

CITY OF BELLEVUE
BELLEVUE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
MINUTES

April 28, 2022
6:30 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Virtual Meeting

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Marciante, Commissioners Beason, Kurz, Rebhuhn, Ting

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT: Vice Chair Stash, Commissioner Helland

STAFF PRESENT: Kevin McDonald, Paula Stevens, Eric Miller, Chris Iverson, Mark Poch, Molly Johnson, Chris Long, Monica Buck, Darwin Li, Department of Transportation

OTHERS PRESENT: Evan Costagliola, Lauren Mattern, Nelson Nygaard; Chris Breiland, Fehr & Peers

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

Upon the call of the roll, all Commissioners were present with the exception of Vice Chair Stash and Commissioner Helland.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved by consensus.

3. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

Michelle Wannamaker, 4045 149th Avenue SE, noted that the meeting materials referenced evaluating demand from new development. Not mentioned was any evaluation of existing conditions before adding the demand from new development. Just looking at Bellevue's new development does not take into account all the traffic cutting through the city, which is demand resulting from growth in other cities. The existing concurrency approach requires new development to conduct a traffic study to evaluate the development's impact on the current transportation system, which includes an evaluation of the current transportation infrastructure near the development that is likely to be impacted by the new development. If that is the case, the traffic study and evaluation of the existing transportation system should also be in the new Traffic Standards Code, at least for vehicles. The Growth Management Act states that new transportation infrastructure to accommodate new development must be fully funded and completed within six years, and nothing is said about requiring new facilities in less than six years. Traffic in Bellevue and regionally has changed drastically over the past six years. A lot of growth has happened. It would make more sense to require new transportation facilities to be completed within four years to respond to the need in a more timely manner, especially where the improvement is paid for by the developer. If the requirement is going to be changed, the time to do so is now as the system and concurrency is being redefined.

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

5. STAFF REPORTS

Principal Planner Kevin McDonald said word has arrived from the City Clerk’s office that boards and commissions will continue in webinar mode until further notice. One issue still to be resolved is how to implement a hybrid approach allowing for both in-person and remote attendance.

Mr. McDonald reminded the Commissioners that on June 9 the Commission would be selecting a new Chair and Vice Chair. Nominations for those positions will be opened at the Commission’s meeting on May 12.

6. PUBLIC HEARING – None

7. STUDY SESSION

A. Traffic Standards Code Amendments – Multimodal Concurrency Code

Transportation Development Review Manager Molly Johnson stated that updating the Traffic Standards Code is the next step in the Mobility Implementation Plan. The staff recommendation is to replace the Traffic Standards Code in its entirety and to replace it with the Multimodal Concurrency Code. A recommendation from the Commission to the City Council will be sought on June 9. The purpose of the code amendment is to align the Comprehensive Plan with the MIP, and to meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act.

Molly Johnson briefly reviewed the process to develop the MIP and to effect a Comprehensive Plan amendment. The proposed code amendment is needed to implement the MIP and Comprehensive Plan policy. The new Multimodal Concurrency Code will replace the vehicle LOS standard with the system completeness framework, which allows for including all modes of travel in concurrency. The amendment is needed to be consistent with the city’s multimodal vision; to be sustainable for the long-range growth and financial forecast; and to be consistent with the methodology used by surrounding jurisdictions.

The Multimodal Concurrency Code includes a level of service standard predicated on system completeness for all modes. The standard is defined as the supply of transportation facilities being greater than or equal to the demand for transportation facilities. The approach uses the mobility unit metric based on person trips. Supply is determined by the projects funded through the CIP .

Molly Johnson noted that instead of a vehicle trips threshold, there will be a mobility unit threshold. The existing code is not clear on how to handle phased development projects and the proposed revision clarifies that the six years for concurrency extends through all phases of projects. Another revision is the implementation of a reservation system to ensure that projects in review will have the mobility units supply reserved. Projects are given a year from the occurrence of a test before having to apply for a project to avoid getting into a mobility unit hoarding situation. Once the application is in, the time period can be extended for an additional year if the review is not completed within the first year. The mitigation strategies need to be updated to match the new code, so instead of an intersection improvement focus there will be a more general focus for all modes. The current code specifies a Director’s Rule and hearing are required but is not

specific about how that is to happen. The proposal is to make it clear that the Director will prepare an implementation guide on which the Commission will conduct a hearing before it is approved.

Commissioner Ting referred to the public comment about non development-based demand, noting that the old concurrency standard took it into account given that it was based on the measurement of actual traffic. The new concurrency standard uses a plan-based approach looks at dollars spent and how much development is created. The question was asked how the new approach takes into account the additional demand that is not generated by new development. Molly Johnson explained that under the GMA concurrency approach, facilities must be in place in order to approve development. From the perspective of concurrency alone, baseline traffic is not considered. However, as projects are approved a SEPA traffic analysis is required and that is where the baseline traffic numbers are looked at.

Chair Marciante stated the understanding that the planned supply is calculated based on the land use forecast and associated travel, which is translated into person trips and supply is made available as specific facilities are funded in the CIP. That is the broader calculation that takes into account both baseline traffic and growth expectations. When a developer comes in with a project, an analysis is done of both baseline and future conditions. Molly Johnson said there are two elements to the analysis when a project comes in. The concurrency analysis looks to the mobility units supplied by the city, and the operational analysis, which is the SEPA analysis, looks at where mitigation of additional impacts is considered.

Commissioner Rebhuhn asked if the mobility units will all be in one big basket or if they will be broken down by demand for bicycles, demand for pedestrians and demands for vehicles and addressing them as needed. Molly Johnson said they are all in one big basket of supply but projects are described by mode.

Answering a question asked by Commissioner Ting about the SEPA process, Molly Johnson explained that SEPA looks at both the natural and built environments. Transportation is part of the built environment. Every project must analyze its impacts on the overall system and must provide mitigation where significant adverse impacts are created by the project. SEPA takes into account the overall increase in traffic that is created by non-development. The city is responsible for describing a level of service and looks at the performance targets to determine where projects may be needed owing to things that happen that are not caused by development. The demand from non-developmental activities is taken into account when looking at the performance targets.

Chair Marciante added that the performance measures are tied to the calculation of supply that feeds into concurrency. The calculation of mobility units determines how concurrency gets established.

Commissioner Ting expressed the view that the performance targets are not coupled to the concurrency standard. Performance targets cannot cause the city to fail concurrency. Consultant Chris Breiland with Fehr & Peers explained said it is not correct to say that the mobility units of supply is entirely divorced from the non-development change in trip making or the regional traffic growth. The pieces that are not specifically associated with development in the city are inherent in the performance target outcomes and thus help to define the projects that will create the supply. When calculating the mobility units of demand, the amount of demand is calculated by the amount of growth in mobility units from the development that is going through the application process . The supply does consider the growth going on outside of the city.

Commissioner Ting commented that if that is the case, the system does not take into account the

mobility units of demand caused by non-development activities. They are taken into account on the supply side but not on the demand side. On the supply side, the non-development growth can be used to generate say 1000 extra mobility units, which can then be used for any development. If there is projected to be additional demand from non-development activities, that 1000 extra mobility units can be utilized to increase the supply, but then if a development comes along that will require 1000 mobility units, they can be taken from the mobility units allocated for non-developmental purposes to satisfy the new project. The unanswered question is how the demand side takes into account non-developmental activities.

Chair Marciante commented that the number of trips associated with a particular grocery store will remain static unless more homes are built. Those trips are associated with development activity. The change in land use causes more trips.

Commissioner Ting said cut-through traffic is an example of non-developmental trips. Those generated trips may have been caused by development, but not development inside the city. That amount of traffic increase if it is not allocated to development in Bellevue is not taken into account.

Chris Breiland explained that the current forecasts go out to 2044 and they are not limited to just the city of Bellevue. They are regional forecasts that include growth in Issaquah and Kirkland and so forth. When looking at the amount of supply in terms of the types of projects that cover the multimodal system, they do consider the growth, including the traffic going between Issaquah and Kirkland, some of which is likely to go up 148th Avenue and will have an effect on the levels of service on that street. There are performance metric targets established for that street and the supply employed by the city to address the performance along 148th Avenue is baked into the overall calculations. Bellevue traffic also impacts neighboring jurisdictions. The system looks at the development that is going on in the city and the concurrency impacts of it in concert with the background changes in traffic caused by regional growth. The supply side is regionally inclusive.

Commissioner Ting voiced the understanding that there will be additional non-developmental demand or impacts and that accordingly the city would build extra, thereby creating some additional amount of mobility units of supply. Chris Breiland said rather than additional amount of mobility units of supply, it is how the city chooses to allocate the funding it has to address the performance target gaps. The forecast looks at growth in Bellevue and regionally, and the analysis looks at how the performance targets stand against that growth. Adding projects the city can afford to build across the multimodal spectrum will yield expected multimodal performance targets outcomes. The city will not be building extra mobility units, it will be building the number of mobility units needed to achieve the forecasted performance targets, inclusive of regional growth.

Commissioner Ting asked if the additional building being done generates mobility units. Chris Breiland explained that mobility units are fundamentally calculated by the city's growth forecasts in terms of how much is to be accommodated. On the supply side, if there was no regional growth, the city might be building more supply than is technically needed, but that is just good planning.

Chair Marciante allowed that some confusion continued to exist and stressed the need to have things cleared up.

Molly Johnson moved on to discussing system methodology to calculate the supply and demand, how mobility units are calculated, and how they are assigned to projects. The focus is on ensuring that there is more supply than demand, with demand measured from proposed development projects.

There is a three-step process to analyzing a project using the new code. The first step is to determine the available mobility unit supply and the second is to determine the mobility unit demand for a proposed project. The third step is simply to assign the mobility units of demand to the project using the reservation system. With that done, and if the available supply is greater than the demand, concurrency will have been met for the project.

Mobility units are determined by three factors: person trips, modesplit, and mode factor. Using 100 person trips as an example, the calculation first looks at how they are split up into the various modes. In the example, 33 of the trips were by single-occupant vehicle, 17 were by carpool, eight were by bicycle, 25 were by transit, and 17 were by pedestrian. Using the mode factor, the impact each mode has on the system is determined. A single-occupant vehicle occupies about 100 square feet and is therefore assigned one mobility unit. Using an average of 2.5 persons per carpool vehicle, each person trip would occupy 40 square feet and would be assigned 0.4 mobility unit. Bikes taking up about 20 square feet would be assigned 0.2 mobility unit. Transit and pedestrians each account for about 10 square feet of space, which would each be assigned 0.1 mobility unit. The mode split numbers are simply multiplied by the mode factor for each mode to yield the overall mobility units. As such, the mobility units are proportional to their impact on the system. The more single-occupant vehicles there are, the higher the number of mobility units needed to accommodate them. The less impactful modes require fewer mobility units to accommodate them.

Determining available long-term mobility unit supply begins with the growth forecasts, which for the initial implementation of the plan reaches out to 2044. The financial forecast through that same horizon year is used to develop the value of a mobility unit by dividing the financial forecast by the total forecast of person trips. With the initial implementation of the program there will be a bank of mobility units available from recently completed projects that still have capacity. Those one-time units will drain out and go away. Also in the bucket is new mobility units created by CIP projects; those will continually be renewed as the CIP is updated and projects are added, creating more mobility units. The demand consumes mobility units in the bucket as projects are approved; reserved units are applied to projects as they get their concurrency reservation.

Molly Johnson used as an example a Downtown office building generating 449 person trips based on the size of the building and its location. Using the mobility unit calculator, the total trips are divided into the various modes, which are then multiplied by the mode factor to determine the total number of mobility units, which in the example was 224 mobility units. Another example shared with the Commission involved a residential structure in the BelRed area that generated 156 person trips. Utilizing the same calculations, the project yielded a demand of 61 mobility units. The mode split calculation is based on the PMA in which the project is located.

Molly Johnson stated that concurrency is defined as the supply of mobility units exceeding the mobility units demand. The mobility units of supply are assigned to development projects as they come in.

Commissioner Rebhuhn returned to the sample residential project in BelRed and asked about the assumption that only 25 percent of the person trips would be by single-occupant vehicle. Molly Johnson reminded the Commission that concurrency is measured in the evening peak hour, thus the figure does not take into account all trips that occur during the day. The data was developed through a variety of sources, including local experience and the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual. It was stressed that the project was located in the orange-colored Performance Management Area (PMA 1) where there is a lot of transit available. Numbers have been developed for all kinds of land uses in all of the PMAs.

Commissioner Ting allowed that having more people take transit or lower-cost travel modes will be beneficial for the transportation system. The question was asked how it is known that the travel mode assumptions will ring true. Molly Johnson said there are very robust TDM requirements for office projects. Commute trip reduction reporting is required every two years and the city checks those reports against the assumptions.

Commissioner Ting voiced the understanding that when looking at the financial forecasts as part of determining the available mobility units of supply the city does the math based on person trips, and asked if the results are also weighted. Molly Johnson allowed that the person trips are weighted based on mode. Supply is based on how much money is spent and a weighted number of person trips. The mobility units are determined by looking at person trips by mode in the modeling forecast.

Commissioner Ting said with the plan-based approach, the city has a certain amount of money to spend and so long as those funds are spent there will be the number of mobility units needed to meet concurrency. Molly Johnson said while growth targets can be estimated, the city cannot predict specifically how development will occur. What can be done is to ensure that there will be an adequate supply by funding projects through the CIP. The demand is based on how the development market actually manifests itself. It could be that there might be more supply than demand.

Commissioner Ting asked if the mobility units of demand are generated on a first-come/first-served basis, or if there is a mechanism by which the city can have the discretion to not allow a single development to take up all the available supply. Molly Johnson said the program is set up on a first-come/first-served basis. Under the reservation system, however, reservations are only good for a year. The system is somewhat self-regulating in that projects must be consistent with the Zoning Code and the growth forecasts. It is conceivable, though, that when the mobility units of supply are low a project could come in that would take all the available mobility units of supply. Commissioner Ting suggested the department should have some discretion to avoid giving all available mobility units of supply to a single development.

Chair Marciante said there appears to be a misconception that the city is not planning for the trips that are actually happening in Bellevue. The fact is that the growth forecast methodology is the correlation between regional growth and the trips it will generate. The growth forecast is the underpinning for how supply is determined. The calculations to determine supply is far more wide ranging than it used to be in that it now takes into account bicycle, pedestrian and transit trips in addition to vehicular trips.

Commissioner Ting reiterated the view that for concurrency purposes, there is no requirement to look at non-developmental external growth. Chair Marciante said that view separates something that is not in fact separate. The growth forecast looks at everything together. The mobility units of supply becomes a bucket that is used in determining concurrency. There is no separate processes for developmental calculations and non-developmental calculations. The mobility units of supply is calculated by looking all of the factors, including the development activities of the overall region and within the city.

Commissioner Ting returned to the calculation of mobility units of supply and voiced the understanding that person trips in that regard refers to person trips created by new development as opposed to person trips based the forecast. Chris Breiland explained that the mobility units of supply calculation is done based on person trips resulting from new development in the city.

However, the financial forecast used to develop the projects needed to accommodate the growth do indeed take into account all of the growth of trips that are occurring both in the city and outside the city. The project list is not developed blindly outside of the regional growth forecast. As part of every TFP update cycle, the city is committed to looking at all of the performance targets, using the forecast that includes all regional and local growth, to determine where there are gaps and what can reasonably be accommodated given the growth within the city.

Molly Johnson said under the RCW, concurrency requires cities to plan for growth as a minimum. That does not mean cities cannot build more projects and thereby provide more capacity than the projected growth will require. Meeting the RCW requirements does not preclude the city from doing other planning and activities that might not be part of the concurrency regulation.

Commissioner Ting said the concern about concurrency was that the city was moving from an outcome-based system to a plan-based system. So long as everyone is in agreement with how concurrency works, there is no issue. What needs to be avoided is saying the city can meet concurrency only so long as a number of other things are done. It does not require taking into account additional development outside the city, it only requires a review of the person trips created by development in the city. In the end the staff will do the right thing and will put in the money necessary to yield a good dashboard that shows how the system is working. People should understand, however, that from a concurrency standpoint the guardrail of having to consider non-developmental growth has been removed, resulting in a performance dashboard that will show the right thing is happening. The difference between the old concurrency and the new concurrency for level of service is not just that it is based on MMLOS, it is the move from being outcome-based to being planning-based. Instead of measuring, the focus is turned to how much money is spent.

Molly Johnson allowed that the current Traffic Standards Code contains the concurrency requirement. It is entirely based vehicle levels of service and does not account for any other mode. Investments made in non-vehicular modes do not count toward concurrency. That changes under the new system.

Chair Marciante voiced concern about the fact that not all Commissioners were on the same page. A simple clarification is needed in regard to concurrency. The way mobility units of supply will be established will be significantly influenced by the performance targets and what can be achieved.

Molly Johnson reminded the Commissioners that a virtual open house was slated for May 3. A wide range of people have been invited, including a targeted list of developers who have had projects in the city in the last three years. Staff will again be before the Commission on June 9 to discuss revisions based on input from the Commission and the public. The schedule calls for forwarding the code to the Council in late June or early July. Staff are working on an implementation guide for which the Commission will be asked to facilitate a hearing on September 8. Once the Director approves the guide, there will be a 30-day transition period to move from the old system to the new system.

Commissioner Beason stated that moving to a plan-based approach is both good and necessary. It is also a good thing that every two years there will be a review to make sure that the methodology and calculations make sense. Some of calculations are difficult to buy, particularly those around mode split. It would be good if everyone used light rail and transit but that is not the reality. Just how those splits have been determined should be made clear.

Commissioner Rebhuhn voiced the need for more information on the supply side. Somewhere buried in there is the answer everyone is looking for and it needs to be brought out into the light.

Commissioner Ting voiced support for the new MMLOS approach and for moving to a system that takes into account multiple modes of travel, especially non single-occupant vehicle modes. More should be said about transportation demand management, the periodic lookback, and what can be done to move the needle toward lower-cost transportation modes. It would be useful to be clear about the supply side calculations and how it takes into account development that is outside the city. There also needs to be clarification about what concurrency is, what the dashboard is and what the performance targets are.

Chair Marciante agreed that when going to the public it needs to be made clear how existing conditions are taken into account, that when planning for growth starts with the baseline conditions. Additionally, the relationship between how the city looks at the overall mobility units of supply and how development gets allocated should also be made clear. There is also evidently some confusion about the six-year period, when a developer must mitigate something, and how long a developer has to directly provide mitigation. Residents want to hear in the simplest terms how the new process allocates the net new demand trips into the different modes.

B. Curb Management Plan Policies

Lauren Mattern, consultant with Nelson/Nygaard, reminded the Commissioners that the primary engagement components of the project were a series of focus groups, a recent curb summit, and a questionnaire to capture a broader audience. Each of those elements have been completed and the results are under review.

Consultant Evan Costagliola with Nelson/Nygaard noted that the curb summit occurred in late March. During the morning session there was a public meeting, and the afternoon session served as a practitioner lab with folks from different cities, mobility providers, the Chamber of Commerce and other key stakeholders. During the public meeting high-level information was given the focus. During the afternoon session, discussion focused on four key themes along with different policy ideas and how they might be implemented. The first theme focused on curb flexibility and resilience. The specific ideas included flexibly assigning curb uses both temporally and spatially; aligning uses with current needs as well as future demands; adapting curb uses over time based on both historic and real time curb data; and curb design that signals to users how the curb should be used.

The second theme was digitization, specifically that curb performance should be measured and evaluated using digital tools and the information and regulations should be conveyed digitally. Enforcement should be enabled using digital tools as well, and equity should be centered in the development of digital curb strategies.

The third theme was related to curb efficiency and curb prioritization. Much of the conversation was focused on how the city should be leveraging curb pricing tools to manage use of the curb. Also discussed was the notion that curb management should center around clearly stated goals and outcomes, and the goals should drive everything from evaluating performance to prioritizing curb uses. There was also discussion about streamlining how the city makes decisions around the curb by clearly articulating what the priorities are at each individual curb space.

The fourth theme focused on the curb experience. Context instead of design and management was the key element of the conversation. The curb should be used not only for mobility and access purposes but also to activate the public realm. Folks talked about the need to acknowledge and address the experience of many different curb users, not just the current predominant curb user.

Curbs should provide for more consistency and predictability through better information sharing, better wayfinding signage, and clarity around what uses are permitted and not permitted.

Lauren Mattern said all six focus groups have wrapped their work. The groups comprised of different representative bodies, were kept small to allow for full conversation. A skilled facilitator worked with each group. With regard to operation needs, a lot was heard about separated bike lanes; the need for improved enforcement; the need for a clearer process for how to apply to use the curb; and comments about accessibility and bus infrastructure design details. One overarching theme for all of the groups was general walkability, particularly between different neighborhoods and destinations.

The groups were asked to comment on what success would look like. The themes that jumped out included having a plan that: solidifies that the curb is for public use; accommodates lots of different types of users and provide clarity around the rules; provides accessibility for all; facilitates walking; provides for vibrant curbs with more activations and excitement.

Asked to highlight future opportunities, the groups referenced being excited about building on programming and activation successes. A lot of specific ideas were voiced about bringing more life, greenery, art, seating and dining to the curb spaces. Another common theme was the need to acknowledge more growth will come and to prepare for it by supporting mode split goals, consolidating parking footprints, and allowing for shared parking.

Lauren Mattern said one of the recent elements of engagement for the project was an online questionnaire. The questionnaire was open for several weeks and garnered 196 responses. Many of the comments focused on walkability and supporting the fundamentals of mobility. Comments were made about vehicle speeds and safety conditions for pedestrians. There were also requests made for wider sidewalks as well as curb dining, seating and greenery, as well as for making it easier to find parking. One question asked the respondents to share how important six specific curb management priorities are to them. The desire for safety for pedestrians and bicyclists were rated as being very important. There was also clear support for any curb management strategy that addresses climate change and positively impacts emissions trends. The need to incorporate and support new technologies such as autonomous vehicles polled fairly negatively.

Commissioner Ting asked if the questionnaire question about new technologies was slanted toward autonomous vehicles, or if people were against things like phone applications that determine the best walking route to a restaurant or other destination. Chris Iverson said the question on the survey listed autonomous vehicles as an example. The question was not explicit to the wide variety of technologies that could be used at the curb.

Commissioner Rebhuhn asked if there were a breakdown as to who responded to the questionnaire, adding that given Bellevue's population 196 respondents is quite small. Chris Iverson said the intent is always to receive as many comments as possible to questionnaires by widely marketing them. Some subjects generate more interest than others. Staff and the consultants will be relying on the questionnaire results to make some recommendations, but much of the work will also be based on previously adopted policies and ongoing work.

With regard to preliminary policy recommendations, Chris Iverson noted that there are adopted policies in the Comprehensive Plan, the city's foundational policy document. Comprehensive Plan policy amendments can only be considered once annually, and the Planning Commission administers the process. In addition, an update of the Comprehensive Plan is undertaken every eight years or so. The Transportation Commission will be asked to transmit its recommended curb

management policies to the Planning Commission to review, edit, conduct a public hearing and then forward to the Council for consideration.

Some curb management policy concepts under consideration were shared with the Commission on March 10. Those concepts were based on previous work and public feedback, and many of the concepts were focused on different types of curb uses and included added support for curb placemaking and activation functions; added support for developing curbside mobility hubs; added support for curb management technologies and innovations; amended language that addresses new mobility functions; and added support for the creation of a dedicated curb management program. Staff are recommending the repeal of four existing policies; modifying five existing policies; and adopting seven new policies. The policies are adopted in the Downtown Subarea Plan and the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The recommendation is to repeal Policy S-DT-157.3, which calls for considering development of a proposal to implement a pay for on-street parking programs. The policy is housed in the Downtown Subarea Plan and the work to develop a curb management plan takes a broader view. Policy S-DT-157.4, which calls for integrating on-site loading space and/or creating designated curbside loading space through development review, is also recommended to be repealed. On-site loading space is now required by the Land Use Code in the Downtown, and the policy is redundant to Policy TR-128 in the Transportation Element. Also recommended to be repealed is Policy S-DT-157.5 which calls for integrating time-limited curbside space for passenger pick-up and drop-off through development review. The policy is also redundant when compared to proposed modification to Policy TR-128. Finally, Policy S-DT-157.7, which calls for allowing the restricted use of designated on-street parking spaces for electric vehicle charging stations, also needs to be repealed given that it is redundant to Policy TR-143 in the Transportation Element.

Turning to the list of policies recommended by staff to be modified, Chris Iverson said Policy TR-128 calls for providing curbside space to accommodate small-scale parcel delivery and loading through development review. The recommendation is to revise the policy to read “Provide dynamic curbside space within the public right-of-way to accommodate parcel delivery and passenger loading through curb operation changes and development review.” The operation changes are meant to be those that are city- or staff-led. Use of the word “dynamic” is intended to reflect different demands at different times of the day and on different days of the week.

Chris Iverson said Policy TR-143 calls for providing curbside spaces for electric vehicle charging stations where on-street parking is allowed. A change is needed to help increase the quantity of electric vehicle charging in the city and the recommendation is to have the policy read “Consider adding electric vehicle charging stations in designated on-street parking areas through development review.”

Policy S-DT-157.1 calls for adding new permanent on-street parking spaces in high-opportunity locations that meet engineering standards for traffic safety. There have been issues in the past where some of the new curb uses that have arisen in the last few years, such as on-street dining and accommodations for bike share in the curb areas, were considered to be potentially in conflict with the action word “add.” The recommended policy language reads “Create curbside zones for on-street parking as designated in the curb management plan.”

Policy S-DT-157.2 calls for exploring the addition of temporary on-street parking spaces for use during off-peak hours. The main focus of the proposed policy modification is to be more deliberate. The new policy language reads “Add on-street parking spaces in travel lanes for use during off-peak hours. It was stressed that the intention is not to have on-street parking in all travel

lanes during off-peak hours, rather specific streets designated within the curb management plan would be identified based on traffic volumes and street design.

Policy S-DT-157.6 calls for considering designating permanent or off-peak curbside vehicle queues in high-demand locations. Chris Iverson noted that the policy was adopted as part of the Downtown Transportation Plan effort at a time when rideshare was a new concept. The policy as modified reads “Designate permanent or off-peak curbside queue areas for rideshare vehicles, taxis and employer shuttles in strategic locations.” Rather than pick-up and drop-off zones, the idea is more akin to waiting areas that are outside of the more congested areas of the Downtown or other urban core neighborhoods.

Chris Iverson said there are seven recommended new policies. Policy NEW-1 reads “Designate curb uses, curb typologies and modal priorities as outlined in the curb management plan.” One of the core tenants of the curb management plan is the concept of the curb typology and curb use prioritization. The intent is for the curb typology to be a type of curb zoning that will advise uses and conditions at curb areas. The policy will become an actionable long-term item as the roadway network evolves and as the street design changes through development and capital improvement. The typology will become very consequential over the long term in thinking about different curb uses.

Policy NEW-2 reads “Implement a pricing-based curbside management program as recommended in the curb management plan.” Chris Iverson explained that the concept of curb pricing and curb use is tied to the concept of supply and demand at the curb. There is a lot of literature nationwide that speaks to the concept of curb pricing for on-street parking and the various permitted uses. A broad policy is needed to speak to the pricing-based curb management plan to help support changes long term.

Policy NEW-3 reads “Identify and create regulated passenger loading zones for taxi and rideshare use, primarily within the Type 1 Performance Management Areas as defined in the Mobility Implementation Plan.” The intent is to encourage better management practices to handle the growing rideshare impacts to curbside environments.

Policy NEW -4 reads “Promote the use of innovative curb technology solutions that enhance safety and efficiency of the curbside environment.” The policy seeks to encourage and allow for curbside innovations to take place long term. Examples may include curb usage monitoring technology, common carrier locker systems, UAS and sidewalk drone delivery systems.

Policy NEW-5 speaks to the concept of mobility hubs and reads “Create attractive mobility hubs that allow for the easy transfer among public, private, and active travel modes. The policy is intended to support multimodal transportation options, especially at transit hubs in the urban core areas of the city. Mobility hubs can be thought of as transportation hubs regardless of mode. In addition to creating mobility hubs at the curbside, the intent is to see them simply be more supported through policy.

Policy NEW-6 talks about creating temporary curbside zones for vendors and retail activity and it reads “Create designated curbside zones to facilitate temporary curbside use for vendors, such as food trucks, in areas with high pedestrian activity.” The focus is on the activation of curb areas. Currently the city does not usually provide permits for various activities at the curbside. The proposed policy provides deliberate direction to see it happen.

Policy NEW-7 reads “Create vibrant activated curbside zones, such as on street dining areas,

parklets, and other placemaking solutions in strategic locations.” It seeks to provide policy support to create activated placemaking curbside zones. The specifics will be defined within the curbside management plan, including specific locations, and through the curbside typologies.

Chris Iverson informed the Commissioners that there would be more of a deep dive discussion of the policies at future meetings. After the policy discussion is completed, the focus will shift to the content of the curbside management plan itself, namely curbside typology and prioritization, the curbside pricing programs, and various curbside management approaches tied to pricing.

Commissioner Ting referred to Policy TR-128 and voiced the assumption that the original text referred to the public right-of-way. Chris Iverson said felt it important to add clarifying language about the public right-of-way because there are actual instances where curbside bumpouts not within the actual public right-of-way were conditioned for private development. The bumpouts are a bit of an enigma in that the street and the sidewalk are public but the bumpouts are privately owned, managed and enforced.

Commissioner Ting asked if Policy TR-143 will effectively push the development cost of an electric vehicle charger from the city to new development. Chris Iverson said the intention is to in specific locations and under certain contexts have developers consider adding electric vehicle charging stations through development review. The idea is to have the cost be absorbed by development activity.

Chair Marciante noted that she had electronically forwarded to staff some suggested policy language revisions to have better flow.

With regard to the feedback from the community, Commissioner Ting said it would be helpful to have a grouping or affinity exercise to pull together the common themes. Additionally, in pushing for a policy like public space for dining, the city should ensure the space will get picked up by a restaurant.

Commissioner Kurz voiced support for the general policy direction as outlined. He expressed the need for the Commission to see more of the behind-the-scenes analysis being done by staff and the consultant team. It is somewhat backward for the Commission to first refine the policies before having all the background data. The new policies use adjectives like “attractive” and “vibrant,” which is a different approach. Curbside space is a limited resource and the plan and policies should address competing goals where there are multiple good uses for a curbside.

Commissioner Rebhuhn expressed some concerns about the limited number of responses to the questionnaire and how much weight will be given to the responses. Also interesting is the continued focus on outdoor dining given that weather conditions prohibit it for much of the year.

Commissioner Beason concurred with the need to have a better understanding of the background data, and with the need for the policy language to be more reader friendly for the public.

Chair Marciante agreed with the need to be clear about the meaning of words like “dynamic,” “pricing-based” and “mobility hubs” that may not otherwise be clear to the public.

Chris Iverson commented that while addressing the policies first may feel backwards, the Commission will have the opportunity to provide intentional feedback as the process moves forward.

Commissioner Ting agreed with the need to address competing priorities. There will clearly have to be tradeoffs and it should be clear just what they are.

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. March 10, 2022
- B. April 14, 2022

Both sets of minutes were approved by consensus.

9. UNFINISHED BUSINESS – None

10. NEW BUSINESS – None

11. ORAL AND WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS – None

12. REVIEW OF COMMISSION CALENDAR

Mr. McDonald briefly reviewed the Commission's calendar of agenda items and meeting dates. The importance of having a quorum for the May 12 meeting was stressed given that it will involve holding a public hearing on the Transportation Improvement Program and making a recommendation to the Council.

13. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Marciante adjourned the meeting at 8:58 p.m.



June 10, 2022

Secretary to the Transportation Commission

Date