

CITY OF BELLEVUE  
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION  
MINUTES

May 27, 2021  
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall  
Virtual Meeting

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

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Commissioner Klutznick

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Paula Stevens, Andrew Singelakis, Eric Miller, Department of Transportation

OTHERS PRESENT: Chris Breiland, Fehr & Peers; Jonathan Kurz

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m. by Chair Marciante who presided.

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Teh, who arrived at 6:33 p.m., and Commissioner Klutznick, who had resigned.

Chair Marciante reported the resignation of Commissioner Klutznick and noted that recruitment to fill his vacant seat was under way. She also reported that the Council had appointed two new Commissioners.

Principal Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald noted that it was Commissioner Teh's last meeting. By way of marking his service on behalf of the city, Mr. McDonald said Commissioner Teh's first meeting included a presentation on modern urban roundabouts by the Washington State Department of Transportation, and the Grand Connection framework plan, which was then only in its infancy. In June of 2019 Commissioner Teh was selected to serve as Vice Chair, a role he filled for a year until being succeeded by Chair Marciante at the Commission's first Zoom meeting. Over his term on the Commission, the list of issues Commissioner Teh has been involved with includes the Vision Zero action plan; the 2019-2030 Transportation Facilities Plan update; the annual updates to the Transportation Improvement Program; striping bike lanes on Main Street; the Eastgate Transportation Study; the Bellevue Way HOV lane; and the bike share pilot program. Mr. McDonald said he appreciated Commissioner Teh's perseverance through many long and interesting meetings.

Commissioner Teh said he appreciated the opportunity to serve as part of the Commission. He noted that he was appointed to the Commission on the same day Chair Marciante was appointed. He said his decision to leave after a single term stemmed from a lack of time. He said he was excited about all the issues covered during his tenure and seeing them come to fruition. He wished everyone the best.

Chair Marciante said she was sad to see Commissioner Teh leave the Commission. She said she appreciated the perspectives and insights he brought to the table.

Commissioner Ting said he also enjoyed working with Commissioner Teh and hearing his reasoned responses.

## 2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

## 3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Ms. Michelle Wannamaker, 4045 149th Avenue SE, noted that staff was proposing to decrease the number of Mobility Management Areas (MMA), and suggested they went too far by also increasing the V/C performance targets. During multimodal level of service the Transportation Commissioners were not allowed to even consider changes to the MMAs or the existing V/C standards. In fact Mr. McDonald was so adamant that he would not even allow a discussion of it. She said she found it difficult to understand how he could now do a complete reversal on the MMAs and V/C standards. She noted that she has been calling for changes to the MMAs for the past six years and had taken the liberty of marking up the two maps from the meeting materials with an alternative option and included them with her letter to the Commission. She said she has also been calling for changes to the V/C standards, but stressed that what she wants to see done is to decrease the standards, not increase them, thus reducing their effectiveness by doing away with the standards and making them performance targets. The fact that there are tables at the end of the Mobility Implementation Plan agenda memo which repeatedly states “per MMLOS” should make the Commission stop and ask why the rest of the document does not refer to “per MMLOS.” The actions the staff are calling for are just what the developers want to see. The city’s current traffic mess is a direct result of the City Council raising the bar on the system intersection V/C standards just as staff are now trying to get the Commission to do with the V/C performance targets instead of holding the line and making sure that developers pay for the full impacts of their projects. If the proposal is approved, developers will be dancing in the aisle and Bellevue traffic will get much, much worse. It appears as though the staff are twisting the MMLOS report so they can pick and choose what they want to see, not what the Commission defined in the MMLOS report. The Commission should not allow the standards to be changed to targets.

Mr. Vic Bishop, former member of the Commission, said he currently serves as legislative chair for the Eastside Transportation Association (ETA). He said the ETA urges the Commission to reject any and all proposed changes to long-standing Comprehensive Plan transportation policies and goals that weaken or remove congestion relief as fundamental to the city’s policies. The citizens of Bellevue deserve more, not less, emphasis on congestion relief and reduced travel times. Their dissatisfaction with the growing levels of neighborhood cut-through traffic, reduction in lane capacity for motor vehicles, traffic backups and overall increases in congestion, is well known to the city. Traffic and trips from new development and congestion have consistently been the biggest concerns voiced to the City Council over the last several years in the budget survey, yet the Commission is scheduled to recommend the most radical transportation policy changes in the history of the city. The changes would lower Bellevue’s standards for mobility, enable worse congestion than currently allowed, increase the time it takes to travel throughout the city, and fail to meet the intent of the Growth Management Act’s concurrency requirement that Bellevue have adequate capacity in the city’s transportation system to accommodate growth. The Commission should strive to make sure every concurrency goal and policy will reduce, not increase, congestion. A good place to start would be to retain the existing Comprehensive Plan concurrency policy, TR-2. The city has the

responsibility to objectively address the current and future demands on the city's transportation system. Furthermore, Bellevue should increase its efforts to meet the existing Comprehensive Plan goal of striving to reduce congestion and improve mobility. To do so the city must resist the temptation to give preferential treatment to any particular mode of travel, such as bicycles. Instead, Bellevue should equitably and proportionately address the needs of all users of the transportation system. He noted that two documents were attached to the letter sent to the Commission showing the proportionality and volumes of various modes of travel in Bellevue, and he stressed the information should be used for a data-driven approach to any transportation policy or investment action. The balanced approach would lead to maximizing the overall throughput of people and goods; most effectively limit congestion; and improve the overall quality of life. The multimodal policy changes should be rejected and the whole process should be rethought with robust citizen input.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS, AND MEMBERS OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION – None
5. STAFF REPORTS – None
6. PUBLIC HEARING – None
7. STUDY SESSION
  - A. Multimodal Concurrency Policy

Chair Marciante noted the receipt of a revised set of policies based on input from Commissioners and staff. She said staff was seeking approval to move the policies on to the Planning Commission for inclusion in the 2021 Comprehensive Plan amendment process as directed by the City Council.

Mr. McDonald allowed that throughout the process staff and the consultant had been using terms that are in part term-of-art, part technical and part created for the purpose of the Mobility Implementation Plan. At the previous meeting, the Commission suggested having the definitions written down and to that end he explained that Performance Metrics are the things being measured for each mode. By and large, the metrics are the same as those recommended by the Commission in the Multimodal Level of Service Metrics, Standards and Guidelines Report finalized in 2017.

Continuing, Mr. McDonald said Performance Targets are how the metric, or outcome of the measuring of the performance, matches up with the minimal performance expectations for each mode. The V/C ratio was established as a standard through the Traffic Standards Code and is one example of a target that may be modified through the Mobility Implementation Plan. The Performance Management Areas conversation began with the Commission in 2017. The Commission retained the existing Mobility Management Areas that were adopted in the Traffic Standards Code. Through the Mobility Implementation Plan, the conversation includes modifying the geographic areas in which the transportation system is measured. The logical creation of the performance management areas may end up being aggregates of different types of land uses.

One term used in the mobility conversation has been the “mobility unit”. The term is used by other jurisdictions but it did not catch hold with the Commission. In seeking a term that would

resonate, staff and the consultant coined the term “concurrency account.” A concurrency account has credits, which is the supply of mobility created by transportation projects, and debits, which is the demand created by development permits.

Mr. McDonald said the changes proposed by staff to the policies are the direct result of input from Commissioners and internal discussions with staff. He noted that previously the Commission noted that the goal statement read more like a policy, and so staff reworked it into a policy, sent it out as part of the agenda memo, and then subsequently revised it to be more directive. No changes were made to policies TR-2 and TR-20 since the last Commission meeting. Policy TR-22 was modified to respond to the Commission’s direction relative to the importance of community engagement. The recommendation to repeal Policy TR-29 stands. Policy TR-30 reflects input from the Commission, and based on continuing input an additional policy emerged from it to provide for engaging the community when the Mobility Implementation Plan is amended, and establishing a time component for that engagement. Policy TR-34 also incorporates the notion of engaging the community when identifying projects, priorities, programs and resources to address the performance targets. Policy TR-73 was modified by the Commission at its previous meeting; the same was true for Policy TR-132. New A was revised slightly based on Commission input to be more direct and to remove the ambiguous notion of balance. New B was revised to change the terminology to reflect the term “concurrency account credits”. New C was amended and revised to be more direct and to remove the notion of balance. New D, New E and New F were all previously recommended to be removed.

Commissioner Stash called attention to Policy TR-22 and the phrase “to advance toward the performance targets.” She noted that the targets are defined in the definitions as the minimum bar and thus it would be more accurate to say “to meet the performance targets.” She said that change would also impact policies TR-34 and New C, both of which use the word “address” when referring to the performance targets. She stated that she agrees with the multimodal approach but stressed the need to be very deliberate about the performance of the system. Bellevue is growing and it should grow smartly, thus the need to seriously consider the targets. She said she was okay with the proposed geographic areas rather than the original 14 MMAs. She said she favors the notion of engaging the community. Going forward to the next step of setting the targets, it will be necessary to be smart in doing so.

Commissioner Ting offered edits to the goal statement, suggesting that wanting to improve the transportation system is redundant and obvious. The question is how to go about doing that and what specific outcomes lie behind the goal. He proposed “To improve all mobility options so that every Bellevue resident has a safe, comfortable and efficient experience on his or her preferred mode, while encouraging and transitioning to more environmentally sustainable and higher capacity modes.” The “what” behind the goal is safety, comfort and efficiency across all modes. The city should encourage people to transition toward being more environmentally sustainable and toward higher capacity modes of travel. People should be both encouraged and incentivized to use the modes that allow for greater efficiency.

Commissioner Beason said she agreed with the other Commissioners in terms of the need to make things understandable and measurable. She said she liked Commissioner Ting’s idea of tying all parts of the system together. It certainly will be necessary to take into consideration the current congestion issues.

Commissioner Teh said he agreed with the tweaks that were made, most of which were minor. He said he concurred with the overall direction of the policies.

Chair Marciante allowed that going from one standard that measures just congestion to a different and multi-factor standard is a difficult discussion. The multi-factor standard depends on what are being called Performance Targets. New C concerns employing a citywide multimodal approach to transportation concurrency. The previous policy talked about measuring concurrency with a standard expressed in terms of congestion. She said she hoped the same type of language could be used, making the connection with the performance targets. There appears to be some who believe a standard will be eliminated in favor of just targets, but that is not what has been proposed. The proposal replaces a one-dimensional standard with a multi-factor standard, and the factors are being called Performance Targets. She suggested language should be used to denote the fact that there will still be standards developers will have to meet based on the multi-factor approach.

Mr. McDonald allowed that words such as “standard” might have one meaning inside City Hall and another outside of City Hall. He said Chair Marciante was right in regard to the multi-factor approach that considers each mode and its value to the community in terms of providing mobility options. There are performance expectations that have been called targets, and they are the expectations for the performance of each mode, improved with each transportation project that gets built. The projects are first screened through the TFP and they are made real by adoption of the CIP. The reason staff and the consultant have aimed to back away from using the term “standard” to describe the performance of each mode is because it has a specific concurrency implication for the Growth Management Act. Each mode is not subject to a specific standard, rather to a performance expectation which has been termed a “Performance Target.”

Chair Marciante said in her mind the Mobility Implementation Plan as a comprehensive tool will act as a standard, and that is what will allow the city to achieve concurrency.

Commissioner Ting stressed the importance to consider congestion control, which is something the public wants. He said there is a clear desire for people to utilize the other modes, but until they do the city needs to help them get there. Increasing congestion as the way to get there seems fairly draconian. It is also important to think about the definitions and implications of the new supply credits. Currently there is no clear definition of what a supply credit actually is. Approving policy language without a clear understanding of the definitions would be very dangerous. He agreed with the need to think about meeting the performance standards, and what will happen if a performance standard is not met. He noted his support for the language added to the policies about engaging the community to gain their feedback. The earlier feedback is received, the easier it will be to make adjustments. There are a lot of implementation details stated in the policy text that can be delegated to the Mobility Implementation Plan, but the principles behind those policies should actually be delineated in the Comprehensive Plan. All standards and targets listed in the Mobility Implementation Plan should be defined in the Comprehensive Plan, which is a standalone document.

In regard to the feedback offered by the public, Commissioner Beason said it was clear to her that the intent of the Commission is to improve things, but the way it is being expressed seems to have left some questions. People will be able to support the changes they understand. The fact that the public thinks certain policies are being diluted is concerning. She said she would welcome hearing again the impact resulting from not hitting a standard, and said she agreed there needs to be accountability.

Commissioner Ting said he was reconciled with the fact that the Growth Management Act

concurrency standard will look at mobility units supply versus mobility units demand. The compromise is what goes into the Comprehensive Plan that defines the standards the city wants to follow, and what the consequences are for missing the standards. He said he continued to be a proponent of having mode-specific standards, but at the Comprehensive Plan level rather than at the Growth Management Act concurrency level which would cause development to cease. The city should hold itself accountable by including some teeth.

Commissioner Beason said the reality is the Commission needs to consider all components along with what is realistic and executable and which will not impact the funding and the overall growth structure of the city. She agreed with the need for accountability and targets, but they should exist within the structure of the big picture.

Chair Marciante pointed out that the proposal does not include getting rid of congestion standards. There are standards for vehicular congestion in place, though they are called Performance Targets. There is still a V/C approach included, though with a different calculation owing to the fact that Performance Management Areas will be replacing the MMAs. The crux of the matter is that the vehicle concurrency standard will be removed from the Comprehensive Plan; it will be moved into the Mobility Implementation Plan where vehicle performance metrics and targets will be defined. The Mobility Implementation Plan as a whole will fact serve as the overall standard.

Commissioner Ting said his concern was that the policy addressing congestion will in fact be removed from the Comprehensive Plan. That in itself could prove to be a bit of a public relations nightmare requiring a lot of explaining. The statement that congestion control is counter to or incompatible with MMLOS is concerning; it seems to imply the city is going to stop controlling congestion. The notion of congestion control should be retained as a policy in the Comprehensive Plan, even if it applies to all modes.

Chair Marciante disagreed. She said congestion is a measure of the flow of vehicles. In cities there is the expectation that vehicular movement will be slower in order to improve the experience of all. A pedestrian corridor, for instance, should have lower vehicle speed. She said she lives in a residential neighborhood where she does not want congestion but where she also does not want speeding. Arterial streets, which are designed to handle the capacity, are increasing in volume, even those in residential areas. Drivers on those streets should not expect free flowing conditions. Those driving through residential areas should feel very uncomfortable speeding, and that in part is what is meant by balancing the needs of the different users, and that is not captured with a V/C ratio. A variety of modes is needed, and there needs to be a pathway to using any mode. The multimodal approach helps to incorporate the roadway contexts into project decisions.

Commissioner Teh suggested the issue was being wordsmithed to death and becoming a feel-good statement that is not in reality achievable. Typically there are three constraints: quality, quantity and time. Quality might be impacts to congestion; time refers to how long it takes to implement the system; and quantity refers to budget constraints. A policy statement should serve as direction for where to go.

Commissioner Ting agreed and pointed out that goal statements are intended to be aspirational, outlining the desired achievements. He also agreed with Chair Marciante about not wanting people speeding in the neighborhoods, and said the Commission needs to be specific about what is to be approved. If it were to be stated that driving speeds on residential streets will be limited to ten miles per hour because of congestion, many would suggest that should be

addressed. The reality is that is the new standard: ten miles per hour on a 25 miles per hour road is what is delineated in the Mobility Implementation Plan as meeting the standard. Mr. Breiland suggested that was an oversimplification. That will not be the new standard in the residential context.

Commissioner Stash agreed that under the proposal the transportation system will still have an overall standard and that the targets will support that standard. That should be made very clear in the policies starting with the first one.

Commissioner Teh noted the need to be clear in terms of policies, standards, controls and procedures. He said there also is a need to be sure that what the Commission is tasked with doing is in line with the framework. Policies should state the operating principles, while standards provide the rules and controls to enforce the policies. He said he wanted to know if the Commission was focusing on the policies or also on the standards.

Chair Marciante asked staff to comment on the standards and the consequences of not meeting them. Mr. Breiland said the specific standard proposed to be adopted is that the Concurrency Account Credits will exceed the Concurrency Account Debits as spelled out in Policy New B. The consequence of not meeting the standard, as written by state law, is that the city must deny all development applications until the Concurrency Account Credits exceed the debits. It is fair to say that the focus is on trying to distill a multifaceted goal into a single standard that can be measured. The targets are intended to determine whether or not the system is performing in a way that is acceptable to the residents of Bellevue. The targets dictate the level of investments needed to accommodate the amount of growth that is allowed under the Comprehensive Plan. Under state law, the transportation concurrency policies and code elements must support the adopted Comprehensive Plan land use policies. The Growth Management Hearings Board has affirmed that a concurrency policy cannot be adopted that is fundamentally at odds with the land use policies.

Commissioner Ting suggested the supply versus demand conversation is separate from the standards to be put in the Comprehensive Plan that talk about the mode-specific Performance Targets. The consequence of violating concurrency is clear, but the standards created by the city are not subject to concurrency because they are not concurrency standards. It would be helpful to have a clear definition of what a Concurrency Account Credit is with regard to supply. How demand is created is clear, but how supply is created is not, thus it cannot be said that development will be allowed or stopped based on a supply credit. A clear definition of what a supply credit is and how it is calculated is needed.

Chair Marciante said there are three legs to the stool. The demand is given to the city by the Puget Sound Regional Council based on estimates of population and job growth, and the city has the responsibility of accommodating that growth in the land use plan. The Commission's job is to identify the transportation system that will meet the demand, and that supply is the Concurrency Account Credits. The third leg involves determining to what level of service should be made. If the decision is made that taking an hour to travel one block is acceptable, that is an accommodation of the growth and the standard. The supply is calculated through the Transportation Facilities Plan; it is the list of all the transportation projects over a 12-year period needed to meet the demand established by the Growth Management Act process. The remaining question is at what performance level should the accommodations be made.

Mr. Breiland concurred with the summation of concurrency and what will be documented in the Mobility Implementation Plan. Concurrency Account Credits are generated by investing in

transportation system infrastructure, specifically they are generated through implementation of the transportation plan. The Transportation Facilities Plan is drafted specifically to meet the demand targets.

Commissioner Ting said that helped him to understand that the Transportation Facilities Plan is drafted specifically to meet the demand. He asked if there is a model or something that takes the TFP and confirms that it will indeed meet the demand, and if there is historical data showing that the model in fact works. Mr. Breiland said Bellevue has invested in various modeling platforms aimed at tracking the performance of all the targets. The simplest form of model tracks what has been placed on the ground. The more complex models focus specifically on things like traffic congestion and traffic speeds. The city has a good track record of forecasting how much traffic volume will grow in the future, and what traffic congestion will look like in the future. The performance of the TFP can be tracked across the metrics with a strong degree of confidence that the targets will be hit, provided growth occurs as predicted and investments are made in the transportation system. He said he along with city staff have begun the process of developing a modeling exercise for the proposed TFP with the new targets. The aim is to test the targets to show they can be met, or to show that they will need to be revised. The modeling results will be shared with the Commission as they roll out.

Commissioner Beason agreed with Commissioner Teh about getting too granular with the policies. She said the goal is to help develop policies in support of the executable and living document that feeds into the bigger picture. The policies need to reflect support for the overall goals of the city, and to encourage activities, behaviors and accountability.

Commissioner Stash echoed that sentiment. She reiterated her desire to see the policies state clearly what the standard is, and include a statement that the standards will be met by mode, leaving the details to roll out in the next phase.

Chair Marciante agreed. She challenged the staff to draft language that simply states what the goal is, what the standard is based on supply, demand and performance, and an outline of what is to be achieved and the intended concurrency standard.

Commissioner Beason asked if there are any issues around use of the word “target.” There are so many moving parts and a target is a statement of the sum of the components. “Standard” evokes a far different picture from “target.”

Chair Marciante agreed with the need to be consistent in the use of the terms “standards” and “targets.” She said her interpretation of “standard” was that it referred to concurrency, and that everything else is a target for each mode in service of the standard. She said what remained unclear to her was exactly what the standard is in terms of transportation concurrency. That must be expressly stated.

Commissioner Stash concurred. She said there needs to be one overriding concurrency standard, followed by targets for each mode in support of meeting the standard. Commissioner Beason agreed as well.

Commissioner Ting asked if additional public engagement was needed before sending the package off to the Planning Commission. Chair Marciante pointed out that there will be public input at the Planning Commission level, as well as at the Council level. Commissioner Ting said his concern was that as the process moves forward, responding to public engagement becomes more and more expensive.



Mr. McDonald said he believed staff and the consultant could embed the Commission's recommendations into the policies without having to come back for additional discussion. He noted the support of the Commission for Commissioner Ting's proposed new goal and agreed it is a reasonable aspiration. He also noted the support of the Commission to embed engagement with the community as the planning continues. He agreed that there is only one standard for concurrency and a number of Performance Targets in support of the standard that reflect the aspirations of the community for mobility, safety and connection, all of which is expressed in the goal. There will indeed be additional public process at the Planning Commission level, including a public hearing on the policies before they are forwarded to the Council for approval.

Chair Marciante suggested where the Commission was stuck was in regard to the New policies. She said they remain too convoluted and they are not clear. New A should clearly spell out what the standard is. Mr. McDonald said New A says what to do, while New B outlines a process for how to use the direction articulated in New A to ensure there will be enough supply in the city to meet the demand. Chair Marciante said New B should not talk about Concurrency Account Credits, rather it should talk about supply, demand and performance. Mr. McDonald said he would try to craft a policy around that, and stressed that typically there is associated narrative that sets the context for policy. He suggested that much of what Chair Marciante was describing was good material for the narrative.

Commissioner Ting said he would feel more comfortable being able to look at the final draft and getting feedback from the public before sending the policies to the Planning Commission. He said the issues are substantive and impactful. The Commission holds a public hearing for the TFP but has not had a robust public engagement process focused on the policies.

Chair Marciante pointed out that the Commission was established in part to make informed decisions on behalf of Bellevue citizens. The Commission certainly engages the public to the extent possible before doing so.

Assistant Transportation Director Paula Stevens asked Commissioner Ting what additional public involvement he was looking for that could not be achieved through the Planning Commission process and the upcoming robust process for public engagement that is in the planning stage for the Mobility Implementation Plan. Commissioner Ting said the Commissioners spend a lot of time thinking about transportation issues. He said he would like to be in the loop as work on the transportation policies progresses. He agreed more community feedback can be achieved through the Planning Commission process, by the time that happens the work of the Transportation Commission on the policies will be effectively done. What the public needs to understand are the benefits and the risks so that the members of the Transportation Commission can make the call.

Ms. Stevens agreed that the roll of the Commission is to listen to the community and filter their comments in the recommendations passed along for Council action. She said her question for the Commission was what additional public process would be appropriate. Commissioner Ting said he would like to see something along the lines of the Great Neighborhoods planning process which has involved some unique outreach efforts and which have been fairly well attended.

Chair Marciante asked staff to return to the Commission on June 10 with the revised policies.

## B. Mobility Implementation Plan

Mr. McDonald said through its work on the Mobility Implementation Plan the Commission will be making very specific recommendations in terms of what to measure, what level of service to set for each mode, and the appropriate geography for measuring level of service for each mode. Policy is the “what” and the Mobility Implementation Plan is the “how.”

Mr. Breiland said the June 10 meeting discussion would include a focus on vehicle Performance Targets. He articulated that the targets are the modal expectations for performance residents can expect when the targets are achieved. He allowed that the metrics are derived from the 2017 MMLOS document, with one proposed change related to transit. The targets are set in the context of a layered network, which was the foundation for the MMLOS work. It would be unrealistic to strive for free-flowing traffic for everyone in all places at all times, which is why there is a need to strive for balance. A public involvement plan for the Mobility Implementation Plan is being developed.

Continuing, Mr. Breiland explained that the layered network concept is from the Institute of Transportation Engineers. The concept is a bigger picture view of what Complete Streets are. The city does not have infinite space to provide for the transportation system and the layered network is all about the idea of moving everyone in their preferred mode, but not always in the same space at the same time. The concept is fundamentally rooted in land use and determining what transportation options are needed in order to serve it. Once the land use context is known, there are various modes of travel that can be considered, each with a set of user expectations related to the land use context. In a busy commercial area, pedestrian expectations will be different from those in a residential neighborhood. Likewise, one’s experience driving a car or riding a bus will vary based on the land use context.

In 2017 staff and the consultants worked with the Commission to layer all the modal expectations on Bellevue Way in Downtown Bellevue. He shared with the Commissioners a graphic showing all the modes using the area, including transit routes, intersections, pedestrian crossings and bikeways. The layered network was designed to try to understand the expectations in the Downtown and how Bellevue Way should function in that context. The targets were built up from the layers and the metrics match those in the MMLOS report.

Mr. Breiland noted that the performance guidelines vary by land use. He said the MIP proposal is to adopt the MMLOS PerformanceTargets. Zeroing in on sidewalk width, he explained that there are different targets for each land use context, including the Downtown, activity centers such as BelRed, Eastgate and Factoria, neighborhood shopping centers, and pedestrian destinations. Using Bellevue Way as an example, and noting that most of the Bellevue Way corridor has a pedestrian designation, the metric is the width of the sidewalk and the associated buffer, and the target is 13 feet. In the Downtown the target is 16 feet, while adjacent to neighborhood shopping centers the target is 13 feet on the side of the street fronting the shopping center, and 12 feet on the other side of the street. The target for sidewalk dimensions vary by the land use context. In more congested areas, wider sidewalks; while in less congested areas, narrower sidewalks.

The city has data for sidewalk dimensions in different parts of the city. It is possible to calculate how complete the sidewalk network is in the Downtown versus Factoria, for example, making it possible to track how the targets are met as the TFP is implemented across the different parts of the city. The Commissioners were shown a map showing sidewalks colored to indicate where existing sidewalks do not meet the target, green where the sidewalks meet the

target, and blue where there is no sidewalk in place. The city could conclude that the first step should be to fill in the gaps.

The metric of valuation is the concept of level of traffic stress (LTS). In the original MMLOS document, LTS-1 was identified for bicycle priority corridors, while LTS-2 and LTS-3 for bicycle network corridors and intersections. While the metric is unchanged, the focus is on what is reasonable to expect in terms of LTS based on available right-of-way, committed projects and the city's intersection with earlier efforts to extend the bicycle network. The work of re-estimating the targets on the bicycle network corridors across the city is under way. A colored map showing the LTS conditions in 2017 was shared with the Commission. As part of the work on the Mobility Implementation Plan, a deeper dive will be taken into the LTS Performance Targets to make sure they are achievable. Of all the arterial corridors in 2017, 46 percent met the target. The current work will help to identify whether or not the progress made since then has been adequate. With regard to concurrency, the focus is on whether the city is building enough of the system in order to be able to accommodate the expectations of people moving throughout the community.

With regard to transit, the metrics relate to transit speed between activity centers and the components of the bus stops. The idea with regard to the latter is to provide comfortable places to wait for the bus along with general routing information. Trips by bus should not be so slow as to be so inconvenient that it is not worthwhile. The previous MMLOS guidelines had a draft target that was derived from King County Metro's transit plan of 14 miles per hour between activity centers, but that target is difficult to achieve given how often buses stop to pick up riders and at intersections. A realistic target is needed. The Mobility Implementation Plan analysis will help to determine what the targets should be and what the city can afford to provide over time. Bus stop amenities across the city are based on the type of transit service. Local transit means the buses do not come by often. Primary transit involves buses that come more often, and frequent transit buses arrive every 15 minutes all day. A chart showing an evaluation of the Frequent Transit Network bus stop characteristics and how well the stops meet the current targets was shared with the Commission. Not all meet their targets currently and the aim is to improve them over time. With regard to transit travel time, no routes currently meet the 14 miles per hour target, and unless some big tradeoffs are made by the city in the future, such as widening a lot of roads, it will not be realistic to have 14 miles per hour as the target.

Mr. Breiland said for all modes except vehicles, the targets generally follow the MMLOS recommendation, though some deviations are proposed for bicycles and transit. The geography is generally citywide with land use variations. For concurrency, a temporal implementation element will focus on how much of the pedestrian network should be built in different parts of the city based on growth over time. That element has yet to be addressed by staff and the consultants.

Commissioner Ting asked how new technologies will be taken into account, such as e-bikes and e-scooters, when looking at performance metrics and targets. Mr. Breiland said for wheeled mobility devices, the bike LTS generally applies. E-scooters function best in LTS environments that work well for e-bikes and traditional bikes. Having really wide sidewalks in the Downtown will in part be in recognition that there will be more people using them, some using wheeled mobility devices, and a need for more space to accommodate them. There will always be new technologies emerging, such as sidewalk delivery robots, that will work fine on wide sidewalks but less well on narrow sidewalks and even less well or not at all in areas without sidewalks. The biggest new technology in the offing is autonomous vehicles.

Fundamentally it is known that autonomous vehicles without policy management will increase vehicle miles travelled and will tend to drive up the V/C ratio at a lot of intersections.

Commissioner Ting said he hopes that when new technologies do come around, the city should keep in mind how they will affect the projected buildouts, and should be proactive rather than reactive. Mr. Breiland agreed that there is much that can be gained from new technologies. They certainly will need to be considered in terms of land use.

Chair Marciante suggested that bicycles on Downtown sidewalks may not be desirable given how many people are using the sidewalk. She noted that in her neighborhood where there is a greenbelt, some cyclists choose not to ride on the greenbelt because of the large numbers of people walking there. Cyclists may choose instead to ride on the street, which is more dangerous. How current facilities are used will need to be considered as new technologies come online.

A motion to extend the meeting to 9:10 p.m. was made by Commissioner Ting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Stash and the motion carried without objection.

Mr. Breiland briefly reviewed with the Commissioners the public engagement plan. He said the intent is to bring the public up to speed about why the Mobility Implementation Plan work is being done and the city's shift to multimodalism. The public will be asked to weigh in on what they would like to see protected, what they would like to see created, and what they would like to see avoided in terms of mobility and day-to-day livability. Traffic congestion is an important issue in the city, but it is not the only issue. The outreach process will seek ideas about equity, urban design and the environment, and possibly will ask the public to weigh in on how the city has invested in transportation in the past and how they would propose transportation investments should be made. The Engaging Bellevue virtual platform will be used along with some focused outreach.

Mr. McDonald said the first opportunity to touch base with the Planning Commission is June 23. The public hearing before the Planning Commission is slated for July 14.

Chair Marciante asked if there will be opportunities for the Commission to take into account feedback provided by the public through the process to make any tweaks or changes. Mr. McDonald said after June 10 when the Commission affirms the policies and transmits them to the Planning Commission, that body will assume the responsibility for them. However, the work being done by the Commission on the Mobility Implementation Plan may result in different policy language from what will be recommended on June 10, and if that occurs there will be an opportunity for the Commission to feather those in.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – None
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 upcoming meeting dates and

agenda items.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Marciante adjourned the meeting at 9:06 p.m.

---

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

---

Date