram said there are four sections to the project list. The projects in gray are funded in the CIP. The green section projects are recommended for inclusion in the TFP with some funding allocation. The peach section has projects recommended for inclusion in the TFP with placeholder funding only, and the projects in the red section are not recommended for inclusion in the TFP. He stressed the need for the Commission to get the right projects into the right categories.

Mr. Ingram referred to the 148th Avenue NE master plan that addresses the north end of the city in the Overlake area on the border with Redmond. He said what has come out the conversations with Redmond has been the suggestion to break out one of the intersections as a separate project, specifically 148th Avenue NE and NE 24th Street, which Redmond anticipates will move forward first. Having the project as separate and discrete will help with its ongoing implementation.

For the Bellevue Way HOV lane, the proposal is to address in the green section the south segment from the Winters House to the park and ride. The project has a lot of support at the

Council level and in the Downtown. A thorough process was undertaken several years ago to evaluate the HOV lane and it was found that the south segment has a lot of benefit. The segment north of Winters House has less benefit and higher impacts. Accordingly, that project was included in the red section.

Commissioner Teh noted that some projects on the list are scored and prioritized while others are not. He asked if ultimately there would be a scoring exercise that will indicate which projects offer the most bang for the buck and which are the most appropriate. Mr. Ingram said the staff have a great deal of experience in prioritizing projects. Over time immense effort has been put into trying to develop overall schemes to balance all the different modes, but ultimately nothing has been found to work across all modes. Roadway/intersection projects simply cannot be scored and ranked in the same way as non-motorized facilities. Commissioner Teh said his concern was being able to stand before the public and say there has been transparency. There needs to be a way to show the methodology and objectivity used. Mr. Ingram said part of the transparency lies in giving the public the opportunity to review and comment on the projects. Community interest has always informed which projects should be included and where they should be ranked.

Commissioner Ting said what it boils down to for him is how to explain to the public the messaging around the priorities, the methodologies and the outcomes in a way that is understandable. What is needed is something like an elevator pitch that is relatively concise. Not everyone will agree with the conclusions reached by the staff, but they should at least be able to have an understanding of how decisions were made. Mr. Ingram said he would work on that.

Commissioner Beason said she believed that the decisions were primarily made based on research and data in addition to economic and political elements that will not fit easily into a simple matrix. She agreed that a little background information would be helpful in understanding how the projects ended up on the list and how they got prioritized. That would go a long way toward being able to validate the projects for the community.

Implementation Planning Manager Eric Miller allowed that the process is always challenging. He noted that at a previous meeting staff shared with the Commission the list of other considerations beyond the criteria used for the roadway/intersection projects. He said that list includes issues such as cost and the political considerations in addition to public input and the amount of money already invested in a given project. Every project on this list has its own story. What matters in the end is not necessarily each project's ranking number but whether the project is in the plan or out of the plan by virtue of being above or below the funding line. The task of developing a preliminary prioritization falls to staff. He agreed with the need to be able to justify each project, but that is where the complexities come in, making it difficult to have a simple elevator speech. The city's transportation system is complicated, the project list is just as complicated.

Commissioner Teh said he did not question any of the staff's work and outcomes. He said his only concern was being able to be transparent with the public.

Commissioner Beason concurred and said having some of the background information will help the Commissioners make educated decisions and serve as advocates in the community. Mr. Ingram said staff could work on flushing out the story details for each project prior to the next meeting.

Chair Marciante noted that the Commission has for many years had the same discussion about how difficult it is to absorb all the information about all the projects. She suggested it would be helpful to have a column that differentiates between a specific problem and the specific solution. Sometimes the project might be a study, but it still is focused on addressing a specific problem. With regard to prioritization, it is always helpful for the process to be transparent. Every project is complex and the professional judgments of the staff are being employed to make decisions based on the available data. The categories matrix should be created and given a rating of from 1 to 5. While at the end of the day the ratings are qualitative and based on judgment calls, it will create more transparency. A final column should be included for recommend or do not recommend. It would in fact be helpful to have a page for each project that documents its history and to update it annually.

Commissioner Beason agreed having a 1 to 5 rating and sharing the expertise would be incredibly helpful. There always is a monetary element associated with every project and it would be helpful to know where a development or private or public investment has necessitated the need to move a project up on the list.

Mr. Ingram said he appreciated the input and suggestions for a way forward.

Commissioner Ting asked if there was any surprising feedback from the website the staff found to be particularly insightful. Mr. Ingram said he noted an increase in the number of comments regarding West Lake Sammamish Parkway over past cycles, and a number of comments not previously seen voicing concerns about widening Downtown streets.

Commissioner Stash asked if there is a single source staff could point to relative to the future bicycle network and the buildout timing. Mr. Ingram said the most meaningful information about the status of bicycle improvements is the story map on the city's website. It shows the status of bicycle improvements since the adoption of the Pedestrian/Bicycle Plan in 2009. Department of Transportation Director Andrew Singelakis said staff would send the link to the Commissioners.

Mr. Ingram noted that three of the four new projects were placed in the peach section, and that the red section includes the north part of the Bellevue Way HOV lane.

Mr. Ingram said staff would have more detailed information for the April 8 Commission meeting around the reasoning behind the prioritizations, and will have more project costs and a projected overall funding allocation for the TFP.

C. Multimodal Concurrency

Consultant Chris Breiland with Fehr & Peers reminded the Commissioners that the Council direction is to move the city toward a multimodal transportation concurrency framework and away from the current approach that focuses solely on vehicular level-of-service. The fundamental question is whether or not the city is building the transportation system faster or on an equal pace with the forecasted growth that generates the demand for the planned system. The supply side, defined as the projects that the city plans to build, is defined in the TFP and implemented in the CIP. If approved, the focus will be on the new multimodal framework. The demand against which to balance the supply is forecasted in the TFP and is generated with building permits. Each development will consume a portion of the overall supply the city is building.

Addressing questions previously asked by Commissioners, Mr. Breiland began by explaining that Bellingham's multimodal concurrency system is a bit of a hybrid. It was established in 2008 and it includes system completeness in terms of sidewalks, trails and bike lanes in addition to traditional auto levels of service and transit service thresholds. The fundamental unit used by the Bellingham system is person trips available. Bellingham requires a sufficient number of person trips available in each of 20 "concurrency service areas", and each area is evaluated annually. Concurrency service areas fall into the categories of urban, transition and suburban. Bellingham is seeking to reduce the overall number of zones to reduce analysis complexities.

Continuing, Mr. Breiland explained that Redmond's concurrency system is based solely on system completeness as determined by planned projects in the city's TFP. He said Redmond's TFP is similar to Bellevue's in that it is a funding constrained list of projects, but it has a much longer time horizon, and it is updated about every eight years. The focus in Redmond is on building out the system over a 15- to 20-year period. Annual updates to the performance metrics are made to track progress toward transportation outcomes and to identify and prioritize new projects. The mobility unit defined in Redmond is person miles of travel. Redmond tracks how many person miles of travel are consumed by new development, which is not unlike the proposed approach in Bellevue. Redmond has a single citywide zone so growth and projects are tracked citywide.

Mr. Breiland noted a question was previously asked about what can be done to track performance in Bellevue. He said the city's BKRCast travel model is a powerful computer program that looks at population and employment in the city. It includes sub-routines that estimate where people travel at different times of the day and the types of modes they are likely to use. The metrics the model estimates fall into the four primary modes of pedestrian, bicycle, transit and vehicle. The model is updated frequently as data becomes available. Data like traffic counts and transit ridership comes out annually, but there are also less frequent pulses of data that come from the U.S. Census Bureau and household surveys. The tool is fundamental to testing the types of projects that should be built and what those projects can be expected to deliver once implemented.

Mr. Breiland acknowledged Commissioners Stash and Ting who attended a briefing and asked how it can be known if the system in the TFP will yield the desired outcomes, and what can be done if the forecasted results are not being realized. He explained that as proposed the concurrency supply is counted when a project is adopted in the CIP, in other words when dollars are programmed to build the project. Those CIP projects are intended to maintain or improve the performance of the system, and the projects are selected to address specific issues. The idea is that funding is allocated to projects across all of the modes to make sure all modal priorities are advanced. Mr. Breiland allowed that to date the performance expectations have not been defined. The refinement proposed for concurrency will be integrated into the related work on the Mobility Implementation Plan. It will be to work from the MMLOS metrics standards and guidelines document from 2017 to identify performance thresholds for each mode and to identify any deficiencies. From there specific thresholds can be determined, and it can be identified where the thresholds are not being met. In conjunction with the BKRCast model, project ideas can be developed to address the unmet thresholds and cycled through the modeling process until a solid list of projects is identified. The city therefore will make a documented decision about what to do about an identified deficiency, whether by moving forward with a project, by explaining why the deficiency should be tolerated, or by deferring a project to a future time.

Mr. Breiland noted that Commissioner Stash had posed a pertinent question about what would happen should funding be unexpectedly impacted and there is insufficient money to implement the TFP as originally identified. The short answer is that the city cannot simply advance all the forecasted development projects. Where funding drops to where only a portion of the system can be implemented, and once the built-up supply is used up, the city would technically experience a concurrency violation. If that were to happen, some development would not be permitted. At that point the city would either reconsider the level of development it wants to accommodate or adjust the investment program to accommodate the mobility needs of new development.

Mr. McDonald shared with the Commissioners a matrix showing all the multimodal concurrency components. He said a multimodal approach is fundamental.. He reiterated that concurrency is achieved when the supply exceeds the demand. It is known when the right projects are being built because the performance of those projects has been measured relative to established metrics and guidelines. The initial performance metrics will be extracted from the work of the Commission on multimodal level of service done in 2017. The performance metrics under consideration should be deemed only a starting point. As the Commission has mentioned a few times, there are a lot of different ways to measure performance and the geographic scale weighs in. In some instances a citywide approach is needed, such as when building a bicycle system. In other instances the focus should be on specific MMAs or TAZs. Establishing the performance metrics, the thresholds, will be a fundamental component in describing whether or not expectations are being met or if there are deficiencies.

Each situation may require a different approach. The solution to improve vehicle level of service by widening an intersection may not be appropriate due to various constraints related to land use or the environment. The Commission's work on MMLOS clearly expressed that some land uses have different expectations for pedestrian levels of service, and in deciding to address a performance deficiency, it is necessary to look at the layered network described in the MMLOS approach.

Mr. McDonald briefly reviewed with the Commission the pathway forward to multimodal concurrency. He said after the fundamental components are approved, the April meeting will include more discussion of the performance metrics for each mode. Then in May that discussion will continue and some policy recommendations necessary to have multimodal concurrency embedded in the Comprehensive Plan will be introduced. By June there should be enough background to approve the performance metrics, and the discussion relative to the policies will continue ahead of having policy recommendations ready in July for the Planning Commission to run through its Comprehensive Plan amendment process. During the summer months amendments to the Traffic Standards Code will be introduced and discussed, with approval of those amendments slated for November. The Traffic Standards Code is not subject to Planning Commission action, rather the Transportation Commission recommendations will be transmitted directly to the City Council . The intent is to have the Council approve the Comprehensive Plan amendments that establish the policies for multimodal concurrency, and the Traffic Standards Code amendments implementing multimodal concurrency, in December.

Commissioner Stash asked for a more detailed explanation of the layered network. Mr. McDonald said the Commission spent a lot of time on the topic in 2015 through 2017. At the core is the recognition that planning gets done in the city for pedestrians, for bicycles, for transit and for cars. There is also planning relative to land use and environmental protections. All of those planning documents exist on separate planes. The intent behind the layered

network approach is to see how all the various plans work together. That is the level of examination needed to identify areas of compatibilities, incompatibilities, consistencies and inconsistencies. It yields a framework for making informed decisions about project priorities. The layered network is a comprehensive approach that is a fundamental expectation of the Mobility Implementation Plan, of which multimodal concurrency is a part.

Chair Marciante asked if performance metrics are specific to performance estimated in the model, or observed performance, or both. Mr. McDonald said the TFP establishes the supply and demand. The BKRCast model tracks over time how the supply of mobility meets or exceeds the demand for mobility. There are a number of ways to track that, including vehicle, transit, pedestrian and bicycle performance metrics. Some are quantitative, some are qualitative, but most are described in the multimodal level of service guidelines. From a planning perspective, the performance metrics are planning level forecasts. At regular intervals, analysis will be done to determine how the system is performing relative to the expectation in the forecast. If the expectations are being met or exceeded, all is good. If there are deficiencies observed, the focus turns to what can be done about it to ensure performance rises up to meet the expectations.

Mr. Breiland added that at the meeting in April staff and the consultant team will clarify the thresholds of the performance expectations established by the MMLOS work, at least for most of the modes.

A motion to extend the meeting to 9:15 p.m. was made by Commissioner Stash. The motion was seconded by Chair Marciante and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Ting suggested giving consideration to concurrency service areas, as used in Bellingham. Bellevue is not homogenous and a neighborhood does not have the same environment as the Downtown. Adding a sidewalk to a neighborhood street does not improve access in the Downtown. Policies TR-29 and TR-30 reference MMAs and service areas. He said he would also like to see performance metrics established per mode, and they should be codified as a minimum bar to be met. That would be better for transparency. There could still be a mechanism for addressing exceptions should the Council deem it necessary. The approach would help to focus on outcomes rather than on dollars spent. For complete networks, usage, congestion and travel times are reasonable measures. For incomplete networks it would be reasonable to have quality and schedule for completion as metrics. There should be usage targets for incomplete networks when they are completed. Full utilization of an incomplete network cannot be expected, but a demonstration of a useful minimally complete network would be very good. The Council could consider incentives and policies that would help reach the desired usage.

Chair Marciante asked Commissioner Ting if his proposal would result in any specific changes to the fundamentals or just serve as additional details to consider as things develop. Commissioner Ting said it would change some text of the fundamentals. He said he was working on some proposed language.

Commissioner Teh noted his support for the framework and said he was excited to see the results and standards that will come out of the it. He agreed with the need to clearly define the layered network approach.

Commissioner Beason said she also would like to see some differences in the concurrency service areas. She said she likes the idea of the threshold of usage of complete networks. That

will help with the incentives moving forward.

Commissioner Klutznick commented that things are moving very fast in Bellevue in terms of development and new leases. He stressed the need to allow for flexibility in the framework as things progress.

Commissioner Stash voiced her support for the process as outlined. She said she looked forward to seeing more about performance metrics and thresholds. She said she favors the approach used by Bellingham which has its performance metrics based on real collected data. The fundamentals do a great job of outlining the whole approach to concurrency, but the last step falls short of ensuring the streets will not get clogged. The last bulleted item should be amended, or a new bullet should be added, stating that deficiencies will be addressed either by a reduction in permits for new development or an increase in the supply. That would make it clear that all of the work will lead to that decision.

Commissioner Ting proposed revising the second fundamentals bullet to read “Achieve concurrency when supply of mobility units exceeds the demand for mobility units for each concurrency service area. Create concurrency standards for each mode. For completed networks, this includes V/C and transit time; for incomplete networks this includes quality of facility and time to completion.”

With regard to defining the layered network, Mr. McDonald said most of the work is in the MMLOS metrics, standards and guidelines. However, the layered network can be defined in real time by working together to describe what it is for multimodal concurrency. Chair Marciante suggested the bullet should call for considering the layered nature of multimodal transportation networks. Mr. McDonald proposed including mention of the conflicts and compatibilities of a multimodal transportation system. He said the important part of the layered system is that it also has a land use context.

Commissioner Beason suggested more conversation is needed on the issue of deficiencies resulting in a reduction in development or an increase in supply. Reductions in development are highly unlikely and it would not be realistic to say that will occur given the current path Bellevue is on.

Commissioner Ting agreed that the goal is not to stop development, which only leads to stagnation. The goal is to make sure there is a plan to accommodate solid growth over time. Managed growth is a largely overused phrase, but it is something the city really has to work on year after year. Having a plan that will yield the desired transportation system over many years is good, but to be avoided is a hacksaw that simply chops off all growth. At the same time, there must be minimum bars to ensure that ten years down the road there will not be a system in place that does not allow growth to happen. He also proposed adding a bullet reading “For incomplete networks, focus on creating a minimally complete subset network with utilization requirements for when the network is complete.” The goal of the bullet would be to ensure the parts of networks that are complete will be used.

Commissioner Beason concurred. She said restricting development makes no sense at all, but behaviors can be modified to maximize the opportunities to utilize different transportation avenues. What is needed is a structure that can be incentivized to gain private sector buy-in and usage of the planned mobility options in place.

Commissioner Stash commented that at the end of the day no one wants to set the city up for

50,000 new employees to come in only to find gridlock. A better way of calling for a reduction in development could be to call for a modification in development, which could range from delays to more supply provided by the private side. In the end, the focus needs to be on making sure decisions will be driven by performance metrics and the concurrency standards.

Commissioner Ting said he wanted the text to include a concurrency standard requirement for completed subnetworks. Performance metrics on their own are only advisory, and there needs to be something with teeth. All available tools and incentives will need to be used to achieve the utilization of completed networks. Mr. McDonald suggested that notion could be appended to the bullet that addresses geographic scale. While there is the citywide scale, there are smaller and smaller scales that get to the notion of local system completeness versus citywide system completeness. The bullet could have words embedded about subsystem performance.

Commissioner Ting said for him the key point was that once a subset of the completed network is sufficiently and minimally complete, there needs to be a standard set in terms of utilization.

Chair Marciante commented that at its core transportation concurrency is the ability to balance trip capacity with development. She said a statement outlining that should be added to the first bullet reading “Employ a multimodal approach to transportation concurrency that meets the multimodal level of service performance expectations.” She agreed that everything possible should be used to maximize the utilization of systems, but said she struggled with how that relates to the concurrency conversation. She agreed that networks should be complete, but she suggested completeness is very hard to define given that networks are often very personal.

A motion to extend the meeting to 9:30 p.m. was made by Commissioner Ting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beason and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Ting agreed that defining complete would be difficult, but finding a way to do so will help define where to build networks that will get used the most at the earliest point. It is within the domain of the Commission to talk about utilization targets for completed networks, though they should be realistic and not overly difficult to achieve.

Mr. Breiland pointed out that in the world of concurrency, words matter a lot. He stressed that there is a very strong difference between a standard and a threshold. If a standard is not met, the result is a moratorium on granting building permits, and the only way out is to fix the deficiency or to have the Council amend the concurrency standard. Both approaches take time. Performance thresholds can be documented in the Comprehensive Plan. They are not something that can simply be ignored, but they are not a concurrency standard as defined by state law.

Commissioner Stash brought attention back to her suggestion to add a last bullet outlining what will be done once the previous bullets are all achieved.

Chair Marciante asked if there would be any repercussions to holding the discussion over to the next Commission meeting. Mr. McDonald stressed the aggressive the timeline needed to meet the goal of multimodal concurrency in 2021. , The conversation on the fundamental performance metrics could continue at the April 8 meeting and a second meeting in April could be accommodated if necessary.

Commissioner Beason said she was comfortable moving forward with the fundamentals as proposed without establishing hard and fast boundaries in light of the comments offered by Mr.

Breiland.

Commissioner Ting noted the need to clarify the term “deficiencies” as used in the last bullet. If it refers to a deficiency in meeting the concurrency standard, the result is in fact that development stops. Commissioner Stash explained that the previous bullet highlights addressing performance measure deficiencies. However the performance metrics are defined, not meeting them should mean something specific.

Mr. Breiland suggested the Commissioners were close to agreement. He said previously the need to identify MMLOS performance metrics thresholds was not identified. The performance thresholds are what the TFP gets built around. If the numbers are not achieved, the city cannot simply look the other way and go on approving development, rather the city would have to define why the a specific thresholds was not met, explain what will be done about it, or explain why nothing can be done about it. The thresholds, however, would not be the concurrency standards, which still would be focused on the mobility units of supply exceeding the mobility units of demand. The thresholds will need to be documented, likely in the Mobility Implementation Plan, along with a defined pathway for what happens when they are not met. That will allow for full transparency in the decision making process.

Commissioner Ting asked if a motion could be brought to the floor to generally move the issue forward while leaving it open to some level of debate. He said he was seeing general agreement even though the specifics of the wording was not quite right and needed additional edits.

A motion to extend the meeting to 9:40 p.m. was made by Commissioner Ting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beason and the motion carried without dissent.

A motion to accept as a draft document the multimodal concurrency fundamentals: Employ a multimodal approach to transportation concurrency that meets the multimodal level of service performance expectations; Achieve concurrency when supply of mobility units exceeds the demand for mobility units for each concurrency service area and for each mode, including v/c and transit time, for incomplete networks include quality of facility and time to completion; Performance metrics for each mode gleaned from Multimodal Level of Service Metrics, Standards, and Guidelines (2017 Transportation Commission Report); Use appropriate geographic scale (citywide, MMA, TAZ) and arterial extents to monitor transportation system performance; Establish a set of performance thresholds for each mode to identify deficiencies and describe severity of deficiencies; identify mix of new supply and incentives/disincentives to modify behaviors and meet performance targets; A decision to address performance metrics deficiencies will consider the conflicts and compatibilities of a multimodal transportation system within the context of land use and environmental priorities; and Deficiencies in meeting the MMLOS thresholds will be addressed by either a modification in development or an increase in supply; and to allow additional modifications to be made going forward, was made by Commissioner Stash. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ting and the motion carried unanimously.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. February 11, 2021

The minutes as submitted were approved by consensus.

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None
10. NEW BUSINESS – None
11. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – None
12. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. McDonald briefly reviewed the Commission's calendar of meeting dates and upcoming agenda items. He noted that the April calendar will include meetings on the 8th and the 22nd.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Marciante adjourned the meeting at 9:36 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date