CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

September 11, 2025 Bellevue City Hall
6:30 p.m. Hybrid Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Chair Stash, Vice Chair Magill, Commissioners Kurz, Rebhuhn, Ting, Welcher, Williams
COMMISSIONERS REMOTE:	None
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	Commissioner Keilman
STAFF PRESENT:	Kevin McDonald, Molly Johnson, Department of Transportation
OTHERS PRESENT:	Chris Breiland, Fehr & Peers
RECORDING SECRETARY:	Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

A. Roll Call

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

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

B. Introduce New Commissioner

New Commissioner Anthony Welcher was introduced and welcomed. Commissioner Welcher noted having lived in Bellevue for 27 years and having a background in multifamily and commercial real estate, and with several governmental organizations that included infrastructure development overseas.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

A motion to amend the agenda to allow the option for the Commission to vote to approve the Mobility Implementation Plan (MIP) was made by Commissioner Rebhuhn. The motion as seconded by Commissioner Ting and the motion carried unanimously.

A motion to amend the agenda to include the option for the Commission to vote to approve the transmittal letter for the MIP was made by Vice Chair Magill. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ting and the motion carried unanimously.

The agenda as amended was approved without dissent.

3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Principal Planner Kevin McDonald informed the Commissioners that no written communications had been received since July 10.

Alex Tsimerman began with a Nazi salute and called the Commissioners Nazi pigs before delivering a lengthy and confrontational statement, criticizing the new rules regarding trespassing penalties, claiming they were extreme and unprecedented, and acknowledged having received thousands of days of trespass orders. Views were expressed in provocative language, with references to city leadership as psychopathic or schizophrenic, while insisting personally posing no physical threat. The remarks included broader criticisms of the governance in King County and invoked national political themes.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS, AND MEMBERS OF THE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION - None

5. STAFF REPORTS

Kevin McDonald explained that the City Clerk's office had communicated to staff that all board and commission members are required to receive formal training on the Open Public Meetings Act and Public Records in a virtual session scheduled to take place on October 16, from 6:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.. The training will include a live interactive format where participants may ask questions. For Commissioners unable to attend live, the session will be recorded and can be watched later, but the City Clerk must verify that each member has completed the training.

A question arose regarding whether recently completed onboarding training would fulfill this requirement. Kevin McDonald clarified that it would not, since the October session involves live dialogue and questions that may differ from a recorded video. He reassured the commissioners that the clerk's office considers the interactive component important enough to warrant attendance, even for those who have already completed earlier sessions.

Kevin McDonald announced that an additional training session focused on parliamentary procedure will also be offered. While mandatory for staff, the training will be optional for Commissioners. The session will take place in person, facilitated by a consultant, and will involve interactive scenarios.

Chair Stash asked if the session would be recorded but Kevin McDonald clarified that it is intended to be an in-person session. Details will be shared once they become available.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Mobility Implementation Plan Update

Chair Stash noted that years of work went into preparing and updating the MIP document, which is to be commended for its completeness and for presenting a layered and integrated

vision of transportation in Bellevue. The plan ties together public transit, pedestrian systems, and bicycle systems into a unified strategy. The document is thorough in that it has defined goals, metrics, and targets, and describes methods of measurement to ensure accountability and success. The significant work done by Kevin McDonald, Department of Transportation Assistant Director Molly Johnson and the consulting team was acknowledged.

Kevin McDonald said the MIP update began with an initial scope discussion with the Commission in December 2024 and continued through the first and second quarters of 2025. Substantive changes were reviewed and approved leading up to the current final review. Once the Commission approves the document, it will be forwarded to the City Council for adoption later in the fall. The Council typically holds a study session, directs staff to prepare an ordinance, and then considers adoption at a subsequent meeting.

Kevin McDonald said the Commission spent a couple of years developing the first MIP before it was adopted by the Council in April 2022. The MIP offers a unique framework; it is designed to define metrics and targets for transportation modes, monitor progress, and establish prioritization for projects when targets are not being met. The plan was crafted to align transportation investments with land-use goals and to pursue the Council's four objectives: accommodating growth, improving safety, considering equity, and enhancing access and mobility. The MIP was recognized with two significant awards in 2022: the Governor's Smart Communities Award, and the Puget Sound Regional Council Vision 2050 Award.

Kevin McDonald said due to changing circumstances since the first MIP was adopted, there is a need to update the document to address certain gaps. Among the most important updates are the introduction of Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress and Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress at Intersections, along with the incorporation of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan into the MIP.

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan was first adopted in 1993. It was amended in 1996 following the Newport Hills annexation, refreshed in 1999, and amended again in 2009. While somewhat dated, the plan fundamentally created the foundation for the pedestrian and bicycle network that the current MIP continues to build on.

The MIP focuses on mobility along arterials in the city of which there are three types: major arterials such as Bellevue Way and NE 8th Street, minor arterials that connect the majors and link residential and commercial areas; and collector arterials that distribute traffic to and from local streets. Each type serves not only vehicle mobility but also active transportation functions.

Kevin McDonald said the MIP is structured around four main goals: accommodating growth; improving safety; considering equity; and enhancing access and mobility. The goal regarding access and mobility involves creating a complete and connected network while also ensuring quality, comfort, and safety, particularly through measuring levels of traffic stress for pedestrians and bicyclists.

The MIP involves an integrated approach. The plan recognizes that land use and mobility are intertwined, and that all modes of transportation must work together to support land development and growth. This concept is expressed through a layered network approach, which identifies each mode of transportation and ensures they function cohesively.

Performance metrics are central to the MIP. For pedestrians, the Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress considers elements such as traffic speed, traffic volume, and infrastructure, and acknowledges that faster and higher-volume roads require more robust pedestrian protections. The Commission spent time discussing additional influences, such as driveway spacing, which were ultimately included in the plan. For bicyclists, modifications were made to the original metric, shifting from reliance on posted speed limits to actual operating speeds, since that more accurately reflects conditions. The plan update adds a new concept of Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress at intersections in recognition of the fact that intersections can become barriers unless they are designed to maintain a rider's safety and comfort consistent with the corridor in which they are traveling.

With regard to transit, the primary metric is the Transit Travel Time Ratio, which compares the time it takes to ride between activity centers by bus against the time it takes by car. Another metric examines the quality and comfort of bus stops along frequent transit routes.

For vehicles, there are two main performance measures: the Volume-to-Capacity ratio at system or signalized intersections; and travel speeds along primary vehicle corridors. A primary vehicle corridor is defined as one carrying more than 10,000 daily trips and stretching for at least half a mile.

Kevin McDonald said the relationship between transportation and land use is addressed through the concept of Performance Management Areas of which there are three types. PMA-1 involves the high-density mixed-use urban centers served by light rail. PMA-2 includes the moderately dense mixed-use areas that are served by frequent transit but not light rail. PMA-3 encompasses the remainder of the city, primarily the residential areas and also some smaller embedded commercial nodes such as Lake Hills or Kelsey Creek.

Turning to the performance targets, Kevin McDonald explained that they describe what the city aspires to achieve relative to each mode of transportation. For pedestrians, the PLTS targets differ between the dense urban areas and residential areas, reflecting the varying expectations and needs of each environment. For bicyclists, the network facilities include targets for Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress along corridors and at intersections. For transit, the targets focus on both travel time ratios and bus stop amenities. For vehicles, there are three levels of performance targets that apply, with urban centers allowing for higher volume-to-capacity ratios than residential areas where fewer travel alternatives exist.

Kevin McDonald underscored the importance of monitoring. Each update of the MIP documents how the system is currently performing to identify performancre target gaps. The process ensures that investments are directed toward infrastructure improvements that advance

the goal of achieving a complete and connected transportation network.

Kevin McDonald explained that the Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress varies depending on both the performance management area and the arterial type. The highest standards are applied in PMA-1, the city's dense urban centers, because those areas are expected to have the greatest pedestrian activity and the largest number of destinations. However, even within PMA-3, the more residential areas, the plan acknowledges the presence of important pedestrian destinations such as schools, libraries, and shopping centers. Those locations receive special consideration and require additional pedestrian infrastructure.

The plan contains two types of targets for bicycles: one for corridors and another for intersections. Bicycle priority corridors, of which there are eleven running in the north-south and east-west directions across the city, were identified as particularly important. The corridors are designed to provide safe travel for bicyclists of all ages and abilities, and therefore they require a higher performance target. At intersections along the corridors, the goal is to ensure that the safety and comfort of the rider is consistent with the quality of the corridor itself so that intersections do not become barriers.

With regard to the transit mode, Kevin McDonald explained that the primary target is a Transit Travel Time Ratio of two or less, meaning that it should not take more than twice as long to travel between activity centers by bus as it does by car. While buses make frequent stops, they also offer the advantage of not requiring the rider to park at their destinations. The ratio is identified as a measure of success during peak travel hours. Amenities at transit stops are included as part of the performance expectations. The plan distinguishes between local transit stops and frequent transit network stops, with differing levels of amenities that acknowledge ridership and ensure rider comfort.

The plan uses two performance targets for vehicles. One is the volume-to-capacity ratio at intersections and the other is the travel speed along primary vehicle corridors. The targets vary by Performance Management Area in recognition of the differences in density and travel friction. Corridor travel speed is defined as 40 percent of the posted speed limit, which acknowledges the natural delays caused by signals, mid-block crossings, and other points of friction. The ratio is adjusted depending on the Performance Management Area, with PMA-1, the urban centers, allowing for greater friction and slower targets. Even in the PMA-3 areas where there are fewer elements of friction, it is not likely the 40 percent baseline will be achieved, so the target is 0.9.

Kevin McDonald reiterated the importance of ongoing monitoring of performance, which is vital for identifying where the transportation system is succeeding and where there are gaps. Maps were shared with the Commission depicting pedestrian and bicycle performance. Blue lines indicated locations where facilities exist but do not meet the performance target, while yellow lines indicated full gaps where no facility is present. It was noted that similar maps exist for transit, where amber highlights mark activity centers with travel times above the acceptable ratio, and for vehicles, where yellow lines and dots mark arterials and intersections failing to meet the targets.

Kevin McDonald explained that to address the shortcomings, the process involves analyzing the performance gaps, prioritizing them based on scoring criteria aligned with the MIP goals, and then developing project concepts for only the highest scoring gaps. The concepts are then submitted for consideration in the Transportation Facilities Plan, where they must compete with other projects for limited funding.

One of the most substantial changes in the MIP update is the integration of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan. Kevin McDonald pointed out that the corridors identified in the original 1993 plan remain central to the current network. The 1993 plan anticipated future needs with surprising accuracy, as demonstrated by the example of Spring Boulevard, which in 1993 was in the BelRed industrial area but which was already envisioned as a corridor requiring pedestrian and bicycle connections.

Kevin McDonald explained the rationale for incorporating the older plan into the MIP by noting that while the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan provided a strong foundation, its prescriptive project descriptions often failed to achieve the performance targets required today, given advancements in best practices and changes in technology. The MIP does not prescribe fixed project types but instead sets performance targets, leaving flexibility for modern design solutions. As an example, the 2009 plan's prescription of a five-foot bike lane on Main Street was compared with what was actually built: a protected bike lane with vertical buffers, a landscape strip, and wide sidewalks. The facility not only met the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress target but also improved pedestrian safety and comfort, demonstrating the superiority of performance-based planning over prescriptive methods.

Kevin McDonald noted that while the MIP absorbs much of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan, it also preserves the value of the earlier documents by including trail maps and project descriptions verbatim in Appendix A, ensuring that until a comprehensive trail master plan is created, the MIP will serve as the guiding document for trails. The comparison of network maps from 1993 and 2025 reinforces the enduring nature of the arterial framework and the foresight of earlier planning efforts, even as the MIP now provides a more flexible, performance-driven, and modern approach to ensuring safety and connectivity for all modes.

With regard to Appendix A of the Mobility Implementation Plan, Kevin McDonald stated that the trails and off-street networks from the earlier Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plan had been cut and pasted into the appendix in order to preserve their legacy value. Appendix A contains quadrant maps of the city, such as those covering areas like Eastgate, Phantom Lake, and Lake Hills. Each map highlights projects originally identified in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan. Every project is listed with a unique number, a name, the start and end points, a description of the project, and a priority ranking. Although the legacy project descriptions may not necessarily reflect what would be built today, they provide important documentation that staff and community members can reference when considering trail projects. Community input and evolving best practices may guide modifications in the future, but the city did not want to lose the historical information.

Commissioner Rebhuhn asked if bus ridership is figured in. Kevin McDonald clarified that ridership is not included as a performance metric in the MIP because the city does not operate buses and therefore does not set goals it cannot control. However, the city does work with transit providers to monitor ridership, which helps providers adjust their services. The city's Comprehensive Plan contains commute trip reduction targets that aim to reduce single-occupancy vehicle travel. The city works with employers to encourage alternative modes such as walking, biking, transit use, or telecommuting.

Commissioner Williams noted having tapped artificial intelligence resources in regard to best practices for Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress and Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress and finding nearly identical best practices to those already embedded in the MIP, a clear indication that Bellevue's work is aligned with broader standards. However, intersection complexity was also mentioned by AI as a potential metric. Kevin McDonald replied that the MIP already accounts for intersections through the Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress at intersections metric. For pedestrians, the plan assumes that corridor standards carry through to intersections, and the city also applies design standards and operational tools such as larger crosswalk dimensions and leading pedestrian intervals, which gives pedestrians a head start over turning vehicles. It was acknowledged that intersection complexity for pedestrians was not included in the update but allowed that it could be considered in future revisions.

Commissioner Williams praised the city for the work of creating an award-winning plan and ensuring Bellevue's recognition. The question asked was why the peak travel period was defined as the afternoon rather than the morning. Consultant Chris Breiland with Fehr & Peers responded that the city has monitored traffic for many years and has found that the afternoon peak remains busier, a trend that has intensified since the pandemic as work schedules have become more flexible. The afternoon combines work commutes, after-school activities, and social trips, making it the most relevant time for measuring peak conditions.

Commissioner Williams observed that in the Overlake area, Redmond's city limits cut into Bellevue's corridor map, creating a small triangular gap. It was asked whether there is coordination between the two cities. Kevin McDonald confirmed that Bellevue staff communicate with Redmond colleagues, particularly in regard to pedestrian and bicycle planning. Redmond's Overlake area has changed significantly over the past decade, and Bellevue's modeling work does incorporate Redmond's traffic data.

Commissioner Williams observed that there is no good way to get from the Overlake area into Bellevue by bicycle, and most riders oppose using Bel-Red Road. Kevin McDonald acknowledged the concern and stated that once the gap in Spring Boulevard is completed, it will provide an excellent east-west corridor for cyclists.

Commissioner Williams observed that while schools, hospitals, community centers, and libraries are intended to have BLTS-2, shopping centers are not explicitly mentioned. Kevin McDonald responded that shopping centers had been discussed previously and might already be highlighted, agreeing that they should be added to the legend for clarity. Chris Breiland agreed and added that definitions of shopping centers can be complex depending on zoning and

activity levels. During the development of the original MIP, sidewalk widths and other considerations were emphasized near neighborhood shopping centers and frequent transit network stops where pedestrian traffic is higher. The legacy treatment should carry through to the current plan.

Commissioner Williams raised a broader question about travel patterns between activity centers such as Overlake, Crossroads, and Eastgate and wondered whether the city identifies typical traffic purposes, such as students commuting to Bellevue College in Eastgate or residents traveling between neighborhoods. Kevin McDonald explained that the framework is more general, focusing on travel between activity centers, primarily PMA-1 and PMA-2 areas, which naturally generates higher volumes of movements.

Chris Breiland added that the activity centers coincide with the largest transit ridership nodes in Bellevue, such as the Eastgate park and ride and Factoria, which serve as major hubs for boarding, transfers, and alighting. The alignment reflects both land use and transit patterns.

Vice Chair McGill also pointed out that Eastgate hosts many community services, such as Hope Link and Jubilee Reach, which attract additional trips. Kevin McDonald emphasized that the identified corridors not only connect major activity centers but also serve the neighborhoods and intermediate points along them, ensuring broad access.

Commissioner Ting recalled previous discussions that identified driveways as potentially hazardous locations for pedestrians and cyclists due to vehicle interactions and questioned whether driveways are categorized as Type 1 or Type 2 in the supplemental prioritization framework. Kevin McDonald said the notes from earlier discussions would need to be reviewed to confirm the intended classification. Driveways do influence both project design and prioritization.

Commissioner Ting recalled earlier discussions about intersection BLTS around shifting from an objective table of fixed design standards to a more flexible and subjective approach, and asked whether that had been incorporated into the MIP. Kevin McDonald confirmed that it had, and Chris Breiland pointed to Table 5 on page 26 which provides examples of treatments such as bike boxes, protected intersections, bicycle signals, and green striping. The goal was to illustrate options without prescribing a single fixed solution, since intersections vary in complexity, available right of way, and competing demands. The approach allows for flexibility while still guiding expectations for comfort and safety.

Commissioner Ting raised a high-level question about the relationship between the Curb Management Plan (CMP) and the MIP. It was allowed that both documents sometimes address similar issues and the question asked was how differences in prioritization should be reconciled. Kevin McDonald responded that the two plans should not be viewed as competing. The MIP, with its established performance metrics and targets, provides the overarching guidance. The CMP supports those goals but does not override them. In cases of conflict, the MIP is considered the governing framework. The MIP establishes the performance targets, while the CMP describes how the curb space is managed in relation to the vehicle mode. The

curb area is complex area that serves as a zone for parking, walking, driving, loading, and unloading. Curb management must be considered holistically with pedestrian and bicycle performance targets before any changes are made.

Chris Breiland elaborated by providing an example along 108th Avenue NE front of the new Amazon tower near the transit center. In that location, the MIP dictated the need for a BLTS 1 facility, which was delivered. However, the developer also worked with the city to carve out loading zones for pedestrian pick-up and drop-off and carved out some space accordingly. In such situations, the CMP helps manage specific curb uses, but the MIP sets the overarching corridor expectation. While the MIP dictates priorities in areas of new development, curb management decisions must still consider multiple stakeholders when weighing tradeoffs between parking, bicycle facilities, and other curb uses.

Commissioner Ting thanked staff for including the 2009 pedestrian and bicycle information within the MIP. Pointing to the West Lake Sammamish Parkway segment near Vasa Park, which had been categorized as a medium priority, Commissioner Ting asked why it had been given that designation before reiterating a request for the city to document the rationale behind prioritization decisions, even briefly, so that institutional knowledge is preserved for future commissions. Even arbitrary decisions should be noted since understanding how choices were made provides important context. Kevin McDonald responded that such rationale likely was not embedded in the older plans but agreed that capturing that type of reasoning would be valuable moving forward.

Vice Chair McGill also praised the inclusion of the 2009 Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan within the MIP, explaining that it was helpful to have all of the information consolidated in one comprehensive document rather than scattered across many. Referencing the performance data regarding primary vehicle corridor performance based on the 2023 data, it was pointed out that Bellevue Way during peak hours is clearly congested in real life but is shown as green in the document. Kevin McDonald explained that the maps contain footnotes indicating that the data is preliminary and subject to updates, as was also the case in the previous MIP. While older data is used as a baseline, new project concepts rely on the most recent information available.

Vice Chair McGill asked why data from 2025 was not yet included and asked what the impediment was to updating the vehicle information. Department of Transportation Assistant Director Molly Johnson responded that the data came from a model run for the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. At that time, the most current data was from late 2023, but vehicle volumes had not stabilized, and in some cases, 2019 data was used instead. The pandemic disrupted travel patterns, making it difficult to rely on certain years. With major employers now shifting back to five-day office schedules, the city is actively monitoring whether 2024 data will more accurately reflect conditions in 2025. The system is a moving target that requires constant updating.

Vice Chair McGill referred to the 2044 projections listed on page 57 and questioned why the same congested segment of Bellevue Way is shown as green in the future. Molly Johnson

explained that modeling assumptions include projects that are anticipated to be built by the target year, such as high-occupancy vehicle lanes, which can shift performance levels. However, even with new projects, growth may outpace capacity, and congestion can remain. Maps are not intended to provide granular specificity but rather to show overall system performance.

Kevin McDonald said the difference between pages 47 and 57 lies in the fact that the first represents current performance, while the second projects future performance based on planned improvements. Although an HOV lane was included in the modeling assumptions for 2044, it may not fully resolve congestion, and some segments might even worsen.

Chair Stash clarified that the performance targets do not mean free-flow traffic but rather acceptable flow within a certain threshold. Molly Johnson agreed and stressed that the maps are intended to highlight system-level issues and indicate where further study is needed, not to suggest that conditions on individual streets will necessarily match the projected performance colors.

Kevin McDonald reminding the Commission that Appendix H of the MIP contains documentation of the performance of each intersection and corridor segment. The appendix is drawn from the Comprehensive Plan's Final Environmental Impact Statement and provides several pages of detailed data, which can serve as a resource for Commissioners wanting to explore the specifics of performance outcomes in greater depth.

Commissioner Ting referred to the online MIP map, which is built into ArcGIS story maps, and observed that the vehicular network performance data displayed there appears to be based on 2019 information. While noting the lag likely is tied to the pandemic, the question asked was whether there is a set interval for updates. Molly Johnson responded that the data is being updated currently as part of the Transportation Facilities Plan model. The Commission will see revised data in the next month when the TFP is presented, though the format will differ from the MIP's performance metrics. It was noted that the number of intersections not meeting their performance targets had changed between updates, which is an indication of how conditions evolve and how priorities shift.

Commissioner Ting asked how the MIP accounts for changes in land use, given that the 2044 FEIS is a snapshot of assumptions made by the Planning Commission and the City Council at the time, and raised the concern that as housing policies and land use allocations change, the transportation system's modeling assumptions may quickly become outdated. Molly Johnson explained that the Department of Community Development provides land use data through a demographer. The office ensures that the most recent Council-approved or anticipated land use changes, such as the Housing Opportunity Initiatives and the Wilburton plan, are incorporated into the modeling. Those updates are not provided on a routine interval such as every six months but are instead tied to model updates, ensuring that the latest land use assumptions are reflected when transportation models are revised.

Kevin McDonald added that while the monitoring maps in the MIP are useful snapshots, they

inevitably change with time. The MIP is built around performance targets, which reflect the intended outcomes tied to land use and PMAs. The targets provide the long-term direction, while the data points represent conditions at a single moment.

Commissioner Ting acknowledged the explanation but reiterated a concern that long-term projections, such as those to 2044, are only as reliable as the assumptions they are based on. Kevin McDonald agreed, noting that forecasts are only as good as their assumptions, which can change at any time.

Commissioner Ting emphasized that one of the pillars of the MIP is equity and expressed a desire for clarity on which groups are targeted and what outcomes are being sought, and argued that lower-income workers should be a primary focus, given their greater reliance on affordable, accessible transportation. The Commission was encouraged to not only track goals but also to ensure that actions taken lead to measurable benefits for those in equity categories, particularly low-wage workers. Further discussion is needed on how to link actions with outcomes to ensure the system helps those most in need.

Vice Chair McGill pointed out that the Commission had not fully explored the equity maps included in Appendix J and agreed that further attention should be given to understanding how low-wage workers and other vulnerable groups use the transportation system, and how the MIP can best meet their needs.

Chair Stash said it is exciting to see new transportation improvements around Bellevue, such as the bright green bike lanes on Bellevue Way which provide clear and visible connections for cyclists. Such changes highlight the integration of active transportation into the road network in ways that are highly visible to drivers and riders alike.

Chair Stash returned to the question of measuring vehicle performance and asked for clarification about how peak hour measurements are determined, since the plan states that corridors are evaluated based on the single busiest hour. Kevin McDonald confirmed that for intersections, a two-hour peak period from 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. is used, but for corridors the analysis focuses on the busiest one-hour segment.

Chris Breiland elaborated by explaining that within the afternoon peak window, the data collection identifies the single busiest hour for each segment. The approach is grounded in the Highway Capacity Manual which sets the standard for traffic flow analysis. The busiest hour may differ slightly from segment to segment, sometimes by thirty minutes, but the method ensures consistency with established transportation engineering practices.

Chair Stash asked about the trails documentation and wanted to confirm that the information on trails in the appendices had been transferred directly from previous planning documents rather than updated. Kevin McDonald explained that the trail maps and project descriptions were carried over unchanged. Chair Stash asked if a trail that gets paved could be built into a bike network. Kevin McDonald said the bike network in the MIP looks only at arterials. That does not mean there are no other places where bikes could ride in the future, including local

streets and trails. Many trails are not designed for bikes though some are, but the performance of them is not documented in the MIP. The project descriptions for the trails describe their width and surface treatments, though the descriptions are 16 years old. The lines on the map indicate the intended location of trails and they remain part of the official record until a more comprehensive update can be undertaken in the future.

Chair Stash asked if future changes to trails will be folded into the Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP). Kevin McDonald answered that the TFP largely addresses arterials, while trail planning is led by Parks and Community Services staff and the Parks and Community Services Board. The trail program is therefore largely independent of the MIP and TFP.

Chair Stash asked for an update regarding the Spring District's east-west missing link. Kevin McDonald explained that the project currently lacks funding and cannot be placed in the financially constrained TFP. Molly Johnson reminded the Commissioners that the TFP is updated every three years and the prioritization of projects are considered as new revenues are identified. The missing link project has an estimated cost of $80 million for the complete street connection because of the complexity of structures, wetlands, right-of-way, and light rail constraints.

Vice Chair Magill asked about a bicycle-only alternative, Kevin McDonald said it has been estimated that it will take $18 million to $20 million just for a compliant pedestrian and bicycle link between 124th Avenue NE and 130th Avenue NE. The prior conclusion was that separating the modes was not advisable given the expense and constraints.

Commissioner Ting commented that despite the cost, completing the connection remains an important priority and should continue to be treated as such in future TFP deliberations.

Commissioner Rebhuhn pointed out that the Commission had earlier elected to remove the BelRed corridor from consideration, but it was later brought back in for consideration. Kevin McDonald confirmed that it was not advanced for consideration into the TFP and is not being studied further at this time.

Commissioner Ting requested scheduling a future discussion on cross-modal prioritization. It might land in the TFP discussion and it is always good to understand the framework.

Commissioner Ting stressed the need to discuss how emerging micromobility devices such as e-scooters fit into the new MIP.

Commissioner Williams asked how e-scooters are currently treated. Kevin McDonald replied that currently there is no distinction between motorized and non-motorized bikes. The Commission has discussed e-scooters in the past and there will more discussions in the future.

Commissioner Ting suggested that future work might differentiate pedestrian, non-motorized wheeled, and motorized wheeled users on multi-use paths.

Vice Chair Magill suggested that questions such as e-bike speeds on sidewalks may be better handled as a safety issue, and asked how safety is looked at as part of the MIP. Kevin McDonald said the MIP is more about the facility type and dimensions to accommodate a broad category of vehicles rather than a particular type of vehicle.

Molly Johnson stated that the landscape relative to motorized devices is rapidly evolving. The current MIP speaks to bicycles rather than scooters. More work is needed in regard to defining how the devices work ahead of determining the right performance targets.

A motion to approve and forward both the MIP and the transmittal letter to the City Council was made by Commissioner Williams. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Ting and the motion carried unanimously.

The Commissioners then compared the options for the MIP cover and agreed to recommend Option B.

Kevin McDonald informed the Commission that the Council is expected to receive the Commission's recommendation on November 25. A representative of the Commission will need to attend the Council meeting to present the recommendation. Chair Stash agreed to attend.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. July 10, 2025

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Rebhuhn. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Williams and the motion carried unanimously.

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Vice Chair McGill asked about the status of the scooter issue. Molly Johnson responded that following the Council's approval of the updates to the scooter code, the city is preparing requests for proposals from shared micro mobility companies to operate a shared scooter program. The goal is to finalize arrangements and launch the program by the spring, ideally by April or May ahead of the World Cup.

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

Kevin McDonald took a moment to review the calendar of upcoming meeting dates and agenda items. With regard to the Commission's annual retreat, the proposal was made to move it from November 13 to January 8.

Kevin McDonald noted that both the Chair and Vice Chair will not be present for the Commission's October 9 meeting, making it necessary for the Commission to select a facilitator to run the meeting. Commissioner Ting agreed to facilitate.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Stash adjourned the meeting at 8:34 p.m.

October 9th, 2025

Secretary to the Transportation Commission | Date