

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

April 22, 2021
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Virtual Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Marciante, Commissioners Klutznick, Stash, Ting
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioners Beason, Teh
STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Department of Transportation
OTHERS PRESENT: Chris Breiland, Don Samdahl, Fehr & Peers
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 with the exception of Commissioners Beason and Teh, both of whom were excused.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Absent objection, the agenda was approved without modifications.

3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – None

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

Councilmember Robertson voiced her appreciation for all the time and effort that Commission has been putting into the topic of multimodal concurrency. She said the City Council really appreciates the Commission's work.

Councilmember Robertson noted that the multimodal concurrency discussions began in 2013 with a series of study sessions with the Commission. That work led to a Comprehensive Plan policy providing direction to implement a multimodal approach to concurrency, and the Commission's MMLOS metrics, standards and guidelines document in 2017. The current body of work is of deep importance to the Council, who when approving the scope of work in January acknowledged that the existing vehicle only approach to concurrency is not sustainable and does not account for the multimodal transportation system the city is planning, funding and advocating for at the regional level. The multimodal approach can better accommodate the travel demands of new employees and residents. A lot of the tech employees who in the near future will be coming to Bellevue will not have their own cars and tend to commute via bicycle and transit. The Council is also working to integrate all modes of transportation both in planning in projects to serve the community in an equitable and sustainable manner, all while working to maintain the ability to welcome new development by providing travel options with

all modes. The Commission's work plan for the year will result in a Comprehensive Plan amendment that will add multimodal concurrency policy. Because the Growth Management Act requires regulations to be consistent with policy, thus once the Comprehensive Plan amendment is completed, the Traffic Standards Code will also be amended.

Councilmember Robertson allowed that the Commission's work schedule is robust and will be difficult to achieve even with two meetings per month. She encouraged the Commissioners to prepare for each meeting and in doing so to take advantage of staff's willingness to answer detailed questions and to respond to ideas before the meetings.

5. STAFF REPORTS – None
6. PUBLIC HEARING – None
7. STUDY SESSION
 - A. Multimodal Concurrency

Principal Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald explained that the concurrency performance metrics and thresholds were familiar to the Commission given that they were gleaned directly from the MMLOS metrics, standards and guidelines document authored by the Commission in 2017. He sought from the Commission direction and/or approval on the concurrency metrics and thresholds. He commented that also on the agenda was the multimodal concurrency fundamental principles which also need direction and/or approval.

Continuing, Mr. McDonald stated that the Growth Management Act requires jurisdictions to adopt a transportation concurrency standard, but it does not spell out a specific concurrency standard. Concurrency standards are intended to support land use, and for each jurisdiction the modes needed to provide that support and the rate and type of land uses are different. Policy for concurrency is created through the Comprehensive Plan and regulations are implemented through the Traffic Standards Code. The consequence of not meeting the concurrency standard is that the city must make decisions with respect to development and building permit applications. The performance metrics exist to indicate how a jurisdiction is doing in light of the intended level of service for each mode. Where the performance does not meet the desired level of service, the magnitude of the deficiency, the location of it, and the tradeoffs necessary to address the deficiency all come into play during the project development and project prioritization stages.

The Commission worked for a couple of years to develop the MMLOS metrics and thresholds for each mode. The Commission was deliberate about describing the qualitative and the quantitative metrics by which to judge performance. One of the most innovative things the Commission did was to develop the concept of bicycle level of traffic stress, which is focused on making sure the system being built to accommodate bike riders is consistent with their abilities and comfort levels. The outcome was different types of bicycle facilities crafted to meet the specific needs of the riders and the adjacent land use context. Bicycle level of traffic stress (LTS) is measured for bicycle network corridors and at intersections.

The Commission recognized that the city does not run or control the transit system, but it does have influence over how people get to and from bus stops, and the travel speed along the Frequent Transit Network corridors. The Commission described the types of transit stop facilities important at each type of transit stop, and a target speed along the Frequent Transit

Network routes.

The Commission recognized that vehicles are and will continue to be an important mode of travel in the city. The Commission chose at the time to maintain the V/C ratio approach at system intersections as a key metric. The Commission also introduced the notion of vehicle travel speed along corridors.

Chris Breiland with Fehr & Peers reminded the Commissioners that metrics define or describe what to measure for each mode. Thresholds define or describe the community's desired level of service for each mode, and define or describe the timeframe for completing the transportation system. The Commission's work in 2017 helped to bring the pieces into alignment, starting with the performance metrics for vehicle level of service and expectations relative to travel speed along corridors and the V/C ratios at system intersections which vary by Mobility Management Area. Essentially, there is more tolerance for slower speed and time spent at intersections in the denser parts of the city where there are more modal options, specifically Downtown, BelRed and Factoria. The metrics identify deficiencies and what can be done about them in line with the specific land use context.

Mr. Breiland allowed that the city does not control transit service but does manage the network and the transit stops that are located on city property. Speed along the Frequent Transit Network corridors and the transit stop facilities are the metrics. The specific speed and transit facilities types are the thresholds.

The metrics are more complex for pedestrian facility performance in the MMLOS framework but they mirror what the city has been doing for many years. The Commission's work in 2017 acknowledged city regulations and best practices in terms of sidewalk and landscape strip width, intersection treatment, and the frequency of midblock crossings. In the suburban parts of the city the sidewalks are narrower than the wider sidewalks in the Downtown and BelRed. Similarly, the intersection crossings employ basic components in the suburban areas and have much higher qualities in urban areas. Midblock crossing frequency has a lot to do with pedestrian destinations and transit stops. With regard to concurrency, the Commission will identify a timeline for implementation.

Mr. Breiland said the LTS performance metric for bicycle facilities is a fairly complex methodology. In essence it says that the busier the road and faster the traffic, the more protection should be offered to the cyclist. The context is defined by the characteristic of the roadway and the type of cyclist to be accommodated. He said an implementation timeline for the bicycle network will also be identified through concurrency.

The Commissioners were shown a single matrix outlining the MMLOS performance metrics and thresholds for each mode. Mr. Breiland pointed out that for the most part the metrics were gleaned from the 2017 MMLOS work, with the addition of the system completeness timeframe added for pedestrians, bicycles and the transit network at the suggestion of the Commission. The rate of implementation will be determined through future financial and planning analyses. Bellevue has robust plans for bicycle, pedestrian and transit facilities and it will take time to implement the large list of projects. The thresholds identified for each specific metric are what a complete system needs to achieve. When implemented over the timeframe yet to be determined, the amount of mobility units of supply will match the mobility units of demand. In other words, a complete system is one in which the thresholds are met for each of the MMLOS metrics.

Commissioner Ting asked if system completeness is a threshold or a standard. Mr. Breiland said it is the threshold against which transportation concurrency will be evaluated. The thresholds help to define the complete system.

Commissioner Ting said he was not clear about the Commission adding the system completeness concept. Mr. Breiland called attention to the pedestrian mode metrics of sidewalk/landscape width and crosswalk spacing/intersection design. He noted that the performance metrics are defined in the MMLOS Metrics Standards and Guidelines. A review of how the city is currently meeting those metrics would indicate that parts of the city do not measure up. What is being added is an acknowledgement that meeting the performance thresholds everywhere as of 2022 is not possible. What is needed is an identification of how much of the system the city intends to complete over time for each of the modes.

Commissioner Stash asked for examples of what would and would not meet the LTS standard. Mr. Breiland said an example of a facility that meets the LTS standard is the new bike lanes along 108th Avenue NE, which is identified as a major north-south bicycle corridor and an LTS-1 facility. Those bike lanes were recently implemented by the city and they are classified as a vertically protected bike lane. Another north-south bicycle corridor is 140th Avenue NE, also identified as an LTS-1 facility, however there is currently no bike lane or lane marking for the stretch through BelRed and it does not meet the threshold. The 2017 MMLOS document identifies the LTS expectations for different corridors throughout the city.

Commissioner Ting commented that the work being done by staff in regard to bicycle usage on trails and roads is very exciting and he suggested it should be added in terms of metrics. Mr. McDonald said a metric related to bicycle use was added as a result of the Commission's input. He said more and more data relative to utilization of bicycle facilities is being generated as the facilities are being built, and the data is being used in a number of ways with an eye on building the right facilities to meet the performance expectations of the users.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Stash about balancing supply and demand, Mr. Breiland said as the TFP gets approved, the supply side is bumped up, giving the city room to approve development permits. In an ideal world, the city would have the ability to bump up the supply in accord with the TFP forecast year over year. In actual practice, there might be a big building boom in a given timeframe that will consume the supply and get close to or potentially exceed the financial ability of the city to implement supply. In that case something must happen in order to avoid running into a concurrency issue.

Chair Marciante asked if there is a metric akin to volume-to-capacity for sidewalks and bicycle facilities. Mr. McDonald said there is no quantitative utilization or V/C metric for either bicycle or pedestrian facilities. He said the Commission did what amounts to groundbreaking work to define the type of facilities based on the intended user experience and the land use context in which facilities exist. Monitoring usage over time can lead to making adjustments. Mr. Breiland said while there is no V/C ratio metric for those modes, there are methodologies to make those calculations. Cities like Davis, California, must deal with bicycle congestion and they utilize certain metrics to identify when to widen bike trails and improvements to intersections to avoid excessive signal delay to accommodate street crossings. For Bellevue, the focus as envisioned is to keep things simpler and on completing comfortable and welcoming systems.

Commissioner Ting suggested something like the V/C concept for transit, bicycles and pedestrians is a great idea. Such a metric for all modes would show where systems are being

overutilized and where they are being underutilized. Mr. Breiland said a V/C metric was not included for transit simply because the city does not control the transit system. Both King County Metro and Sound Transit have what they call a crowding threshold that they seek to avoid exceeding by rearranging their services as resources allow.

Commissioner Stash asked for more detail about the work of measuring against the thresholds to determine how the city is doing in terms of system completeness. Mr. Breiland said the pedestrian, bicycle and transit systems gaps are known based on the performance thresholds. What has not yet been done is to analyze what it would cost to fill in the gaps and complete the systems, so it cannot yet be said how long it will take and how much it will cost.

There was consensus to move forward with the performance metrics and thresholds as outlined.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Fundamental Principles for Multimodal Concurrency

Chair Marciante invited Commissioner Ting to discuss the amendment he proposed on April 8 to the fundamental principles. He said his amendment relative to Principle 2 was based on the need to customize facility need based on area type, to ensure an adequate supply in each area to cover the demand, and to ensure that users of all modes will have a good experience. Facility improvements generate mobility units supply and should satisfy person trips, and there should be standards for that because standards hold the city accountable. There is flexibility that allows for taking into account incomplete networks. The MMLOS report from 2017 also recommends retaining the existing metrics and LOS standards using MMAs. In addition, policies TR-29 and TR-30 specify that the MMLOS should look at specific MMAs and in each area. The TFP is a citywide document but there are many projects located within a single MMA. Projects that span multiple MMAs could be divided based on expected usage, cost or potentially distance.

With regard to the amendment as it pertains to Principle 5, Commissioner Ting stressed the need for good data for each mode in order to have a more complete picture. Having a minimum threshold will ensure that the facilities are being used as planned. Thresholds are not standards and failing to meet them will serve only as red flags.

With regard to his amendment relative to Principle 8, Commissioner Ting stressed the importance of recalibrating. Mobility unit supply is a notion that is supposed to map person trips and demand, but the science is inexact. Looking at observed data on the demand side is very important but it needs to be matched with equivalent data on the supply side.

Commissioner Ting said his amendment when taken as a whole tries to hold the city more accountable in terms of the transportation system. Transportation continues to be at the top of the list in surveys of Bellevue residents relative to pain points.

Chair Marciante said her preference was to stay away from mentioning mode-specific performance standards and she asked Commissioner Ting why he felt it necessary to specifically call them out in Principle 2. Commissioner Ting said the 2017 MMLOS report calls for establishing performance standards. It calls them out for vehicles and one other mode.

The document also states that every person in Bellevue should have a reasonable expectation of a good travel experience regardless of mode. It is critical to figure out how to do that while encouraging people to use the different modes. If usage targets are not set, encouraging use of the different modes will not meet with success.

Chair Marciante asked if the same outcome would be achieved by focusing on modes meeting performance metrics. Commissioner Ting said standards have more teeth. In order to get people to use the facilities that get built, there needs to be a plan for ensuring all person trips projected for each facility will be accommodated, and there should be consequences for deciding to just not worry about it. Thresholds are good, but standards increase accountability and a sense of urgency where a facility is not being used.

Chair Marciante asked what the proposed standards language would really mean in practice. Mr. McDonald stated that the MMLOS report and the Comprehensive Plan guide the currency work. There are in fact two sets of standards included in the MMLOS document, including the V/C standards in MMAs. The Commission at the time decided at that time that the standard that was in place in the Comprehensive Plan and the Traffic Standards Code should be documented. The Commission simply included those standards into the MMLOS report. The other standard in the MMLOS report pertains to sidewalk dimensions. There are locations in the city that have a minimum sidewalk dimension as set by the Land Use Code. The Commission at the time recognized the standards were in the code and chose not to change them, but did recognize the standards as minimums and as such included a recommendation for wider sidewalks in certain areas of the city.

Continuing, Mr. McDonald said Commissioner Ting's recommendation seem like policy and could be embedded in the policy recommendation the Commission will bring forward. The principles have a narrow focus in that they state an understanding of what concurrency going forward looks like. The principles, while guiding the work, are not the entirety of the work. The next stage in the process will be to develop policies for the Comprehensive Plan, including updates to policies TR-29 and TR-30, both of which are legacy policies from a vehicle-centric concurrency standard the city is moving away from. The concepts outlined by Commissioner Ting could be addressed in policy.

Commissioner Ting stated that words are important. He agreed that that principles are not policies; principles describe the intent of MMLOS concurrency. Policy TR-30 specifically calls for establishing MMLOS and concurrency standards and other mobility measures and as such the policy is very relevant and time appropriate. Mr. McDonald allowed that in the 2015 update the Council adopted a lot of progressive policies related to multimodal concurrency. Those policies are now six years old and the Commission has done a lot of work since then. As such it is appropriate to review the policies to determine if they will make sense going forward.

Commissioner Ting pointed out that the Commission in the 2017 MMLOS report was very intentional about retaining the existing metrics and LOS standards in the Comprehensive Plan and the Traffic Standards Code. Mr. Breiland explained that at the time the 2017 MMLOS report was being prepared, the scope of work was not to simultaneously tackle concurrency. The Commission recognized that it could not adopt a policy document that would be inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Accordingly, the idea was to retain the current vehicle-centric MMA-based V/C standard while moving forward toward addressing MMLOS metrics, guidelines and thresholds. The Commission had in previous work identified that system completeness was their preferred approach to deal with multimodal concurrency. Under the mode-specific performance standards, if any one of them is not met, the city must deny the

building permit. In 2010 the city of Tukwila considered four MMLOS standards but concluded that the odds of missing one of them was so high as to be unacceptable. Unfortunately, the city chose to retain just the vehicle standard. Where there are standards defined as required by the Growth Management Act, not meeting a standard means concurrency is not met. That is why the proposal was made to have a singular system completeness standard informed by performance thresholds. Missing a performance threshold can have repercussions the city must address, but not in a blunt manner that leads to a development moratorium.

Chair Marciante asked what would be involved to update the way a single standard is calculated, versus modifying the approach to have a different standard for each mode. Mr. Breiland said the performance metrics can be adapted as conditions change. A specific modal need could be addressed by adjusting a performance metric, which would in turn change the mobility units of supply.

Commissioner Stash agreed that having too many standards could overcomplicate things and prevent forward progress. She added, however, that at the same time she could see the argument in favor of having standards for each mode as a way of forcing the city to actually solve the problems for each mode. She asked if it would be possible to say that for a period of time the metrics will be thresholds, after which they will be converted to standards once there is supporting data. Mr. Breiland said he has not seen a community go with an interim bridge standard, in part because no jurisdiction in the state has multiple concurrency standards it is seeking to meet.

Commissioner Stash asked if a single overarching concurrency could be put in place that involves a number of underlying thresholds, along with a requirement for a specific number of the underlying thresholds to be met at a minimum. Mr. Breiland said the city could at its discretion decide what rules should apply where a threshold is not met without triggering oversight from the state's growth hearings board. The idea would be that the performance thresholds would be set by looking at what the community is wanting to do without getting into something that would be fundamentally unsustainable.

Commissioner Stash asked how often thresholds are not met without repercussion. Mr. Breiland said Redmond has performance thresholds related to its transportation facilities plan. They have not been meeting the transit ridership threshold and they have been keeping a close eye on that and seeking to determine the underlying reasons.

Mr. McDonald offered that the conversation was still pointing in the direction of establishing strong policy that provides guidance and support for a desired outcome. He said a sample policy could be drafted reading something like "Monitor and periodically adjust the performance thresholds for each mode in each area of the city." Another policy could be drafted to describe a process to be followed where a threshold is not met. The same concept is currently embedded in the Comprehensive Plan in regard to vehicle level of service.

Commissioner Ting said to him the fundamental principles are indeed principles. Principle 2 talks about a single citywide concurrency service area, and as such it is also policy. To nuance the policy would be to call out a specific V/C standard. If the thinking is that having multiple standards would be too hard to hit, he stressed that it will be completely up to the city to determine where the standards should be set. The Commission should consider the minimum standard for each and move forward with it as a commitment. If there are no standards, by definition the city will meet concurrency provided it spends the money it says it will spend. If the demand for mobility units meets the supply of mobility units, concurrency will be met, and

by definition the mobility units supply will meet the mobility units demand if the city spends the money, regardless of the outcome. Mr. Breiland stressed that the monies spent will be for projects in a plan that has been identified and tested through the Transportation Facilities Plan. If the land use plan is implemented at the same time as the transportation plan, for which a technical analysis and testing shows will meet the identified performance thresholds, concurrency will be met. In the instance that people choose not to travel in predicted ways, all development will not have to be stopped. It simply would mean that planning in the next update of the TFP will need to be adjusted.

Commissioner Ting agreed that missing on the plan to some degree should not stop development. He said he was suggesting that there should be a minimum bar to be met around what a reasonable experience is for every mode, and that minimum should be the standard. If people happen to change their modes of travel, that should not cause development to stop.

Commissioner Stash agreed that the supply is defined by the budget. The demand is determined from one year to the next as projects are approved through the permit process. The demand will not go away, but if the budget is cut, the demand will still need to be addressed but with less funding for the supply side. She said in light of that she believed there should be more teeth than just thresholds that can be superseded and not worried about. Mr. Breiland stated that if for some reason the budget is drastically cut and the city is not able to advance much by way of supply, the city will not be able to advance much by way of demand without triggering a concurrency issue. The city could not reduce its spending on transportation projects while continuing to approve building permits. Commissioner Stash pointed out that it takes multiple years to bring development projects online, so the city could approve a big project in 2021 only to see the transportation budget cut by the time the new development project is completed. Mr. Breiland said the city would need to have enough supply in the six-year CIP at the time the development permit is approved. In the out years, if the transportation budget drops substantially, the city would be forced to tell new developers that the resulting lack on the supply side means they will either have to reduce their demand on the system or help fund the system in order to obtain a building permit.

Commissioner Ting commented that if the city were to cut the transportation budget by 20 percent, it could still generate a sufficient supply of mobility units to meet the demand by virtue of the fact that buildout would occur at the expected percentage budgeted. The city would be left with the choice of saying it either is or is not generating enough mobility units. Mr. Breiland said if the city decides to cut its transportation spending by 20 percent, it must reduce its accommodation of new building permits by that same amount.

Commissioner Ting said it was his understanding that mobility units supply was defined as the city spending as much as budgeted, thus the mobility units supply equals the mobility units demand. Mr. Breiland said the TFP establishes the total package of mobility units supply and commits the city to build it. The TFP is financially constrained so the city cannot simply say it will build projects that are not financially realistic. In developing the TFP, the city identifies the amount of growth allocated by the Puget Sound Regional Council, and determines the transportation system needed to accommodate the demands of that growth, though it is constrained by financial realities. Development of the TFP includes looking at a multitude of performance outcomes to define where projects are needed, the performance of the overall system, and all environmental impacts and mitigations. The city cannot arbitrarily cut the financing going into building out the system and trigger no implications on the amount of development being approved. Final approval of the TFP is a determination that the amount of supply necessary to meet the demand at the identified performance levels associated with the

TFP analysis will be delivered. Once that is set, concurrency is determined.

Commissioner Ting argued that the city could cut the transportation budget by 50 percent and still tell future development they are fine to go ahead, because by definition whatever the new development will create in terms of mobility units demand, and whatever amount of money the city chooses to spend, will meet the mobility units demand. Mr. Breiland said that would be the case only if the TFP is approved with half the amount of funding and all the performance metrics issues that would generate. Commissioner Ting said that approach is not very accountable.

Chair Marciante suggested that approach would require modifying the thresholds. Cutting the budget would in essence result in the creation of a different plan with different thresholds and standards. Commissioner Ting agreed the city could indeed cut the budget and change the thresholds or standards at the same time. He said thresholds are good but standards are better because a standard is a commitment and is harder to change. Standards are not set too high but neither are they set too low, and there are consequences for not meeting them.

Chair Marciante asked if moving into the threshold process will remove the vehicle standards. Mr. Breiland said that would be the result. Chair Marciante said she was on the fence relative to having standards or not, but said she was very concerned about mode balance. She asked how the principles will help the city achieve a balanced system. Mr. Breiland said the concept of including metrics for each mode, where they come from and what they are supposed to do, is in the principles, which call for establishing thresholds for each mode at geographic sub-city scales. As drafted, the principles outline thresholds, not standards. Commissioner Ting's proposed amendment would upgrade the thresholds to standards.

Commissioner Ting asked if there had been any feedback about having multiple CSAs rather than citywide mobility units supply versus mobility units demand. Mr. McDonald said for purposes of concurrency supply and demand, staff believes the citywide approach is appropriate. He allowed that performance monitoring, the metrics that are set and the thresholds that are expected can all be geographically smaller than a citywide approach for concurrency.

Chair Marciante asked how to make sure, under the citywide concurrency area approach, that a building in the Downtown will not result in construction of a sidewalk in Somerset. Mr. Breiland said the list of projects that accommodate the demand for growth will correlate to where the growth occurs. He said it is known where the growth is occurring, and part of the scope of work for the Mobility Implementation Plan will include what supply is attributable to accommodate growth. Those specifications have not yet been defined. As a concurrency performance metric, a sidewalk would not be added beyond a typical walking distance of where the growth is occurring, which is generally understood to be half a mile. Concurrency does not tie those pieces together, the project development phase in which it is determined what supply is actually needed will have some guidance for staff to use in making sure that pedestrian improvements are identified for areas that have pedestrian trip growth where the metrics for the sidewalks are not being met.

Commissioner Ting asked why multiple CSAs should not be created if work is going to be done to figure out where the mobility units supply will have impact for the mobility units demand. To do otherwise would mean things would be left up in the air on the hope that the right thing will happen. Mr. Breiland said the fundamental reason is complexity. He said staff and the consultant team were directed to not make the concurrency piece overly complex. The

more zones there are, particularly for some types of trips, the more the amount of supply needed to accommodate the demands starts to migrate. A car trip crosses many parts of the city and as they go from a development in the Downtown its impacts across the city will need to be tracked. That can be done mathematically, but the process adds a large amount of complexity to the system. Commissioner Ting said he understood that there would be extra work, but he stressed that the work is important given the desire to ensure that the support for the mobility units supply for a building that goes up in the Downtown will occur in Downtown. Otherwise it will not be possible to know if the right supply for the demand will be provided in the right areas.

Councilmember Robertson said the city can certainly measure a smaller geography when updating the TFP. She said the Council will always be looking when updating the CIP to make sure that the city is well-served in allocating all the transportation dollars. Putting too much emphasis behind how things are measured, however, could have the effect of tying the Council's hands. The intent of the multimodal approach is to set a new concurrency standard that will meet all modes in line with how the city is changing. It is not intended to create a lot of extra work for the staff. The Council will not fund projects that are not effective. She cautioned against putting too many details and measurements in place and thereby making it difficult for the Council to manage the budget.

Chair Marciante expressed the opinion that it was too early to define the number of CSAs. With regard to ensuring that the supply will track the demand, she asked if it was necessary to make it a principle to say the supply must be provided where the demand occurs.

Commissioner Ting pointed out that Principle 2 specifically states that concurrency is met when the supply of mobility units exceeds the demand. The question remains whether that means citywide or by specific areas. That is more than just a detail, it is a core principle behind multimodal concurrency.

Chair Marciante said she was inclined to not support the motion to amend the main motion.

Commissioner Stash said she would like to see more teeth included in Principle 2 than what the current proposal has. She said that could be something along the lines of meeting a certain percentage of the thresholds. With regard to Principle 5, she said she was fine with it becoming policy as opposed to a principle, and she said she supported having more than one area but less than 14. With regard to Principle 8, she said the response provided by the staff answered her questions.

Commissioner Klutznick said his inclination was to vote against the amendment.

The question having been called by Commissioner Ting, the motion to amend the main motion failed 3-1 with Chair Marciante and Commissioners Klutznick and Stash voting no, and Commissioner Ting voting yes.

Commissioner Stash said her no vote was coupled with a high level of trust that the issue would be handled with policies or other discussions going forward.

A main motion to approve the multimodal concurrency fundamental principles was made by Commissioner Stash. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Klutznick and the motion carried 3-1, with Chair Marciante and Commissioners Klutznick and Stash voting yes, and Commissioner Ting voting no.

Mr. McDonald said during the month of May staff would introduce policy recommendations for the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that the Planning Commission would begin its substantive review in July, making it necessary for the Transportation Commission to complete its work on the policies by July 8.

11. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Michele Wannamaker, a resident of Eastgate, stated that the MMLOS performance, metrics and thresholds table just approved is incomplete per the MMLOS report from 2017. What the Commission included in the table was the vehicle LOS V/C concurrency, and the arterial corridor analysis for urban travel times. However, the 2017 report includes system intersection delay and said that important element should not be overlooked.

Chair Marciante said she was sure the staff would address the issue going forward.

12. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

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

13. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Marciante adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date