CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

September 13, 2018
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
City Council Conference Room 1E-113

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:	Chair Wu, Commissioners Bishop, Lampe, Teh, Woosley
COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:	Commissioners Chirls, Marciante
STAFF PRESENT:	Kevin McDonald, John Murphy, Marie Jensen, Chris Long, Franz Loewenherz, Department of Transportation
OTHERS PRESENT:	Chris Brieland, Don Samdahl, Fehr and Peers
RECORDING SECRETARY:	Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioners Chirls and Marciante, both of whom were excused.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chair Wu added to the agenda a discussion of the upcoming retreat under New Business, and asked to have item 11, Public Comment, moved ahead on the agenda to precede item 9, Unfinished Business.

A motion to approve the agenda as amended was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe and the motion carried unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Don Marsh, 4411 137th Avenue SE, raised the issue of the electric distribution wires that follow Newport Way. He said on February 6, 2017, heavy snow knocked down trees and powerlines along Newport Way and the resulting power outage affected nearly 8000 customers in Eastgate and Somerset, some for more than 12 hours. The steep slope and thick trees along Newport Way cause problems with the distribution lines every few years. For the safety of drivers, pedestrians and residents, it is time to solve the problem. The Commission was asked to recommend that the city use Schedule 74 to move the short section of powerline underground. It is understood that the city would pay 40 percent of the cost and that Puget Sound Energy would pay 60 percent. Since Puget Sound Energy must relocate its poles to accommodate the proposed wider sidewalk and bike lane, it is a good time to address the safety issue for the community.

Ms. Claire Martini, 6810 Roosevelt Way NE, Seattle, spoke representing the Cascade Bicycle Club. She voiced support for the portions of the Bellevue bike network funded by the levy. For several years Bellevue has made commendable investments in building a transportation network that serves people in cars as well as people on bikes, on foot and those using transit. The progress

has been brought about by the analytical eye of the Commission. The Club is particularly excited about the 108th Avenue demonstration bikeway and the bike share pilot program as tangible and highly visible milestones. The refrain of the Club has been and will continue to be that significant shifts in modeshare and percentage of people biking to reduce congestion will come once a connected, protected and intuitive Bellevue bike network is in place. The projects on the proposed 2019-2020 project list offer a good start, but there five primary questions and concerns to keep in mind: 1) In addition to north-south connectivity, there needs to be some east-west connections put on the map; 2) What is meant by "downtown network improvements?" 3) It is good to see continued priority of data and the Club looks forward to learning more about bicycle counters, specifically how many and where they will be located; 4) The Club hopes the Commission will act on the opportunity to leverage major regional transportation investments, primarily the Eastside Rail Corridor that will open in 2020, and light rail coming in 2023; and 5) The Club hopes to see continued prioritization of protected facilities given that the data shows protected facilities are preferred by most women and the 50 percent of people in Bellevue who are interested but concerned about trying bicycling.

4. COMMUNICATIONS FROM CITY COUNCIL, COMMUNITY COUNCIL, BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Councilmember Lee, liaison to the Commission, welcomed the Commission back from the summer break. He said the work of the Commission is highly valued by the Council. He said he looked forward to the upcoming Commission retreat.

Commissioner Lampe noted that the week of September 10 to 14 was declared by the Mayor to be electric car week in Bellevue. He said on September 11 there was a demonstration in Downtown Park. There were some 35 cars on display and participating.

With regard to the Sound Transit Citizen Oversight Panel, Commissioner Lampe said the panel recently received a report regarding the Ballard and West Seattle links as part of ST-3 and the methodologies being used to evaluate different options. He said Sound Transit is being much more proactive than it was relative to East Link in terms of getting the options narrowed down quickly. Finances do continue to be a challenge for Sound Transit as property and construction costs have continued to rise.

Commissioner Woosley said he recently had the opportunity to meet the city's new fire chief. The conversation included transportation and the chief suggested the Commission should keep in mind issue of life safety when dealing with levels of congestion and increased delay. Currently there is about a four-minute response time, but as congestion increases the response time will increase.

Chair Wu reported that she recently visited New York City and took a bike ride along the Hudson River Greenway, going all the way to the Brooklyn Bridge. She said the facility is actually very ordinary. In designing facilities, care should be given to making sure they are fun as well as functional.

5. STAFF REPORTS

A. 2018 Capital Improvement Process CIP

Principal Transportation Planner Kevin McDonald reminded the Commissioners that he had earlier in the week sent them a link to the Council agenda item focused on the upcoming CIP

discussion. He asked the Commissioners if they would like to develop a formal recommendation relative to the CIP, which would require some agenda time over the next couple of months, or if they would prefer to review the CIP individually and provide separate comments to the Council.

Commissioner Woosley commented that the CIP is a critical part of the city budget, adding that the Council is going to need to prioritize the unallocated funds available. He suggested the Commission should emphasize the billion dollar shortfall identified in the transportation capital projects list and encourage the Council to invest as much as is reasonable to reduce the list. The Commission should weigh in with a recommendation to the Council.

Commissioner Bishop asked to what degree the Commission was involved in the CIP process when last updated two years ago. Mr. McDonald said the role of the Commission has evolved over the last few budget cycles. Two years ago the Commission forwarded a transmittal to the Council with general recommendations. Commissioner Bishop said he would be in favor of seeing the Commission getting involved in discussing the priorities and weighing in with the Council.

Commissioner Teh concurred. He said it would be good to have the Commissioners all on the same page. Commissioner Lampe said he also supported that approach.

Chair Wu voiced the same opinion and directed staff to include a discussion of the CIP on a future agenda.

Commissioner Woosley suggested a review of past communications from the Commission to the Council on the CIP would be a good place to start. There is much the Commission could say, but he stressed that the Commission has put a lot of thought into developing the various transportation project plans. Those plans certainly imply what the Commission would like to see happen.

B. Neighborhood Sidewalk Program – Newport Way SE

Mr. McDonald called attention to the memo that had been included in the Commission packet. He said the Newport Way SE sidewalk project is taking advantage of an opportunity to extend the geographic scope of the project.

Commissioner Bishop commented that the issue of undergrounding powerlines is dear to his heart. Mr. McDonald pointed out that the Commission was not being asked to weigh in on that issue.

Commissioner Woosley urged staff to pass on the information that was presented by the public about undergrounding the powerline, and Mr. McDonald said he would do that.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Levy Projects – Project List for 2019-2020

Levy Program Co-Manager Marie Jensen noted that the Commission was last updated regarding the levy in October 2017. At that time the Commission was provided with an overview of the levy program, including project types, and was briefed on the Neighborhood Congestion

Reduction program. The 20-year levy, which was approved by the voters in 2016, will sunset in 2036. It is focused on projects such as crosswalks, bike lanes, maintenance, traffic technology, sidewalks, traffic calming, street lightings, signals, turn lanes and radar signs. The funding covers the cost of outreach, planning, design and construction throughout the life cycle of each project. The types of projects specifically sought are those for which levy funds can be leveraged with other funding sources.

Levy Program Co-Manager John Murphy said the levy revenues total $7.4 million per year. The funds are split into two primary categories: neighborhood congestion reduction, and safety and connectivity projects. By Council directive, neighborhood congestion reduction receives $2 million per year, and the balance of $5.4 million goes to safety and connectivity projects that include five category types: sidewalks traffic technology, maintenance projects, bike facilities and safety projects. The allocation to neighborhood congestion reduction cannot be used for anything but congestion reduction projects, but the allocation to safety and connectivity is more flexible to best address community needs and to take advantage of leveraging opportunities.

Continuing, Mr. Murphy said the projects on the list stem from existing work programs, with the exception of congestion projects. The Commission has had direct input in terms of selecting the evaluation criteria, receiving updates relative to developing programs, developing plans, and receiving general updates from the staff on the existing programs. The Council's involvement includes adoption of plans and programs and regular updates.

Work on the list of 2017-2018 levy funded projects began in earnest in March 2017. For the biennial period, 43 projects were selected. Staff are currently working to select projects that can be delivered in roughly two-year cycles. It is suspected that by the end of 2018 there will be approximately $6.2 million of projects either fully completed or under construction.

Commissioner Woosley said he would appreciate receiving some information regarding the projected levy funding over the 20 years given that as property prices increase, the fifteen cents per thousand of assessed valuation will yield more over time. Ms. Jensen said staff would pull together that information.

Mr. Murphy shared with the Commission a chart indicating the biennial allocation to each project type, the number of projects during the biennium per project type, and the source of the projects. He also shared several images depicting the projects that have been done and that are underway.

With regard to bike lanes and facilities, Mr. Murphy noted that during 2018 the levy will help to fund 15 new or improved lane miles

Community input serves as the backbone of everything done in the transportation department. Many of the projects stem from existing program channels. The public can call or go online and request specific projects. As projects are proposed, they are subjected to the department's evaluation criteria. The Neighborhood Enhancement Program is a good source of projects. The focused neighborhood-driven enhancement program seeks directly from neighborhood residents input on projects needed in their areas.

Commissioner Woosley pointed out that Neighborhood Enhancement Program project costs have a cap and he asked if there was an intent to match those funds with levy dollars to bring about larger projects. Mr. Murphy said potential partnership opportunities are being explored. All of the projects that are transportation related do get funneled to existing programs whether or not

they are funded through the Neighborhood Enhancement Program. Levy dollars are being used to provide a local grant match and to date about half a million in levy dollars have been used to gain access to a million and a half grant dollars.

Commissioner Bishop said he hoped the transportation department was keeping a spreadsheet of the projects in each program to denote what was funded with CIP dollars and what was funded with levy dollars. Commissioner Lampe agreed that would be a good idea, adding that the city owes it to the public to be able to show how the levy funds are being used. Ms. Jensen said some of that information will be contained in the accountability report which hopefully will be published in the first quarter of 2019. The first iteration of the report will feature the 2017-2018 highlights and then it will become an annual report.

Mr. Murphy explained that the 2019-2020 projects include those that have been drawn from existing project backlogs. The projects must be consistent with what the voters approved. Projects with more of a regional bent may not be appropriate, whereas a sidewalk on a local street may be appropriate. He reiterated that there is a degree of flexibility in how the safety funding is allocated, so accordingly there will be a slight adjustment for the 2019-2020 cycle to address some needed sidewalk and maintenance projects.

With regard to Neighborhood Congestion Reduction element for 2019-2020, Mr. Murphy noted that traffic studies at nine locations will be launched in October. The broader Eastgate study is anticipated to be completed in the spring of 2019. The prioritization exercise to select projects for design and consideration for future funding as a result of the traffic studies will be done in the summer of 2019. Two projects are expected to be completed during 2019, specifically a mini roundabout at Newport Way and 164th Avenue SE, and the construction of a traffic signal at 112th Avenue NE and NE 24th Street.

The Commissioners were informed that by the end of 2020, which will be four years from the time the levy was approved, some 90 projects of every type will have been completed in every neighborhood throughout the city. Mr. Murphy said one example of the impact of the levy is the Neighborhood Sidewalk Program, which started in 2007. The program is focused on funding gaps in sidewalks that do not rise to the level of a discrete CIP project. Since the program began, just over five sidewalk segments have been completed with the $1.5 million in annual funding the program receives. It is expected that by 2021, the levy will have helped to fund 12 gap segments.

For 2019-2020 the focus will be on continuing to identify congestion projects. It is anticipated that levy funds will be used as matching funds for construction of the 150th Avenue SE/Newport Way project. There will also be a continued focus on ways to leverage grants and other funding sources; moving ahead with additional downtown and other neighborhood bike improvements; finishing work identified in 2017 by the community; and intersection improvements.

Ms. Jensen said staff have been working with the city's GIS department to create an interactive levy project map. Clicking on a dot or a line on the map will return a project name, project description, cost estimate, project phasing and contact information. The intent is to launch the map in early October. Links to the MyBellevue app have been made to take visitors to the levy webpage. Additional celebrations will be scheduled going forward; the 108th bikeway celebration was certainly a success. The levy webpage and direct email continue to be pushed at every opportunity.

Ms. Jensen said the Commission will continue to be updated on an annual basis. She noted that

most projects started in 2017 are expected to be completed in 2019. The selection process for the 2019-2020 projects has been completed and the staff are ramping up their planning and design work on those. The City Council will be updated on September 17. The involvement the Commission has had in the existing programs will continue going forward.

Commissioner Bishop said he was aware of a golden opportunity on 35th Street SE from Eastgate down toward the Parkway. King County Metro utilities is doing a major project involving a main pipeline that has required tearing up the entire street. There is a section of the roadway that does not have a sidewalk, though a deal was negotiated with Metro to gain an interim sidewalk on some portion of the street. Mr. Murphy said the opportunity was taken to add on to the Metro project to include an interim trail, funded with levy dollars.

Commissioner Bishop commented that the off-ramp from I-90 eastbound to 150th Avenue SE is an integral part of the city's analysis of that intersection. The project will make a big difference in the level of service at the intersection. The 200 feet of work is entirely within the right-of-way of WSDOT. WSDOT has a problem given that the ramp backs up onto the main line, creating a safety problem, but the thinking is that the city will pay for the ramp. He suggested the city should aggressively push WSDOT toward thinking the off-ramp should be part of their I-90 Eastgate to Issaquah project. Traffic Engineering Manager Chris Long said the issue has been broached with WSDOT. Their design work on the I-90 project from Eastgate to Lakemont is at the 60 percent design stage and they made it clear that the off-ramp was well outside the scope of their capacity and safety project. However, the city will not be taking its work beyond 60 percent design. That will allow for the opportunity to conduct further analysis, to look at how the WSDOT improvements impact the 150th Avenue SE corridor, and to reengage and partner with WSDOT down the line.

Commissioner Woosley said he wanted the Commission to communicate to the Council as it formulates its legislative agenda that there is collaboration between the city and King County Metro.

Commissioner Teh said he appreciated receiving updates regarding the progress made to date. He said he would like those updates to include an outline of the community's priorities and requirements relative to the various projects.

Commissioner Lampe said he was pleased to see that all neighborhoods are getting some piece of the levy action. He added that within ST-3 there is $100 million for system access that will be available over 20 years to five subareas. He suggested that may be opportunity for the city to partner with Sound Transit on sidewalks and station access amenities.

Commissioner Woosley referred to the project on 108th Avenue SE from I-90 to Bellevue Way and asked what additional work is to be done there. Mr. Long said the work has been done. It included extending the bike lanes further to the south, including sharrows connecting to the I-90 trail.

Chair Wu said she appreciated that the annual review with the Commission did not include digging down into the individual projects on the list. She noted that the Commission worked on the development of the criteria for the neighborhood congestion program as well as the criteria for other programs. Commissioner Woosley agreed that setting the criteria for project selection is one of the Commission's most important roles. The Commission's oversight role in making sure projects comply with the criteria is equally important.

Commissioner Woosley asked how neighborhood congestion reduction projects are defined. Mr. Long said the way the ordinance reads, projects that are chosen must address the easing of congestion for motor vehicles within, near and/or connecting neighborhoods to services to improve access and mobility. Taken to the next step, it was concluded that programs should target small to medium size projects that improve capacity and reduce congestion on streets leading to or from residential neighborhoods. The description is admittedly broad and as such allow for some flexibility with regard to defining connections to neighborhoods. Accordingly, the Iron Triangle intersections, while not in a neighborhood, do affect congestion on neighborhood streets and therefore qualify as neighborhood congestion reduction projects. The same is true of the intersection of 148th Avenue NE and NE 8th Street in that it provides vital connections in and out of neighborhoods.

B. Level of Service in Bellevue: Toward a Multimodal Approach to Mobility

Mr. McDonald reminded the Commissioners that in June three options for ways new development might help pay for non-motorized transportation improvements were brought forward for consideration. One of the three options was removed and the Commission provided staff and the consultant team direction to refine the two remaining options and to apply the procedures and outcomes of those options to typical real projects in Bellevue.

Chris Brieland with Fehr & Peers said the three options previously discussed included conducting a full SEPA analysis for all projects to evaluate multimodal LOS impacts and mitigation strategies. The Commission chose not to carry that option forward given the associated complexities. The second option was a multimodal impact fee developed under the Growth Management Act having its own set of regulations. The third option involved a SEPA mitigation fee in-lieu. Both of the remaining options are fee programs but because of the way they are authorized under SEPA or the Growth Management Act, there are different options for developers.

Development projects in the city have three courses of action they can take. They can pay the impact fee under the appropriate category of the city's rate study. They can also disagree with the city's trip generation rates in the rate study and choose to do their own detailed trip generate rate study, possibly resulting in the payment of a lower impact fee. Additionally, instead of paying a fee, a development can choose to build a project chosen from the list that offers the equivalent value of the fee it would otherwise pay.

Commissioner Woosley asked if required frontage improvements get credited toward the overall impact fee. He also asked if a developer could choose to fund a multimodal component adjacent to a frontage component. He pointed out that one frustration for the development community is that they pay their fair share to accommodate trips but the money does not get invested in the vicinity of the development, thus the developer takes the heat for the increased congestion around a development. Mr. Brieland said any frontage improvement that includes a project on the project list can be taken as a credit against the fee. Commissioner Woosley commented that in order to be equitable to all developers, the projects on the impact fee list should be consistent. Mr. Brieland said projects on the list must effect system improvements; they cannot just be local access improvements.

Mr. McDonald pointed out that the Commission plays a role in developing the impact fee project list. Currently the list is limited to vehicle capacity projects, but in the broader sense of mobility it could include multimodal projects.

Mr. Brieland said a developer could choose to build a project on the impact fee list that might be adjacent to the project provided the city concurs. It could get tricky however given the need to buy right-of-way or gain SEPA clearance. The city is open to how projects on the list can be implemented in association with developers paying fees, but it is left to the discretion of the city.

Chair Wu pointed out that the option of building projects on the list is usually very expensive and thus is an option only for really big developers.

Mr. Brieland said Option 3 is the same as Option 2 except that it allows a developer to claim the city overstates the impacts of a development on multimodal LOS and therefore the mitigation requirements. Proof of such a claim must be made through a separate SEPA analysis done at the expense of the developer and reviewed by the city, at the conclusion of which negotiations with the city would determine an appropriate mitigation fee payment, project implementation, or some other option. The developer and the city could negotiate any project, not just those on a list.

Mr. Brieland said the consultant team ran three real sample developments through the two options, including a transit-oriented development project in the BelRed area, a mixed use project in the downtown, and an apartment in the Crossroads/Overlake area. In terms of making the comparisons straightforward, certain assumptions were made. For the Growth Management Act impact fee and the SEPA mitigation fee in-lieu, the studies behind both is exactly the same and relies on the same project list, the same fair share methodology, the same deficiency calculations, and the same frontage improvement reimbursement requirements. That means the projects can be set up using exactly the same fee per person trip.

The Crossroads example involved a 618-unit multifamily apartment complex that replaced some retail uses. Mr. Brieland said the project is straightforward and is in the look-up table in the impact fee schedule, and noted that it would be unlikely the developer would want to challenge the rate. The developer would get credit for a bike facility and transit stop improvement on the streets where frontage improvements are required. The developer would pay the difference between the impact fee and the credits allowed, and the outcome would look the same under either option.

The complex transit-oriented development project in BelRed could trigger some concerns over the trip generation rate schedule. The 419-unit project, which includes 129 low-income units, office and retail replacing existing industrial uses, is a project that would not be found in the rate schedule. Because the project is unique, a trip generation rate study is required. The study would have to be reviewed by the city and then the city and the developer would agree to an appropriate rate based on the use and the developer would pay the fee.

In the case of the third scenario, a mixed use project in the downtown that includes 143 multifamily units, a restaurant use and retail space, replacing both retail and restaurant uses, the concern is with the proportional impact finding. A development could argue it will only generate transit trips because it has no parking and other restrictions in place. In that case the developer could argue that the impact fee is too high because of the unique characteristics of the development and the fact that the trips generated are easier to mitigate than general trips. That argument could only be made under the SEPA fee in-lieu program because the Growth Management Act says the trip rate of a project can be challenged but not the cost per trip. Option 3 allows for challenging the trip-generation rate given the particulars of a development and could have the tendency to reduce the amount of fees collected. The city would have to agree with and approve the outcome of the SEPA study, but the option could legitimately show that the impact is less for a development and therefore the mitigation is less.

Commissioner Bishop asked if that would apply only to non-motorized trips or if it would also apply to the traffic impact fee. Mr. Samdahl said the traffic impact fee would remain as it is. The voluntary SEPA portion would only apply to the non-motorized portion of the trips. He added that if an independent study were to show that 80 percent of the trips to and from a development would be by transit or some other means, and if the city agreed with the study, the vehicle trip generation rate would be lower. However, the person trip generation for non-motorized could actually go up. Mr. Brieland said the city may want to include a trigger that requires an independent SEPA review if an argument is going to be made on the vehicle trip side. That is because theoretically a developer could argue for a lower vehicle trip generate rate and then pay the voluntary fee off of the lookup table, which would result in underpaying the impact fee.

Under Option 3, the traditional traffic impact fee will remain and the multimodal LOS impact fee would be an additional fee. Under Option 2, the current traffic impact fee would be recalculated as a multimodal impact fee drawing from a different project list. Mr. Brieland stressed that one fee will not necessarily be higher than the other. It could be set up so that they are exactly the same under either case.

Commissioner Woosley said he saw a couple of issues, beginning with the risk to the city of losing a significant amount of anticipated impact fee revenues. There could also be a legal problem if the mitigation is allowed to be used for less expensive trip mitigation projects.

Mr. Brieland reiterated that Options 2 and 3 can be very similar. The base fee rate for both could be the same, and developments that elect to pay the fee would face the same outcome under either of the two options. Both options allow developers the right to argue that their trip generation rate is unique for a variety of reasons, and that they will not generate as many trips as the city study indicates. Option 3 has the additional SEPA evaluation that could be used under the incentive for a developer to reduce his costs. That would mean that the city would collect less revenue for multimodal projects than it would have otherwise. In order to make the SEPA analysis reasonable, the city should develop SEPA analysis guidelines. Option 3 allows for alternative projects not on the project list, though they must be reviewed and approved by the city, and the SEPA impacts must be mitigated as defined.

Mr. Brieland said the recommendation of the consultants and staff was to go with Option 2. Most cities in the state have gone down that path which still gives developers options to try different things. Option 2 is far less complex for the city to administer and there is more certainly with regard to multimodal LOS project funding and implementation than under Option 3.

Chair Wu suggested that Option 3 would allow developers more flexibility. She asked what it would take for any jurisdiction to choose that approach. Commissioner Bishop pointed out that both options require the city to do an evaluation of all multimodal LOS projects and come up with a list and a rate schedule. Option 3 requires the city to develop SEPA analysis guidelines, a task that would not need to be done under Option 2.

Mr. Samdahl said to conduct an independent multimodal analysis of the development would not be an entirely simple task and thus would likely only be done by some of the larger developments. Such a study would have to include a demonstration of the modal splits among other things. Mr. Brieland added that the Growth Management Act requires a rate study be done and a rate schedule to be produced and approved via ordinance in order to establish the impact fee program. The SEPA analysis, either as an new EIS or a supplemental EIS, must define where the impacts and mitigations were defined from, which dictates the project list. That would also

need to be adopted by the Council as part of some larger plan. Both approaches are authorized under state law, but cities must pick one or the other and cannot have both.

Commissioner Woosley said the Commission should recommend a process that will have the most accurate identification of the most likely trip generation and modesplit. He said he was not clear if that would be Option 2 or Option 3. If every project had to undertake a SEPA analysis it would become cost prohibitive. The city has over the past 20 years taken the course of focusing more on a programmatic SEPA approach, allowing the adopted plans of the city to move forward without the expensive and often uncertain process. The metrics to be used should be as simple and as fair as possible.

Mr. Brieland stressed that the project list, its defensibility, the type of projects selected and the trip generation calculations are the same for the two options. The only real difference is that Option 3 gives developers the opportunity to look at a different way to mitigate for their projects, and in so doing it creates a little more review for the city and the potential that the city will collect less in total mitigation revenues.

Chair Wu said she would like to see a chart outlining the full process with all of the steps involved, along with an indication of which factors might influence the impact fee schedule.

Commissioner Bishop said it has been his experience that developers like having options allowing them to be innovative. Option 3 allows for that. It should be up to the builders of the systems to develop triggers, caps and requirements that will prevent the loss of traffic impact fees in favor of cheaper pedestrian sidewalk or bike lane fees, something that could be built into the guidelines or rate schedules. He agreed that it would only be the big developers who choose to take advantage of the additional options.

Commissioner Lampe said he was having trouble following the logic of adding flexibility that would tend to increase the chances for gaming the system, which could lead to a decrease of revenues flowing to the city.

Commissioner Teh said he too was concerned about an approach that would open the possibility of gaming the system. He said he preferred Option 2 just because it is simple, fair and efficient.

Chair Wu asked about the process schedule going forward. Mr. McDonald said he wanted from the Commission a recommendation regarding which of the two remaining options the Commission should transmit as a recommendation to the Council. The schedule calls for making a recommendation to the Council later in the year, probably November or December. Once direction from the Commission is clear, the staff and consultant team can write up a more comprehensive report documenting the conversations to date and the expected outcomes. That will be brought back before the Commission for review and concurrence prior to drafting a transmittal to the Council.

Chair Wu said she would like to see a subset of the Commission spend a little more time delving into the details of the case studies, getting more clarification from staff and the consultant team, and bringing back the important issues to the next Commission meeting. She proposed that she along with Commissioners Bishop and Woosley should be the ones to sit down with staff and the consultants.

Commissioner Woosley concurred. He said the goal was to develop an approach that is both accurate and fair. Impact fees can be highly controversial and it will ultimately be up to the

Council to make a final decision. Accordingly, it would be good to invite someone from the Council to sit in on the offline conversation to make sure the transition to the Council will be smooth.

Mr. McDonald said his concern with the proposed approach stemmed from the fact that the role of the Commission is to look at the policy at a higher level and submit a recommendation to the Council. The Council then will direct the Commission to dig into the details of how to implement the policy. It is not the role of the Commission at the current phase to dig into the projects and understand them completely.

Chair Wu said the reason behind her suggested approach was to better understand the two options. She said she was not yet comfortable with either approach and hoping to find a consensus position. Commissioners Bishop and Woosley supported the idea of meeting as a subgroup to dive deeper into the details of the two options.

Commissioner Lampe agreed with the need to understand the options and to get things right in the end. He stressed the need to balance that against the staff resources and the budget for the consultants, but otherwise said he would support having a subgroup explore the details. Commissioner Teh concurred.

8. DRAFT MINUTES REVIEW/APPROVAL

A. June 14, 2018
B. June 28, 2018

Commissioner Bishop called attention to the third paragraph on page 2 and pointed out that the reference to June 2 should read July 2.

A motion to approve the June 14, 2018, meeting minutes as submitted, and the June 28, 2018, meeting minutes as revised, was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Bishop and the motion carried unanimously.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT – None

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS

With regard to the Commission's annual retreat, Chair Wu said she had great respect and admiration for the individual knowledge of the Commissioners. She said by working together, the Transportation Commission can be the strongest commission in the city. The retreat offers an opportunity for everyone to get on the same page. The Council adopted its vision and priorities in the spring and the Commission should take some time seeking to understand those priorities and developing feedback on how the Commission can help. The retreat also offers the Commission an opportunity to learn about what is going on in the city the expectations for the coming year.

Chair Wu reported that Councilmember Lee will not be available on September 27, the date chosen for the retreat.

Commissioner Woosley agreed the Commission should take time at the retreat to focus on the

Council's priorities and discuss ways to make sure the Commission is in sync with those priorities. If Councilmember Lee is not available to attend the retreat, some other Councilmember may be who could also help the Commission understand what is behind some of the adopted priorities.

Commissioner Bishop pointed out that the ordinance that establishes the Commission's requirements and obligations is clear in noting that the Council makes all final decisions, but it leaves plenty of room for the Commission to make recommendations on any transportation-related topic it so chooses. He suggested some time should be spent at the retreat focused on the kinds of things the Commission might want to think about. He said he also would like to see the Commission have more interaction with the Planning Commission, including joint meetings from time to time.

Commissioner Woosley said it would be good for the Commission to be briefed regarding major planning efforts slated for the upcoming year.

Commissioner Lampe said he would welcome having a presentation by Steve Marshall. He added, however that many of the technology issues will take a while to implement and accordingly other topics should be elevated in terms of importance. If there is a presentation by Mr. Marshall, it should be relatively short.

Commissioner Teh agreed with the need to better understand the Council goals and priorities.

Chair Wu said having a presentation on how technology might change the way transportation issues are handled would be good for the Commission to have. Having the information will improve the ability of the Commission to make good recommendations.

There was agreement to keep the retreat scheduled for September 27. Mr. McDonald said the Hilton Garden Inn in the downtown has been reserved as the site.

12. COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. McDonald reviewed with the Commissioners the schedule of upcoming meetings and agenda items.

13. ADJOURN

A motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Woosley. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Lampe and the motion carried unanimously.

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

Secretary to the Transportation Commission — Date: 10/26/2018

Chairperson of the Transportation Commission — Date: 10/25/2018