

CITY OF BELLEVUE
EAST MAIN STATION AREA PLANNING
CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES

March 29, 2016
4:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall
Room 1E-113

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chris Breiland, Christie Hammond, John King, Scott Lampe, Jim Long, Erin Powell, Danny Rogers, Bill Thurston

MEMBERS ABSENT: Pamela Unger

OTHERS PRESENT: Mike Kattermann and Janet Lewine, Planning and Community Development Department; Phil Harris, John Murphy, and Marie Jensen, Transportation Department; Liz Stead, Development Services Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Gerry Lindsay

1. CALL TO ORDER, APPROVAL OF AGENDA, APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 4:01 p.m. by Chair Lampe who presided.

Chair Lampe noted that the Committee had been charged by the City Council with providing guidance to staff and consultants on the station area plan by engaging the community in a planning process that establishes a clear vision and community goals for the station area. The Committee has accomplished most of its charge over the last 18 months and is on the verge of seeing the fruits of its labor. It is important that the Committee finish its work on the draft strategies and vision statements to give the community an opportunity to say what they think so their comments can be included in the final recommendation to the Council. Through the work of the Committee, a consensus has been achieved on a majority of the traffic issues addressing pedestrian and bicycle access, and envisioning the future character of the area. He said the focus of the meeting would be on completing the discussion on the draft vision statement and strategies, specifically on building height and floor area ratio for redevelopment. The public open house will be held in mid-May, and the draft open house materials will be reviewed at the Committee's May 3 meeting.

A motion to approve the agenda was made by Mr. Long. The motion was seconded by Mr. Breiland and the motion carried unanimously.

A motion to approve the minutes of the February 23, 2016, meeting was made by Ms. Powell. The motion was seconded by Mr. Breiland and the motion carried unanimously.

2. PUBLIC COMMENT

Ms. Leshya Wig, 4811 134th Place SE, asked the Committee to keep the wording of the vision statement consistent with the wording of the draft strategies by deleting “nearby” from the second sentence of the second paragraph in the Land Use/Redevelopment section of the draft vision statement. Doing so will align the language with the language of the fourth bullet in the second paragraph of the Land Use/Redevelopment section of the draft strategies. Additionally, she asked the Committee to consider revising the second bullet in the second paragraph of the Land Use/Redevelopment section of the draft strategies to read “Optimize square footage for building footprints, floor plates and retail space to support a placemaking event.” The change will tie the strategy in better with the vision statement that says sidewalks are bustling with activity from cafés, outdoor seating and shops. The bullet point as drafted could be interpreted as putting an upper limit on the amount of retail allowed in the project. Retail needs a certain critical mass to survive, particularly since the site is separated from the downtown and other retail. Capping the amount of retail allowed, particularly below the necessary critical mass, will mean no retail at all will be attracted to the site, which in turn would lead to not being able to provide services and amenities to the community.

Mr. Mon Wig, 4811 134th Place SE, thanked the Committee members for their thoughtful engagement over the past year. With regard to the view corridor, he stressed that it will impact the site by triggering a shift of the taller buildings closer to 112th Avenue SE. If the community would prefer to see the taller buildings located along I-405, the Committee may want to consider recommending either removing or modifying the view corridor. The intent is to redevelop the Red Lion site with a high quality development that lies adjacent to single family residences and that serves as a front door to the downtown.

Ms. Renay Bennett, 826 108th Avenue SE, noted that she previously had brought to the attention of the Committee a question quoted in the January 26, 2016, meeting minutes in which Chair Lampe asked about the potential for including a left-turn movement at 108th Avenue SE as proposed during public comments. She said she was the one who mentioned the left-turn movement but asked that the minutes reflect that she had not actually proposed including the left-turn movement. She said what she did propose was that any changes in the left-turn movement be concurrent with traffic mitigation on 108th Avenue NE. The Committee agreed with that as noted on page 7 of the February meeting minutes, but it was not reflected in the draft vision statement. Several members of the Committee raised the issue of changing the access at 110th Avenue SE on the thinking that it would allow for better access into the neighborhood. That is a good idea and a good start toward increasing access to all parts of the neighborhood. With regard to the first paragraph on the first page of the draft vision statement, she suggested the third sentence should be revised to read “Neighborhood access points and streetscapes have been modified...” Addressing both the access points and the streetscapes speaks to real traffic mitigation, not just access points. With regard to the seventh item under the Traffic section on page 1 of the draft strategies, she said the time for exploring is over and as such the sentence should be revised to read “Implement new technologies and best practices...” That is true for both Main Street and Bellevue Way where there is traffic going to and coming from the downtown. With regard to item 10, the unprotected left-turn signal, she said mention is made of it being for all legs. She said she could not remember hearing the Committee discuss that and

wondered where it came from. The Committee was encouraged not to include all legs because any unprotected access onto 108th Avenue SE will impact the traffic of both Bellecrest and Surrey Downs. Item 11 should use the word “implement” rather than “evaluate.” The neighborhoods need help. There are 5000 cars a day coming down 108th Avenue SE, a street that provides driveway access to single family homes.

Senior Planner Mike Kattermann called attention to a comment received in the form of a letter from Mr. Don Miles that had been included in the Committee packet along with the response from staff.

3. DESIGN REVIEW AND INCENTIVE SYSTEM

Urban Design Manager Liz Stead explained that her group is responsible for conducting design review work, conditional use applications and administrative conditional use applications. Most of the work done by the group is in the downtown and in the Bel-Red corridor. The approach contemplated by the Committee includes upzones which would then put projects into the design review category.

Ms. Stead said the city has a process called administrative design review that involves a team of urban planners, landscape architects and building architects. When projects are first envisioned, a pre-application meeting is held to discuss the options for the site and to learn about the development proposal. The group seeks at that meeting to identify any fatal flaws. The review groups involved in the pre-application meeting then submit a letter to the applicant with their findings. The group then works one-on-one with the applicant on getting everything together prior to a submittal for design review. Once a design review application is submitted, it is reviewed for compliance with all development codes and guidelines, as well as design aesthetics and any transportation impacts. An environmental review is also conducted, and white signs are posted on the development site in line with the requirement for noticing projects. A public meeting is held for all large projects where the community is invited to comment.

A notice of decision is ultimately released. The voluminous report documents how the project has met all applicable design guidelines as well as the dimensional standards. The notice of decision can be appealed before the hearing examiner. Where no appeals are filed, the project is considered complete relative to land use approval within 14 days of the notice of decision.

Ms. Stead said the dimensional standards represent a small portion of the Land Use Code. The review takes into consideration building type, residential or commercial; the required setbacks; the maximum building floor area per floor; and a variety of other issues that define the envelope of the building, such as the sidewalks, required street trees, and throughblock connections through the site. The group looks at the base, middle and top of proposed buildings seeking distinctive features and design intent for each section.

Questions are often asked about the difference between a setback and a stepback. A setback is measured from the property line, where as a stepback occurs above a certain height. In the downtown there is no required setback from the property line, except in some of the outer regions. Both setbacks and stepbacks may end up being required for the East Main area.

The design review group essentially looks at new projects as if it had a blank slate. From there the different elements are layered on, such as connectivity within the block, lot coverage, required open space, podium height and how it relates to the pedestrian space, building ingress and egress, maximum building height, below-grade parking, and the required number of parking stalls based on use and their size. Attention then turns to the finer grain to include street trees and the building/sidewalk relationship, as well as building articulation, mechanical screening, weather protection for pedestrians, the uses fronting the pedestrian environment, public space, and utilities and equipment integration. Signage is addressed through the city's sign code.

Ms. Stead explained that floor area ratio (FAR) is a measurement of development intensity. An FAR of 1.0 on a small site can actually feel pretty big; the same FAR on a large site would not feel as big. In the downtown, FAR is paid for through the amenity incentive system, which means developers buy additional height and mass by providing certain amenities, such as below-grade parking and residential uses.

There are design guidelines in place that are based on neighborhood identity. As new neighborhoods are planned, it is important to determine what their identity should be so that design guidelines can be established that will ensure the identity of the neighborhood.

The downtown has very specific requirements that address the relationship between buildings and sidewalks. There are requirements that are applicable per street that determine things such as sidewalk width, the width of planting strips, and throughblock connections.

Ms. Powell asked if there is a maximum FAR in place for the downtown. Ms. Stead explained that the allowed FAR is different for each zone. The highest allowed FAR is in the core of the downtown, and moving toward the edges of the downtown the FAR numbers are reduced. Currently, some zones in the downtown allow unlimited FAR for residential uses only, and the limiting factors are the maximum building height and floor plate size; the approach was put in place at a time when there was a desire to incentivize residential in the downtown. For commercial buildings in the downtown core, FAR is capped at 8.0.

Chair Lampe commented that in looking at the East Main redevelopment area, the Committee has focused on making it attractive with a lot of open space. Ms. Stead said the city does not have a lot of tools to enforce open space. For much of the downtown, the fact that lot coverage up to 100 percent is allowed means that a developer by right can fill an entire site with a building podium. That makes it difficult to break down developments in ways that create public spaces. Many of the larger buildings have chosen to create privatized spaces such as roof decks for use by the occupants of the building. The city has clear challenges when it comes to creating open space at grade. Generally, where open spaces exist in the downtown, they were created in exchange for an amenity credit. There is a minimum and a maximum FAR in the downtown by zone; the minimum is what can be constructed with only small investments in the amenity system, and to reach the maximum requires the provision of more public benefits.

Chair Lampe asked what will come into play in reviewing the East Main redevelopment area given its proximity to a light rail station. Ms. Stead said staff will certainly dial in on pedestrian

walkability relative to the project. If the Committee recommends a specific mix of commercial and retail uses, those elements will be reviewed as well.

Mr. Rogers voiced confusion over the difference between code regulations and design recommendations. He asked how far the Committee could go in recommending open space and specific retail uses. Ms. Stead said the code contains specific requirements known as dimensional standards. Buildings are, among other things, allowed to be a certain height, to have a certain amount of FAR, and are allowed to cover a certain percentage of the lot. The code requirements are black and white. The design guidelines, on the other hand, are somewhat subject to interpretation. Buildings are required to incorporate some modulation, but how that is done is a matter of interpretation. The Committee should avoid trying to be too specific with regard to the design guidelines. The design guidelines are part of the code, but there is flexibility in how they are applied. Both the code and the design guidelines are very important and both are needed to achieve good outcomes.

4. PROJECT UPDATE

Mr. Kattermann pointed out that the draft vision statement does not yet reflect all the changes made by the Committee to the draft strategies. Once the conversation about the strategies is completed, the vision statements will be revised to match. The revised version could be before the Committee at its May 3 meeting.

Mr. Kattermann reminded the Committee members about the wedding cake format for the downtown that locates the tallest and most dense buildings in the center and requires both height and density to taper off toward the edges. He stressed the need to keep in mind what is or will be allowed on the north side of Main Street when considering the area to the south of Main Street in the redevelopment area. The Planning Commission is considering an FAR of 5.0 for the OLB zone to the north of Main Street. The Planning Commission is also currently considering additional FAR for the area to the west of 112th Avenue NE above and beyond what the Downtown Livability Initiative CAC recommended. The current code relative to the OLB district to the south of Main Street allows an FAR of 0.5 and a height of 30 feet along 112th Avenue SE and 75 feet closer to I-405.

The Committee previously reviewed various options in terms of building height for the redevelopment area, including a height limit of 200 feet which with a bonus of 15 percent would bring the total to 230 feet; and a 300-foot height limit. Photo examples of buildings in those height ranges were shared with the Committee. Schematic drawings of how the redevelopment area could look under the proposed height and massing were shown as well.

The consultant was asked to take a look at what could be done on the site with an FAR of 5.0. A traffic analysis was also done. If the view corridor goes away, an issue being addressed by the Council, much of the FAR could be located along 114th Avenue SE closer to the freeway, or the overall mix could be spread out on the site.

Senior Planner Phil Harris said one way to look at the impacts of traffic is to look at how it impacts travel time through the station area. Traffic impacts from the redevelopment area will

primarily affect 112th Avenue SE and 114th Avenue SE. Traffic patterns on 108th Avenue SE are not really driven by the redevelopment area, but rather by what happens in the downtown.

Mr. Harris outlined four different routes for traveling through the station area and reviewed with the Committee how travel times on each could change based on the redevelopment area building out at the draft vision FAR of 4.0 and the Red Lion redevelopment scenario proposed by the property owner with an FAR of 5.6. He noted that most of the travel time increases occur at the various intersections. The Red Lion redevelopment scenario indicated the largest travel time increases, particularly for northbound 114th Avenue SE which increased from 5.5 minutes to eight minutes, with most of the delay occurring at Main Street and 112th Avenue SE. The Red Lion redevelopment scenario does not really impact north-south travel along 108th Avenue SE.

Mr. Harris explained that the baseline scenario assumes the current road network, the existing zoning, and the planned downtown growth, whereas the redevelopment vision assumes a new street on SE 2nd Street between the Red Lion and the Hilton as well as other network improvements, and redevelopment at a greater density.

Mr. Kattermann called attention to the fifth bullet on page 3 of the draft strategies and noted that the Committee had previously discussed a maximum FAR of 4.0 and a maximum height of 200 feet achievable only through the bonus amenity system. The Wigs have asked for an FAR of 5.0 and height of up to 300 feet. One way to achieve that would be through a development agreement or some means of buying into the additional height and bulk.

Mr. Kattermann pointed out that strategies four through seven talk about building placement, with the taller buildings located closer to I-405 and Main Street, and stepbacks along 112th Avenue SE. The Committee has talked about moving buildings back away from 112th Avenue SE should the view corridor issue go away. The Committee has also discussed the use of landscaping and architectural design to minimize the wall effect, and developed a recommendation for the Council to review the corridor, an action that is already under way. The Committee discussed siting parking underground or otherwise out of sight to avoid surface lots, looking at the parking requirements relative to transit-oriented development, and utilizing the safe design principles to assure visibility and lighting in public spaces.

The Committee members were reminded that they had not spent much time on the secondary transit-oriented development area to the south of SE 6th Street and north of SE 8th Street between 114th Avenue SE and 112th Avenue SE. The area has several environmental constraints in the form of shoreline associated wetlands, wetlands on the national inventory, and sensitive area related to wetlands and habitat. Within the area is the existing Lincoln Plaza, the Marriot, and an office building that is part of the Gateway development. There is little development potential in the area; any change would require redevelopment which is unlikely to occur in the 20-year horizon. The area has an FAR of 0.5 and a 75- to 90-foot height limit.

The property owners were asked to indicate what type of redevelopment could be achieved with an FAR of 2.0, and their suggestion for tall towers separated by shorter podiums was shown to the Committee. Given the constraints on the sites, redevelopment of the sort shown was

considered by planning staff to be unlikely. Mr. Kattermann recommended retaining the 0.5 FAR and allowing greater height to 100 feet.

Mr. Kattermann reviewed the next steps in the process, which included finalizing the draft vision and strategies and holding them out for public review; compiling a draft report; preparing the documentation for an environmental review; preparing for live and online open house events on May 18; and then revising the draft report into a recommendation to be forwarded to the Council.

Mr. Kattermann noted that the Committee had previously discussed recommending a maximum FAR of 4.0 and a maximum building height of 200 feet, and allowing additional density up to an FAR of 5.0 and height of up to 300 feet with a development agreement or similar approach.

Mr. Rogers said the designs shared with the Committee that were the most attractive were those that had open space in the middle. By allowing building height up to 300 feet, buildings can be moved around on the site in ways that allow for more open space.

Mr. Breiland said the Wigs have generally been open and clear about their objectives, and they clearly want more FAR and more height. He said he had previously been uneasy with how far south additional density could drift to the south. If an FAR of 5.0 is to be allowed, it should be done only through a development agreement and it should be restricted to the Red Lion property by limiting the increased FAR to a set distance from Main Street.

Mr. Long asked what would happen with the area to the south of SE 6th Street under that scenario. Mr. Breiland said the Hilton and Bellevue Club sites would have an FAR of 4.0 and building height of 200 feet. The area to the south of SE 6th Street should retain the current FAR of 0.5 and building height of 100 feet.

Mr. Thurston suggested success will be associated with creating a placemaking community center. The Red Lion site is very close to the commercial center of the downtown. However, an FAR of 5.0 is a bit of push in terms of total density, but if mitigated through a development agreement and incentives the results could be very good.

Mr. Kattermann noted that currently there is an overlay in place that limits building height along 112th Avenue SE. A similar mechanism could be implemented to allow building heights up to 300 feet within a certain distance south of Main Street, leaving the rest of the site limited to something like 200-foot buildings. The restrictions on building height and requirements for setbacks along 112th Avenue SE should be retained to encourage taller buildings closer to the freeway.

Mr. Breiland suggested a building height of more than 200 feet on the freeway side may be needed in order to yield an overall FAR of 5.0. Height is less of an issue closer to the freeway; it should be limited along 112th Avenue SE. Mr. Kattermann clarified that a tall building located at the corner of Main Street and 112th Avenue SE would be outside the view corridor. If the view corridor restrictions are retained, they would effectively limit the Red Lion site to a single 300-foot tower in the northwest corner, should that much building height be allowed. If the view

corridor goes away, theoretically a second 300-foot building could be located to the east along Main Street.

Ms. Hammond said the Committee had talked about creating a pedestrian-friendly environment along 112th Avenue SE with wider than normal sidewalks. That would seem to argue in favor of both setbacks and stepbacks along 112th Avenue SE. Mr. Kattermann said that could potentially be the case depending on how much right-of-way there is. The call for wide sidewalks and a pedestrian environment is included in the character statements.

Mr. King commented that if a 300-foot building is allowed on the corner of Main Street and 112th Avenue SE, it will need to be very well designed because it will stand out as a marquee address. Mr. Breiland said the development review will compel that. Mr. Kattermann said design of a higher standard could be one of the requirements of the development agreement in order to obtain the additional building height and the 5.0 FAR.

Ms. Hammond if the Committee was supposed to develop a recommendation for what should happen if the view corridor is retained and another for if the view corridor is done away with. Chair Lampe said the focus should be on the understanding that the view corridor will be in place, in which case the Committee should be clear about the height and bulk limits along 112th Avenue SE. If the view corridor goes away, the sense of the Committee has been that the taller buildings should be moved back toward the freeway.

Mr. Thurston said he was not persuaded that putting the taller buildings along the freeway was a better alternative to having a single tall building on the corner of Main Street and 112th Avenue SE.

Ms. Powell said she wanted the city to honor the view corridor as it extends from the public house of City Hall. She said she objected to the proposed building height and anything that would block the view toward Mount Rainier. A recommendation to the Council to build to the max will also be a recommendation to forget about the iconic Mount Rainier view for the rest of the city, and that is not ethical. She said she could live with the old Scenario 2 that had building heights of 125 feet.

Ms. Hammond said the Council will make the decision relative to the view corridor and it would be irresponsible for the Committee to assume the view corridor will remain in place and not have an option for what should be done if it is eliminated.

Mr. Breiland suggested that if the view corridor restrictions are retained, achieving an FAR of 5.0 will result in building height being pushed toward 112th Avenue SE, which is not consistent with what the Committee has said it wants to see. If the view corridor is not eliminated, building height should be limited to 200 feet and the FAR to 4.0. The additional height and FAR should only be allowed through a development agreement and then only if the view corridor goes away.

Mr. Rogers commented that limiting building height to 230 feet but allowing an FAR of 5.0 will yield a bunch of boxes on the site and no middle courtyard.

Mr. Breiland said while he personally was not overly concerned, not everyone on the Committee would agree to allowing building height of 155 feet fronting 112th Avenue SE.

Mr. Kattermann reminded the Committee members that with the view corridor in place, buildings located at the corner of Main Street and 112th Avenue SE, and those fronting 112th Avenue SE, would not be impacted by the view corridor restrictions, whereas buildings fronting 114th Avenue SE would be. The Committee, however, has been very clear about not wanting tall buildings along 112th Avenue SE; the outstanding question is how much height is acceptable there.

Mr. Long said if the city is not growing it is going the other way, and that is not good for jobs, business or home values. He said he liked the notion of restricting additional height and bulk to the Red Lion site, but to otherwise impose restrictions will stifle the ability to create a great place of the redevelopment area. The result could be no redevelopment at all. He noted his support for allowing an FAR of 5.0, though allowed much will depend on whether or not the view corridor is removed.

Mr. Kattermann suggested assuming the view corridor will stay in place. He said the Committee could include language allowing up to an FAR of 5.0 and up to a certain height, leaving the view corridor restrictions to guide where development will occur on the site.

Mr. Thurston asked what the height of the Hilton is and was told that it is 110 feet. He pointed out that the 155-foot building on 112th Avenue SE in the scenario presented to the Committee has its narrow front facing 112th Avenue SE, and if coupled with setbacks and stepbacks, it may not be as imposing as people might otherwise fear, particularly in that it is essentially shielded by the park property.

Mr. Kattermann said the argument could be made that a transition from the downtown is created by limiting the most FAR and height to the area along Main Street.

There was consensus that the FAR for the redevelopment area between Main Street and SE 6th Street should be 4.0 and the building height set at 200 feet. There was also consensus that an FAR of up to 5.0 and a height limit of up to 300 feet should be recommended for the Red Lion site under a development agreement, with the taller buildings confined to the area immediately south of Main Street and along I-405.

Mr. Rogers agreed with the suggestion of Ms. Wig relative to the third bullet in the second paragraph of the Land Use/Redevelopment section of the draft strategies. As drafted, the language could be interpreted as imposing a maximum square footage for retail space. Mr. Kattermann said the item gets back to the fact that currently the city has maximum floor plate sizes for different uses. The square footage for retail space is intended to address the big box retail issue. The intent is not to limit the total amount of retail, and that could be clarified by having the bullet read “maximum square footage for building footprints and floorplates” and adding another bullet reading something like “allow a mix of retail uses, not including big box retail.” Mr. Thurston proposed adding “to support a placemaking event.” There was agreement to

revise the bullets as suggested. Mr. Kattermann reiterated that the vision statements will ultimately be revised to match the strategies.

For the area south of SE 6th Street, Mr. Kattermann noted that the recommendation was to maintain the 0.5 FAR and to increase the height to 100 feet.

Mr. King pointed out that the Committee had spent very little time focused on the area south of SE 6th Street and said it seemed disingenuous for the Committee to reach any conclusions. Mr. Kattermann said the point was well taken. He added, however, that the amount of development and the potential for redevelopment that could occur in the area is fairly minimal.

Ms. Powell asked if the Committee could simply recommend that no further development occur in the area south of SE 6th Street. The area should not have been allowed to develop in the first place given the wetlands. Mr. Kattermann responded by saying that to recommend against additional development would be to go against the code, which is already very protective of the wetlands. Accordingly, there is very little development potential. Redevelopment is about the only option, which would require tearing down what exists. The reason for the increase in allowable building height was to give the property owners some additional flexibility in the event of redevelopment, but the Committee could recommend making no changes at all.

Ms. Powell recommended making no changes. Ms. Hammond concurred.

Chair Lampe said it was his understanding that the small amount of development potential that exists lies outside of the wetland boundaries. Mr. Kattermann said that was true for the most part. Redevelopment could trigger some additional protections for the wetlands under the higher standards that were put in place after the site was developed. Chair Lampe said he could support the recommendation to retain the existing FAR but increase the allowed height to 100 feet.

Mr. Thurston pointed out that if the site were to redevelop under the proposal, the footprint of each building could actually be reduced. The truth is that the area will be difficult to redevelop under any scenario.

Ms. Powell reiterated her call to keep the FAR and height as they are currently.

There was consensus to retain the current FAR of 0.5 and the building height of 75 feet for the area south of SE 6th Street.

A motion to extend the meeting by 15 minutes was made by Ms. Powell. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hammond and the motion carried unanimously.

With regard to paragraph 4 of the Land Use/Redevelopment section of the draft strategies, Mr. Kattermann agreed to beef up the language about siting the taller buildings and the wall effect based on the Committee's discussion.

Mr. Kattermann noted that the seventh paragraph in the Land Use/Redevelopment section of the draft strategies recommends reevaluating the parking ratios for the transit-oriented development

area. He allowed that that is something the city would do as a matter of course in looking at the development standards for transit-oriented development for the redevelopment area and other sites in the city. The recommendation includes a call for parking to be structured underground or located internal to other structures so as to be out of sight.

There was agreement to go with the wording of the seventh paragraph, as well as the eighth which calls for incorporating design standards that create safe and secure environments in and around the new development.

With regard to the paragraphs in the Character section, Mr. Kattermann noted that the Committee had discussed them previously in the context of land use and the different transportation items. Any changes needed to reflect changes made in the land use section will be made.

Mr. Kattermann noted that comments and suggestions previously made by the Committee triggered the proposed revisions, specifically to paragraphs 1 and 2 under the Traffic section, and to paragraphs 5 and 10 in the Pedestrian/Bicycle Access section. He proposed redrafting paragraph 9 under the Traffic section to read “Evaluate the feasibility and tradeoffs of modifications to the intersection of Main Street and 110th Avenue SE for the purposes of providing additional neighborhood access for residents, improving pedestrian safety, and discouraging non-residential traffic. Modifications to be evaluated may include but are not limited to realignment of 110th Avenue SE, a traffic signal with protected left-turn movements, additional sidewalks, crosswalks and pedestrian signals.

Ms. Hammond asked if the realignment of 110th Avenue SE could mean putting the roadway straight through into the neighborhood. Mr. Kattermann said it could mean that. Ms. Hammond said such a move likely would take traffic off a collector/arterial and put it directly into a residential area. Mr. Kattermann said that consideration would be part of the feasibility study. As the intersection is currently configured, a left-turn can be made going northbound on 110th Avenue SE, but it is not possible to put in a left-turn signal for southbound traffic. The paragraph simply would call for taking a look at the intersection to see if something could be done to improve access for local residents.

There was agreement to make the change to the paragraph as proposed.

Ms. Powell asked if Sound Transit would be paying for any revisions to the intersection. Mr. Kattermann said it would not be Sound Transit because the revision was not required as part of the mitigation package.

With regard to paragraph 10 under Traffic, Chair Lampe noted the public had called attention to addressing the protected turn signal phase for all legs of Main Street and 108th Avenue SE. Mr. Kattermann said the recommendation was to look at all of the legs at the intersection rather than just one turning movement. Chair Lampe said he assumed the traffic analysis of the intersection would include all legs even if only one was specifically called out.

Mr. Breiland observed that most of the other paragraphs use the word “evaluate,” whereas paragraph 10 specifically calls for adding a protected left-turn signal phase for all legs of the

intersection. Given that the Committee does not have the authority to dictate that something be added, he suggested using “evaluate.” Mr. Kattermann said the action may or may not come about depending on the intersection analysis. The original language of the paragraph addressed specifically the westbound to southbound turning action. He suggested the paragraph should state the Committee’s intended outcome rather than a specific action. The original language include the reference to improving safety for people walking across Main Street and 108th Avenue SE.

Ms. Hammond said the intent should be to look at improving safety for all directions.

Ms. Powell weighed in by saying there is the potential to increase traffic on 108th Avenue SE if the turning movements are addressed. Language should be included about being concurrent with traffic mitigation on 108th Avenue SE and the need to discourage people from using 108th Avenue SE to get to and from the downtown.

A motion to extend the meeting until 6:30 p.m. was made by Ms. Powell. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hammond and the motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Hammond said the intent of paragraph 10 is to look at safety in all directions, but also the idea of whether left-turns in all directions would provide for a greater regulation of traffic going onto 108th Avenue SE.

Mr. Kattermann said if he was hearing the Committee correctly, the desired outcome for paragraph 10 was to improve safety, to improve access for residents of the neighborhood, and to continue to discourage or preclude non-residential traffic on 108th Avenue SE. The analysis would, among other things, look at what adding signals at the intersection of Main Street and 108th Avenue SE would do to the traffic on 108th Avenue SE. He said he would revise the paragraph to reflect those outcomes and bring it back to the Committee for review.

Ms. Powell suggested paragraph 11 should call for implementing a 20 mph speed limit 108th Avenue SE from south of Main Street to Bellevue Way, not just near the school, rather than simply evaluate it.

Mr. Breiland said under state law it would be difficult to reduce a residential speed limit to 20 mph. The speed limit in the school zone can certainly be set at 20 mph.

Mr. Kattermann said the 20 mph option can be included as an outcome in the paragraph, but it will still be subject to evaluation. He agreed to revise the paragraph to call for the establishment of a 20 mph speed limit in the school zone.

Mr. Kattermann informed the Committee that there would not be a meeting on April 26. The Committee’s next meeting will be on May 3. The public open house is slated for May 18 from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Mon Wig, 4811 134th Place SE, pointed out that a transit-oriented development conference will be going on in Los Angeles on May 3. He said he would be attending that conference rather than the public open house.

Ms. Renay Bennett, 826 108th Avenue SE, said the traffic restrictions at Main Street and 108th Avenue SE does work. When it was instituted in 1990 it took a thousand cars off of the residential streets. She allowed that there are some who do not obey the rule.

Mr. David Slight, 227 110th Avenue SE, suggested the outcomes are too specific relative to specific turns, streets and directions. He said he has known about the potential realignment of 110th Avenue SE for the last two years though it has not been heralded very loudly. The residents of 110th Avenue SE will no doubt be as active as the residents of 108th Avenue SE should there be a through street suddenly appearing as an alternate to the left-turn signal on 108th Avenue SE. He suggested the traffic analysis should be less specific and more focused on the entire area, because it is the whole area that is in need of traffic solutions.

6. ADJOURN

Chair Lampe adjourned the meeting at 6:24 p.m.