**Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

Date/Time:** Thursday, May 24, 2018 / 5:30 – 7:30 PM **Co-chairs:** Betty Spieth-Croll, Alex Krieg

**Location:** City Hall, L280

**Members Present:** Joe Laubach, Blake Trask, Brian Estes, Alex Krieg, David Seater, Emily Paine, Nick Paranjpye, Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Betty Spieth-Croll, Saroja Reddy (for Ben Noble), Dustin Lambro, Councilmember Mike O’Brien, Pat Cohn

**Members Absent:** Ron Posthuma, Laurie Torres

**Guests:** Goran Sparrman, Karen Melanson, Nick Makhani, Lorelei Williams, Maria Koengeter, Jeff Lundstrom, Elliot Helmbrecht (all SDOT)

**MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:32 PM**

**Approve Agenda**

Betty approved the agenda

**Public Comment** (2 min. per person)

Doug MacDonald:

“First I want to say that producing of the materials is better - I actually had time with it. I still can’t say that I have studied it because the volume of this material that we are trying to make sense of is a big deal. I just want to make one preliminary observation to test if I’m right as to why this is such a mess and is going to require some difficult conversations. If I read this, the one pot of money that is held harmless is the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, and they are not happy because the cost for that program says that they will not get what is promised. But the other pot of money which is really sensitive to how and why people voted for this thing – put aside the Bus Rapid Transit thing for a minute - is that people know the streets are falling apart. There is $36M in the levy for asphalt maintenance. But in that discussion comes the revelation that Scott Kubly was either misinformed or dissembled when he told this committee that the consent decree for curb ramps would be funded without invading the levy. If you read the description on AAM, it now says that AAM is where the curb ramp money is going to have to come from. We have to do the curb ramp stuff – it’s a civil rights obligation but taking it from AAM means the roadway maintenance program shrinks significantly from what was expected. Next year at this time, you will have the roadway version of what you have this year in the sidewalk assessment and it’s going to prove very problematic because I predict it will demonstrate that our roads are falling apart faster than we though, including the roads that bicycles ride on. And the worst of that is that one of the reasons our roadways are falling apart is because of the impacts of our increased reliance on bus transit - the singular pillar of our plans to make the city work better by moving people around without using single-occupancy vehicles. If you triangulate those problems and ask yourself how voters are going to feel next year when they figure out what gets held harmless and what doesn’t get held harmless and they ask themselves what they are getting. For this levy, you need to build credibility that this thing will work into the future. My concern is that, as much good work as has been done to bring this to stasis about what’s been done, the difficult conversations have just begun.”

**Approve Previous Meeting Minutes**

Blake: In the previous February meeting minutes, there was supposed to be a revision to include an action item table.

Elliot: We added the table to the back of the April meeting minutes to reflect that revision.

Blake: Does that include the February meeting minutes as well?

Elliot: It would only reflect the April meeting minutes. Would you like February’s added?

Blake: I thought we held February’s meeting minutes as tentative approval until the action item tracker was added to both meeting minutes.

Elliot: That may have been a misunderstanding. I can go back and add them.

Blake: In a previous meeting, I asked for a better understanding and breakdown around striping and how maintenance decides to stripe or restripe portions of the roadway.

Elliot: I do not have it but can send out to the committee via email.

Betty: The task list needs to be cumulative and continue from meeting to meeting. Items should not be removed until completed.

Meeting minutes approved.

**Co-chair Report**

* **New member introduction: Dustin Lambro**

Dustin: Political director at teamsters local 117. I was appointed by the mayor in April 2018 and confirmed by the Council in April 2018. Transportation policy is a little bit new to me although our union has done a considerable amount of work with Uber and taxi drivers. I care a lot about the issues from the perspective of my day job and as a community member

Betty: Does Dustin fill the vacancy on the committee?

Elliot: Dustin takes the place of Katie Garrow and we still have one vacancy on the committee.

* **Co-Chair Report**

Alex: Betty and I were able to attend SPAB, STAB and SBAB meetings this past month. Another thing that was sent out last night was content from Brian Estes which stems from last meeting and the desire for an additional letter in addition to our 2017 letter with content that needs to be communicated to SDOT. My preference would be to distill this feedback down and write something at the conclusion of the assessment.

Betty: I just wanted to note that I really appreciate the work that was done to draft this document. I don’t think we can discuss at length today since we have a full agenda but the way I would like to use this material is to consider it as early input for the letter we will be writing at the conclusion of the assessment.

Brian: This was definitely a collaborative effort with myself, Emily, David and Blake. We were very disappointed with the April Council Committee meeting. In the letter, we have a clear set of tasks for SDOT for clearer transparency and I think that is applicable to tonight.

David, Emily and Blake: I think it is a reasonable approach to consolidate letters.

Alex: Elliot, you wanted to give an update on Fauntleroy.

Elliot: Yes, SDOT will be working with Mayor’s Office and Councilmember Herbold to work with the community and come to some near-term safety improvements along the corridor while Sound Transit comes to their alignment decision.

Blake: Will Fauntleroy come back on the table?

Elliot: I will have to get back to you.

Emily: When is Councilmember Herbold and the Mayor’s office meeting on this? When will we know next steps?

Elliot: They will be working on it this summer, but I’ll have to get back to you on specifics. I just wanted to be sure to keep you informed of what was taking place as this committee was concerned about the lack of improvements on Fauntleroy.

Alex: I hope that SDOT will not have to do a lot of assessing to decide what to do since there has already been 8 years of assessment work.

**Director’s message**

Goran: Good evening, this evening is the next phase of the conversation on the Levy to Move Seattle assessment. What we heard loud and clear was that you wanted more details. We polished that information and delivered more details. We also heard loud and clear that you wanted to get the information well in advance. That was certainly our goal this month and we’ll keep trying to meet that goal.

Before moving into our financial update, I wanted to update you on our department. On Monday, SDOT rolled out a new restructure to align the resources and talents in the correct positions so that we can continue to deliver our projects. The new organizational framework will allow us to be more focused and integrated in how we move forward and incorporates financial considerations earlier in the process.

Lorelei Williams who will be speaking to you later is the new interim deputy director for SDOT capital project delivery. She will be the director of project development and delivery and the Office of Move Seattle. With that, I’m going to pass it onto Karen to talk about the financial side.

**2018 Q1 Financial Update**

Karen: I want to echo what Goran said and give a few more details on the organizational re-structrure with regards to finance. We continue to integrate the finance function into the entire Department. Myself, Nick and others work very closely with the Office of Move Seattle and with Lorelei to make sure that we are understanding and scrubbing all of our financial numbers.

* **Q1 2018 Financial Summary**

Karen: We’re going to begin with an overview of Q1 2018 before we get into a conversation about the sub-program assessment. You have a detailed [Q1 2018 finance memo](https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/SDOT/About/Funding/2018_0515_Q1_FinanceMemo.pdf) that you received in advance but I plan to give a high-level summary this evening. First, I want to review the table:



Karen: I do want to pause for a moment and talk about the revised budget number and what we have done internally with the assessment process to look closely at our spend plan for 2018. We will be working with the City Budget Office (CBO) to go through a re-appropriation process to align the funds we need for this year and future years. We will be re-appropriating some of that $331M in the revised budget to future years based on when we need the funds for those projects. Once we complete that process for 2018, we are looking at a spend plan of approximately $190M (this includes capital, maintenance, and reimbursable expenses). As we go through the re-appropriations process, we’ll update you and you’ll see that revised budget number align with our projected spend plan.

Alex: Do you have the equivalent for the $158M revised budget for only Move Seattle funds?

Karen: We’re still working through those numbers with CBO as there are many sources going into that number.

* **Q1 2018 Financial Summary: Major expenditures by levy category**

Karen: The $23M of funds spent on Move Seattle projects breaks down into the following categories; $8.5 M for Safe Routes; $5.9M for Maintenance; and $8.3M for Congestion Relief

* **Q1 2018 Budget Update**

Karen: The Move Seattle fund source over the past three years – 2016 to 2018 – has grown in Q1. That is due both to color of money differences and an increase in spending for projects that are funded entirely by Move Seattle. Q1 spending over the past three years has also been relatively consistent. Due to the rigor with which we have reviewed numbers for this year to develop our spend plan, we can say that Q1 2018 is aligned with the 2018 spend plan.

David: Am I interpreting this right – we carried forward $116M from last year but only spent $23M in Q1?

Alex: Q1 is always the quarter with the lowest spending.

Karen: Q1 is typically the lowest spend of the quarters due to weather-dependent work. Q1 and Q2 are in line with our spend plans at this time and we fully expect that Q3 and Q4 will continue to increase to bring our total for the year to $190M (this includes capital, maintenance, and reimbursable expenses).

Betty: This year is the first year we can start to see trends, and this is the first time we are starting to see trend lines since we asked you to show us this type of data.

Brian: I know at the beginning there was some ramp-up and increasing staff capacity. Moving forward, would we expect to continue to see increases in the Move Seattle fund source?

Karen: It has to do with color of money in the early years. For example, we were spending bond and grants sources. Programs and projects that are more heavily funded by Move Seattle – such as Arterial Asphalt & Concrete (AAC) and Bike Master Plan (BMP – are moving into construction.

Betty: I wonder if in Q1 of 2016 you even had the money. At that time, were you just collecting it?

Karen: I don’t think that is it, we still had it. I don’t know that this will be a consistent trend because we’ll still have March grants hopefully so that mix will continue to change.

Lorelei: One additional thing to add is that in Q1 2016, we were just coming out of a situation where we were not sure if we were going to have to let people go or move forward which is why that quarter is the lowest-to-date.

Rachel: Did you think you would have to let them go because you didn’t know if the levy would pass.

Lorelei: Correct.

David: “All funds” are staying consistent while Move Seattle is increasing. What is happening with the funds that are not for Move Seattle?

Karen: I wouldn’t think of it as though it has a direct one-to-one relationship. We are breaking out Move Seattle as one fund source because of a LOC request. If we were to break out all fund sources, you would see variations as well.

David: If Move Seattle is a component of the “all funds,” the proportion that is not Move Seattle is getting smaller. I’m wondering if there are costs being shifted into Move Seattle funds that in the past would have been funded differently?

Lorelei: A portion of the funds was the remaining Bridging the Gap (BTG) levy money. As Karen also alluded to, there is a range in the timing of our grants and when we spend those as well.

Alex: I understand that, but this is three times the size of BTG. Should there be an incremental increase in “all funds” because the levy itself was larger?

Nick (SDOT): There are also a lot of funds consistent on current economic circumstances – real estate excise tax, commercial property tax – that we must ask for budget authority to spend. That can decrease the overall total of “all funds.”

Betty: I still feel that we are beginning to see trend lines but when you only look at Q1 trend lines, you are still seeing a very narrow picture.

Nick: In future years as we move into Bridge Rehabilitation work and work that can be done 365 days/year, you should expect to see an increase in Q1.

Alex: I want to restate what I heard Goran say. The “all funds” category are not all SDOT funds but are just funds for Move Seattle projects.

Brian: I wanted to ask for an update on the RET Analysis.

Elliot: That is a future next step that will be completed once we have recommendations.

Goran: Want to test it from a racial and social equity perspective to make sure that we don’t have unintended consequences.

 **Levy to Move Seattle Sub-Program Data Review & Modal Board Updates**

* **Levy Assessment and sub-programs under review**

Elliot: As a reminder from last meeting, 8 sub-programs need further review and adjustment of the 31 total sub-programs. As listed in the assessment, we’re breaking the 8 into two separate categories:

* + Modal board sub-program focus areas
		- New sidewalks
		- Transit-Plus Multimodal Corridors
		- BMP
	+ LOC focus areas:
		- Sidewalk Safety Repair
		- Arterial Major Maintenance
		- AAC
		- Bridge Replacement
		- Curb Ramps & Crossings

Betty: The pedestrian board has requested to review sidewalk safety repair and curb ramps & crossings.

David: We are pretty closely involved in those sub-programs, so we thought it would make most sense for us to own those programs.

Elliot and Betty: I think that you should go for it.

Emily: Bike board is also interested in the Bridge Replacement sub-program.

* **Process for updating the workplan**

Elliot: Before we proceed, I wanted to ground you in the process. We’ve adjusted the process based on what we have heard from you and from the modal boards. We plan to use May to share data and spend time in June to take input and present draft recommendations. In July, we will return to the committee for approval on the draft recommendations before sending to the public for outreach with a goal of finalizing recommendations in August.

Alex: I would love to hear the relationship between priorities and recommendations. What are the Council and elected officials looking as an output of this exercise?

Elliot: It depends on the process. Right now, as it stands, we will present the sub-program data today and come back on June 7 as a workgroup to discuss. Plan to come on June 21 with feedback on the 5 sub-programs or the number you are responsible for at that time. The key things we want to hear from you are - with the budget you have, what should be the guiding principles and priorities to guide the draft recommendations. We will then take that feedback and provide draft recommendations in July that you can react to.

Brian: Would we need a meeting in July?

Elliot: Yes, but it needs to be scheduled

Councilmember O’Brien: I’m looking for clarity from SDOT on how they plan to prepare for these projects and clarity on what happened which I think is getting clearer. I also will commit to doing a thorough process when it gets to Council so we are getting feedback from modal boards and this body. If SDOT, LOC and the Modal Boards disagree, that will be a much longer process in Council. My preference is to work collaboratively.

Alex: What if the priorities expressed are in tension with recommendations presented by SDOT?

Councilmember O’Brien: There are various levels of tension and disagreement, but I will provide an opportunity at Council for concerns to be expressed.

Betty: I know there was a hope to have these recommendations done as part of the budget process. How are these recommendations memorialized in the budget process?

Councilmember O’Brien: In an ideal world we set the city budget in the fall, including the budget for the Move Seattle Levy. We’ll also be setting the budget for the next two years in fall 2018. One of the things I’ve heard tonight and in discussions with Goran and his team is clarity about the budget of Move Seattle levy projects from 2018-2020. Placeholders can also be added, if needed, to add budgets after the budget process is complete.

Goran: I want to add that my expectation is that we agree. If we do disagree, it should be substantive disagreements on policy which will then go to City Council. We also need to do a better job forecasting when and where the money actually flows which will help the Council in their job.

Blake: My understanding is that the next three years are pretty locked in, in terms of projects.

Lorelei: I think that is accurate - 2018 is locked in, 2019 is pretty locked in and 2020 is fairly locked in.

Blake: If projects are fairly static at this point through 2020, why is a budget action necessary?

Lorelei: This will be more important as Council updates their 6-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

Blake: Are there deliverables listed in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)?

Saroja: The budget spending plan is updated and the sub-programs will be included.

Betty: I feel the city has a sense of urgency in completing this process.

Councilmember O’Brien: My hope is that there is plenty of time to complete this process. The budget process is not the main driver, but we do want to keep moving forward on the levy projects. I want to ensure we have a transparent and inclusive process. It should align with the budget process, if possible, but if it isn’t able to that is the least of my concerns.

Blake: To reiterate, this conversation is primarily about the last 3 years of the levy.

Lorelei: That is the mostly correct. However, if something comes out of this process that makes us question 2019 and 2020, we can work to make adjustments.

Goran: If there is an issue or red-flag in the next few years, modal boards or the LOC should feel free to raise it. It’s important for the department to focus on delivering and executing the program. The sooner we get to clarity around the program, the sooner we can move forward

* **Workplan assessment – key data**

Elliot: Before we review each sub-program, I wanted to review the data that we laid out for each sub-program. Each one-pager generally includes the same information; levy goal, levy commitment, key assessment findings, funding assumptions and financial status, accomplishments and expenditures to date, and next steps.

* **New Sidewalk Sub-program**

Elliot: We have $68-$69M to deliver the program. With $12M spent in the first two years, about $55M remains. As a reminder, additional blocks were added without additional budget, reducing contingency to deliver high-cost sidewalks. If we were going to build 150 traditional sidewalks and 100 low-cost, we would need an additional $8M. We have been working with the Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board to discuss their priorities.

David: At the Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board meeting, our primary takeaway was that we saw a tradeoff – we could build 250 blocks total if sidewalks were shifted to low-cost. We felt that we were being asked if we should shift the ratio so that we can still build 250 blocks or build fewer than 250 and focus on traditional sidewalks. I’ll have more of an update after our next meeting, but our initial thoughts are that we should follow the recommendations and outreach outlined in the PMP rather than trying to second-guess the outreach.

Rachel: Did the PMP deal with traditional vs. low-cost as an issue?

David: The PMP has a prioritization framework for determining where we should be investing in our sidewalk network.

Nick: Does the low-cost sidewalk option mean more maintenance as we go?

Lorelei: It’s low-cost because it takes less right-of-way and costs less money to construct. It also typically includes a barrier and curb rather than including a gutter.

Nick: Are you sacrificing safety?

Lorelei: No, I would not say that we are sacrificing safety. Our finished concrete sidewalks certainly look better and it is not as high of quality but you are not sacrificing safety.

David: The other nuance is that low-cost sidewalks aren’t typically built in the same place as the traditional. Low-cost sidewalks are typically built in residential areas.

Councilmember O’Brien: It looks to me that the main difference between the 2015 and 2018 funding is a $5M difference in leverage. Where does the $8M come from?

Elliot: You would take the $5M leverage and the increasing costs to construct sidewalks to reach the $8M.

Councilmember O’Brien: To me, this one is a pretty good story. Obviously, we were optimistic on leverage. I am curious, was it just a bad assumption that we would get more TIB grants and are we being more conservative now thinking that we will only get one? Or has something changed in the program?

Elliot: This would both be a reflection of a less leverage and the reality that sidewalk projects are costing more.

Lorelei: I would also add that we will not get TIB grants for low-cost sidewalks.

Alex: At some point when the original plan was developed, someone said we could assume 10 TIB grants. Now, someone else is saying that it is no longer possible. Clearly that is the root of the problem.

Elliot: One result of the assessment, that you are seeing in this program and you are seeing in other programs, is that some estimates made at the time were optimistic.

Blake: Take us out a little bit further. I know we are focusing on these sub-program buckets because they have issues. I would like to understand a bit more what the green checkmarks mean. While there was a little bit of optimism in some places was there a bit of pessimism in other places? Have you looked at the global nature of the levy.

Elliot: There are typically two reasons a checkmark is green – there was either enough funds in that program to meet the commitment or we were able to adjust the scope, without changing the commitment, to fit within available budget.

Betsy: Can you speak to how you are able to move money?

Elliot: The legislation is crystal clear in that we cannot move money outside of the three main levy categories – safe routes, maintenance and repair, and congestion relief – without prior approval. Under 10%, we can move money between categories with LOC approval. If we want to move over 10%, Council can approve moving funds.

Goran: I would like to reiterate that any change to move funds should go in front of Council to ensure transparency.

Betty: To confirm, work to this point did not have money moving around in the three main levy categories.

Councilmember O’Brien: Correct. The reality is that we can move money around but we also have commitments that we have made to voters that we need to stand by as well. If we get to the point where we need to make some hard decisions about moving money around, we can do that but we need to be transparent about how we are doing that.

Brian: SDOT keeps saying that we are building stuff and I think it’s important to assess results and what is working well. Maybe we need to reassess which programs are priorities for funding.

Goran: Let me speak to that. I would be very uncomfortable in significantly adjusting something that voters did vote for as there was significant outreach to get us to that point.

Councilmember O’Brien: To get back to the original conversation – the levy commitment was 150 blocks of arterial concrete sidewalks. Somewhere we added 100 blocks of low-cost sidewalks. Now we are saying we can do 100 plus 150 with an extra $8M. $5M of $8M is needed because we were too aggressive with our TIB grant assumptions. I think we are pretty close on this one and feel like over the next 6 years, we can get close to the 250 block-commitment.

Alex: What I heard in the meeting is that the remaining blocks are the longer blocks where we will likely see cost-escalation.

Lorelei: In these numbers, we have done our best to estimate for the escalation. There is a possibility that escalation could be higher than we anticipated.

Blake: I’m afraid my questions on green checkmarks did not get addressed.

Lorelei: Green checkmarks represent the sub-programs that we feel good about, but they do not have extra cash for other sub-programs.

Jeff: We analyzed all 31 programs and there was no program where there was extra money. They were all close to the budget needed to deliver the programs.

Goran: If we were to find that we had extra funds, we would come back here to assess where to spend them.

* **Transit-Plus Multimodal Corridor Sub-Program**

Elliot: This is a version of the presentation the TAB received last night.

Maria: The levy commitment was to complete seven transit plus multimodal corridor projects, redesigning major streets with more frequent and reliable buses, upgraded paving, signals and other improvements to improve connectivity and safety for all travelers, whether walking, biking, driving, or taking transit.

We realized over the last few years that expectations for this deliverable are significant. From the time the Levy to Move Seattle budget was developed, it was based on the Move Seattle 10-year strategic vision. Since then, the expectations for this program have grown to include RapidRide and corridor-wide multimodal facilities which would exceed the levy budget and original assumptions behind that budget.

We feel that we can meet the intent of the levy commitment by making transit and safety improvements on the seven corridors with secured funds. However, that will not align with the community expectations for RapidRide or corridor-wide multimodal facilities. Delivery of RapidRide is dependent on a funding and delivery partnership with King County Metro. We have been working with King County on this. METRO CONNECTS includes the same 7 corridors as part of their 2025 vision for 13 new corridors in the county. We have made progress incrementally with each project as it has advanced, such as Delridge. Both agencies want to coordinate closely, and that partnership is key. Finally, securing leverage is also taking longer than anticipated, both at the federal and regional level.

Alex: Two things I feel slightly exercised about. One is that expectations increased. There were campaign materials that set these expectations. The second thing is the partnership with King County Metro should not have been an assessment finding but should have been a fact of doing business. I would caution against recharacterizing this as I think the voters were sold on the RapidRide program.

Goran: We spent days trying to understand the specific campaign language as the language was not always the same as the levy commitment.

Alex: One fundamental part of the reassessment is trust-building exercise, so I would caution SDOT against using this language as this was the program most clearly sold to voters and the one program with the largest funding gap. I would not hang your hat on the legal language.

Councilmember O’Brien: The legal document is what SDOT as an organization gets to work on and the Council passes.

Blake: The statement that “expectations grew” is really loaded. I was one of those people negotiating and trying to figure out where we could get with the Move Seattle levy, and I think it was underpinned by a Transit Master Plan that wanted to do more on multimodal corridors. I think the vision was clear that when you are making major transit improvements, there is an opportunity to do a lot more and how there could be co-benefits. I think the campaign described those conversations, whether or not it was the letter of the law.

Maria: SDOT has continued to try to meet the community’s expectations and has made some progress in 2016 and 2017 by setting some program goals, timeline and funding strategies to try to deliver as much as we are able to. We have advanced both Madison and Roosevelt in to the FTA capital grant program. Both projects are rated high. We have four corridors – Madison, Roosevelt, Delridge and Rainier – in active stages of design. We have secured funds and submitted applications for additional funds. We have collaborated with King County to define program roles and responsibilities.

As part of the 2018 assessment, we revisited levy language and struggled to interpret the language. To inform this conversation, we assessed a range of potential program investment levels and program timeline assumptions with new federal delay and uncertainty.

One bookend is a levy project with secured funds. The 2015 levy funding plan had $63M of levy funds and $191M of leverage funds. The 2018 funding update shows the $63M of levy funds and the difference in range between secured and likely/identified leverage ($29M - $205M). This has gone a step further to be more specific about upcoming grant opportunities. Leverage is heavily-weighted by the federal small starts grant applications. With secured funding, SDOT can make high-priority transit and safety improvements and investments can be scaled or phased based on available funds.

The other bookend is what it would take to deliver a RapidRide and Multimodal Corridor Program that would meet community expectations and address the transportation issues in our city. It would take the levy budget plus the King county partnership and an additional $130M. The additional $130M would provide money for more extensive transit priority, corridor-wide pedestrian and bicycle investments and upgrades to adaptive signal investments.

Nick: Is there a dollar amount for King County partnership?

Maria: King County is currently evaluating the budget and has determined it would be about $576M for RapidRide but we don’t know the number for Seattle lines yet.

Alex: Is there more certainty on Delridge, Roosevelt and Madison than the remaining 4?

Maria: The federal small starts process has proved to be very uncertain.

Councilmember O’Brien: I’m a little unclear on the expectation. I remember that RapidRide was the big selling point but is there a metric of how much we would speed up the routes?

Maria: In the RapidRide expansion program, we have worked with Metro to develop program development goals which includes travel time savings of 10-15%; reliability of 85% (higher than the current lines); and improvedservice frequency.

Blake: Delridge is not going to have an AAA facility?

Maria: The idea is to fill in the gaps to complete a bike facility along the lines.

Emily: It may be counting the greenway.

Maria: An example of the kind of investment that can be completed with secured funds is Route 44. It made bus lanes in spot locations, and included transit signal priority, in-lane bus stops and pedestrian crossing improvements. This cost $9.5M and generated 12% in travel-time savings.

Nick: How far is the distance?

Maria: The corridor goes from U District to Ballard.

Another example is the Roosevelt RapidRide project which would include the full suite of RapidRide improvements including: full RapidRide amenities at all stops and higher frequency of service; continuous red bus lanes from Eastlake to Downtown (also benefits streetcar); extension of route to Roosevelt with trolley wire; four miles of protected bike lanes; signal upgrades with adaptive operations and transit priority; pedestrian safety and access improvements; overlapping paving investments by AAC program. The cost for the program is $77M with 23% in travel-time savings.

We will advance projects according to corridor development process to assess scope and priorities. We’ll follow the process outlined below.



In June, we plan to follow-up with the Seattle Transit Advisory Board (TAB) with two separate meetings and this committee. TAB is willing to develop draft recommendations.

Alex: I have a statement from the STAB. In the interest of time, we will plan to send around. Essentially, there are a lot of questions and they are seeking some additional scrutiny particularly because the RapidRide 2016 expansion report had no hint of this.

Statement from STAB co-chairs:

As you requested at the end of our meeting this evening, below is an initial response to SDOT's presentation from the co-chairs of the Transit Advisory Board. While we've tried to consider the comments made by other board members in tonight's meeting, the ideas reflected below are solely reflective of the co-chair's initial perspectives (Jen and Erin). As you heard, we plan to have another interim board meeting to process the presentation fully as a group, after which, you'll receive a more formal reply that represents the entire board's perspective.

We support making transit speed and reliability improvements to the seven transit corridors identified. However, we are interested in SDOT maximizing funding sources by exploring reordering the delivery timeline for the corridor improvements. For example, could the implementation timeline of the 4 projects that have a good chance of receiving federal funds be moved to later in the levy cycle to increase the likelihood of being able to deliver a project that would be perceived as more "complete?" We would also like to know the possibilities for better aligning SDOT and Metro's corridor improvements.

SDOT stated that they could deliver on what the levy promises, but not on what the community expects in each corridor. We would like SDOT to provide us with a definition of what specific elements it believes the levy promises. For example, what specific improvement elements does SDOT believe each corridor must have in order to qualify as meeting the basic requirements of the levy. Is it a 10% improvement in transit speed and reliability plus at least one intersection improvement? Is SDOT targeting ridership gains? What metrics can we expect from you regarding these improvements going forward to help us compare variations on projects?

Finally, to help us provide meaningful feedback regarding how SDOT should move forward with using levy funds on RapidRide corridors from a guiding principals perspective, we would like to receive a financial breakdown of each corridor. What funds have been spent to date? What are the secured, likely, and identified leverage funds as they relate to each corridor? We would also like to understand any local matches that have been, or could be, tied to federal grant applications. This information will enable us to see what levy funds may already be tied to specific projects, which corridor improvements are already mostly funded and which will need additional funding sources - or which will never have enough funds to meet SDOTs definition of a RapidRide corridor with these levy funds alone.

We look forward to working with SDOT and King County Metro to create the best transit improvements throughout the city possible with the available funds.

* Bicycle Safety – Bicycle Master Plan

Elliot: The original levy commitment was to build 50 protected bike lanes (PBLs) and 60 neighborhood greenways. Costs are coming in higher than original estimates with average costs of PBLs at $1-$2M and costs of greenways between $650K - $1.5M. These costs are very dependent on location.

Emily: The Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board (SBAB) saw a similar proposal in May. We have a move Seattle levy subcommittee that is open to making adjustments for fewer miles but strongly feel that those need to be high-quality miles that will do a lot for connectivity. Our other concern is how fewer miles will affect BMP implementation overall. BMP is supposed to be implemented by 2035 and we are skeptical that we can complete that with the reduction in funding. In addition, SBAB is considering a 6-year implementation plan to capture all remaining projects in the levy.

Betty: Consistent message with your board and these modal boards is that you need to not look at just the levy but further out.

Brian: Concern about the wide range of average costs, if feels that these costs may not be accurate in 6 years.

Emily: Shifting the focus from miles towards a focus on BMP implementation may be more effective.

Jeff: We analyzed both how they put the levy together originally and real projects and projections to put these estimates together.

Blake: Can we have specific data on bike lanes?

Goran: Yes, we can provide the data but would like to walk you through it as it can be complex.

Councilmember O’Brien: It is also hard to develop ranges when you have 2nd Ave and then a much cheaper lane. I hope to approve later this year a detailed list of projects and costs as it is important to set public expectations going forward.

* **Levy Assessment Next Steps**

Alex: I propose focusing on the 5 remaining sub-programs at our 6/7 meeting so we can end our meeting on time.

Elliot: The idea for tonight was to get information. If there is other information you need, please let us know. We can provide recommendations and framework, but we really wanted to come to you with a blank slate originally. Would you like us to provide you with starting recommendations?

Betty: I think it would be helpful to create options, so we can react to the options.

Emily: We are waiting on different alternatives from the SDOT liaison which we still don’t have. Our subcommittee meets Monday, June 4 and the committee meets Wednesday, June 6.

Dustin: Elliot, I would like to work with you individually to understand some of the information I’m missing.

Elliot: Yes, I can do that.

Betty: Can you circulate the schedule for the modal board meetings coming up? If board members attend, they will be able to get another hour-and-a-half of nuance.

Elliot: I can do that.

Alex: You should probably consider an extended meeting on June 21. Also, how do you expect to accomplish meaningful public outreach at a time when people aren’t paying attention. It’s a credibility and trust issue. My level of attention to civic issues is very low in that period.

Goran: Thanks for the feedback. We will work with our colleagues and see if we can adjust the schedule to move public outreach later in the fall.

**Action items**Action items below capture action items from previous meetings, beginning with the February 2018 meeting. Complete items will remain on action item tracker for one additional meeting minutes to capture “complete” status and then be removed.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action item** | **Meeting** | **Lead** | **Status** | **Deadline** |
| Consider extended meetings to review priorities and draft recommendations | May 24 | LOC co-chairsElliot | Elliot to coordinate with LOC co-chairs on which meetings need to be extended | TBD |
| Send June modal board meetings to LOC members | May 24 | Elliot | **Complete:** Elliot to send email to LOC members | June 7 |
| Schedule July meeting | May 24 | LOC co-chairsElliot | July meeting is no longer needed; Elliot to coordinate with co-chairs on scheduling early August meeting | June 11 |
| Add February meeting action items to action item tracker and to February meeting minutes | May 24 | SDOT | **Complete:** Added in tracker below and to February meeting minutes online | June 1 |
| Keep committee informed on Fauntleroy progress | May 24 | SDOT  | Elliot to keep the committee updated as the Mayor and Councilmember Herbold continue community process to identify near-term safety improvements | Ongoing  |
| Specific data on how OMS determined ranges in the bike lane cost estimates for PBLs and greenways.  | May 24 | SDOT | **Complete:** Elliot to work with OMS to provide information for LOC | June 7 |
| Provide sub-program options for LOC and modal boards to consider | May 24 | SDOT | **In progress:** Elliot coordinating with Office of Move Seattle to develop options | SBAB - May 31SPAB – June 1STAB – June 1LOC – June 1  |
| 2017 Move Seattle Report | April 24 | SDOT | On hold until after the assessment | TBD |
| Determine LOC meeting dates in June | April 24 | LOC co-chairsElliot  | **Complete:** Meeting dates set for 6/7 and 6/21 | May 4 |
| Request to provide additional budget information on all 8 sub-programs at May 24 meeting | April 24 | SDOT | **Complete:** SDOT provided [data sheets](https://www.seattle.gov/Documents/Departments/SDOT/About/Funding/2018_0518_WorkplanUpdate_SubProgramData.pdf) in advance of 5/24 meeting. Data sheets are also posted online | May 21 |
| Send April meeting date to committee members | Feb. 22 | Elliot | **Complete:** Elliot sent date to committee members | March 2 |
| Sent Fauntleroy statement from Genesee Adkins to committee members | Feb. 22 | Elliot | **Complete:** Elliot sent statement and included in summary online | March 2 |
| Review final version of annual letter for approval at April meeting | Feb. 22 | LOC co-chairsElliot | **Complete:** Letter approved | April 24 |
| Create timeline for appropriate opportunities for the LOC to receive updates and feedback re: Fauntleroy | Feb. 22 | Elliot | **Complete:** Reflected in May Fauntleroy action item above | April 24 |
| Data on how SDOT tracks cumulative progress or delay for projects | Feb. 22 | Elliot | Elliot to work with team to send data to LOC | June 21 |
| Data with breakdown of striping and how SDOT determines whether to stripe or restripe a road | Feb. 22 | SDOT | **In progress:** Elliot provided initial data via email to Blake Trask | June 1 |
| Further discussion about SDOT responses to the CDM Smith Report and follow-up in 2018 and when the committee can expect an update | Feb. 22 | SDOT | Updates included as part of assessment work | Ongoing |
| Add cumulative deliverable count to SDOT annual report | Feb. 22 | SDOT | Elliot to track and add | TBD |
| Add discussion to future agenda regarding performance measures on the levy dashboard | Feb. 22 | SDOT | Elliot to add to future agenda | TBD |
| Send materials earlier to committee | Feb. 22 | SDOT | **Complete:** Since April, SDOT has been sending materials earlier to LOC members | April 20 |
| Review policy regarding posting meeting materials online | Feb. 22 | LOC co-chairsElliot | Elliot to add to future agenda | TBD |

 **MEETING ADJOURNMENT: 7:33 PM**