

Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

Date/Time: Thursday, June 7, 2018 / 5:30 – 7:30 PM

Co-chairs: Betty Spieth-Croll, Alex Krieg

Location: City Hall, Room 370

Members Present: Joe Laubach, Blake Trask, Alex Krieg, David Seater, Emily Paine, Betty Spieth-Croll, Sara Reddy (for Ben Noble), Dustin Lambro, Councilmember Mike O'Brien, Ron Posthuma

Members Absent: Brian Estes, Nick Paranjpye, Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Pat Cohn,

Guests: Goran Sparrman, Jeff Lundstrom, Ted Castro, Elliot Helmbrecht, Rodney Maxie, Sue Byers, Matthew Donahue (all SDOT)

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:30 PM

Approve Agenda

Agenda approved

Public Comment (2 min. per person)

No public comment

Approve Previous Meeting Minutes

Elliot: We are not approving the meeting minutes today. We sent them out today and will approve them on 6/21. A tracker was added, including items from February. Let us know if you have any comments.

Co-Chair Report

Alex: Today we heard that Laurie Torres—who is a member, at large—has resigned from the committee effective today.

Betsy: We recently received public comment to our personal work emails. We just wanted to state a reminder that any kind of communication should go to Elliot to distribute to the co-chairs and the committee so that it is on the record. When communications arrive to us personally they aren't as easy to process. We received this comment from Myrna Basich.

Dustin: Is it inside baseball that people would have your emails? Is the online process that people would send it to you, Elliot?

Elliot: My email is on the Levy website, so any comments or questions people have can be directed to me. Our process is to let people know about public comment, so they can provide comment at the meeting, or like we are doing now, we can print out the emails or messages they send us.

Betty: It would take some work to find our personal emails. I think we would like to avoid that as some work emails cannot receive those type of emails. These are copies of the emails we received in the last couple of weeks on the 35th Ave NE paving project and printed for you to see.

Director's message

Goran: Thank you for holding some extra meetings and taking on this extra work. We certainly recognize the sacrifice you are doing by taking on this extra work and wouldn't be at a point where we could move forward with high confidence without your help. We are only about 15% through the expenditures of the Levy so I think we are in a good place to reset and move forward with your help, and we really appreciate your time to make sure we do this right.

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

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

Elliot: We'll be looking at data for the five sub-programs we didn't get through two weeks ago, three of which the LOC is charged with providing a recommendation on.

- **Arterial Major Maintenance (AMM) Sub-program**

Ted: The levy commitment is to repave 65 targeted locations every year, totaling about 70 lane-miles of arterial streets with a repair and maintenance program run by city crews. Just a reminder that this is a program focused on smaller projects that our crews address. Since the work is primarily done on a spot repair basis, a majority of this subprogram budget needs to be allocated towards spot repairs. On average, SDOT completes approximately 38-65 spot repairs per year. The range depends on how much concrete we use, which is more expensive than asphalt. We assume that we have \$40M to deliver this sub-program, but we may be able to get additional funding for this program as we have been successful with additional budget requests. Current estimates show that after spending \$11M in the first two years of the levy, SDOT has \$29M of remaining funding. To deliver the levy commitment, we estimate we will need an additional \$18M - \$33M. The range of additional needed funds depends on the level of concrete paving required versus asphalt paving. Concrete paving is more expensive than asphalt paving. The low-end \$18M estimate assumes 3% of total paving would be done with concrete; the high-end \$33M assumes 10%. Approximately 35% of city-wide arterials are currently paved with concrete.

Councilmember O'Brien: I assume concrete would need to be repaved less frequently than asphalt?

Rodney: Yes, concrete roads last 20-30 years. A mill-and-overlay asphalt project typically lasts 10-15 years. Concrete roads should last at least twice as long. It also depends on subbase repair. If you don't repair the subbase, you will have potholes.

Sue: When you have potholes, you will have to rebuild the whole street. That's the whole point. We usually do a mill-and-overlay, where you remove and repave the top two layers.

Dustin: Was the levy specific about concrete versus asphalt or did it just say that you had to repave?

Rodney: That's one of the challenges when you talk about spot paving. This a program that is designed for us to deal with the worst-of-the-worst roads in each neighborhood, whether they are concrete or asphalt so we aren't able to choose the paving method.

Alex: Can I ask a question about this curb ramp note from data sheet? "Curb ramp construction costs account for approximately 30-40% of the AMM budget. These curb ramps are required to be funded via

the AMM program because they help achieve the City's Consent Decree requirements (1,250 curb ramps constructed annually). While this is a necessary expense, it ultimately reduces the amount of funding available for paving." How does that play into the ability to achieve the levy commitment?

Ted: When we go out and pave streets, that process automatically triggers the need to reconstruct curb ramps that are not ADA-compliant. The assumption when the levy was developed was that it would be funded with ADA dollars – a completely different program. Not only have we found the curb ramps cost more than we anticipated, but we have also found that the ADA sub-program does not have the budget to absorb costs for all curb ramps required under the consent decree of 1,250/year.

Alex: Did curb ramp construction always count for 30-40% of the budget?

Rodney: There were always curb ramps costs associated with the budget. The difference is that we used to have flexibility on when those ramps were upgraded on certain roads depending on the amount of pedestrian traffic. With the ADA consent decree dictating that 1,250 curb ramps must be upgraded per year, we do not have the flexibility to complete curb ramps later.

Ted: The program does try to coordinate with the ADA sub-program. If there are high priority areas where curb ramps are needed through that process and there happens to be an overlap with paving needs, they will work together to accomplish that. That isn't always the case because paving needs might not always align with the high-priority curb ramp replacement areas.

Alex: I tried to remember when the last director talked to us about this consent decree and curb ramps. When was that? The message seemed to indicate the consent decree was planned for and everything was fine. I want to confirm that message was also optimistic.

Jeff: I would say it was optimistic.

Betsy: But you are saying that ADA curb ramps have a major impact on this program. I'm asking because it doesn't show up in your findings or data.

Ted: The finding was that there was added scope for replacing curb ramps. We did not fully budget for that because we thought that the ADA sub-program would help cover that. I don't want to say it was assumed that they would pay for all of it but we assumed that it would be much more than the current amount.

Councilmember O'Brien: The original intent was that the ADA sub-program would pay the curb ramp portion of these projects. Once the settlement came along, the ADA budget was largely consumed with meeting other portions of that that and could not pay for as much of these curb ramps triggered by spot repairs. There was an indirect impact on the Move Seattle budget from the settlement.

Goran: Another important note is that curb ramps are costing more than we anticipated.

Ted: The assumption in the levy estimation was too low. Our engineering manager provided us with a statistic: the 2014 average curb ramp cost per unit was \$7400, and the 2017 average curb ramp cost per unit was \$9500. Those are just construction costs, not including soft costs. That is a 28% increase from 2014 to 2017 which is much higher than normal inflation.

Blake: You mentioned that you can get supplemental money through budget requests. Where is that reflected in the funding update or the levy funding plan.

Ted: In the pie chart on the one-pager in front of you, it is reflected in the \$23M of local money. It is not necessarily certain we can receive that every year, so we should not count on receiving an increase in local funding.

Blake: In the analysis here, you mentioned there are uncertainties and a potential \$1M to \$2M we could acquire through local funds. If we assume we could acquire those local funds, would that be approximately 20% more over the 9-year levy period?

Ted: I would say it would be optimistic to assume that would happen, in terms of the emerging needs of the city. We had an economic boom, but it isn't projected those types of revenues will continue and we are competing for those funds with others across the city.

Blake: Is it correct to assume that since there are spot improvements, they don't require as much advanced planning and we might be able to be nimbler and adapt?

Ted: Correct.

Rodney: We do need some planning to make sure we have enough crews to do the work. If suddenly we have \$10M available, we need to do at least a little planning a year in advance to use those funds.

Sue: Completing the design of the curb ramps takes time. We can't go out and trigger crews right away.

Blake: My point is AMM is substantially more flexible.

Sue: Yes.

Ron: I am trying to do some quick math. If the amount needed to achieve the original scope is now at least 50% higher than the original budget, and you said the cost for the ramps is 28% higher. With the market conditions, are these additional costs just materials? If you're using city crews, I don't think market conditions affect the cost of city crews.

Ted: This would mostly be affected by the cost of oil and the cost of asphalt.

Ron: So those things are going up over 50%?

Ted: Not 50%, but they are estimated to be increasing.

Ron: It would be helpful to break out the cost drivers to see how the gap happened. I don't think they account for the \$18M-\$33M. The oil, gas and concrete cost increases are not significant enough to drive that large of an added cost.

Ted: We used representative costs from 2016-2017 to come up with this estimate, but every area is different. Cost per unit will fluctuate significantly. Asphalt vs concrete is just one factor, the amount of curb ramps is another. We have been able to achieve paving for cheaper than the cost-per-mile assumed in these calculations, but we tried to use a representative group of projects over the last couple of years to develop this estimate.

Ron: If in fact we are doing more curb ramp work than we anticipated when the levy passed, that is in fact a good news story even if it was forced by a judicial decision. In many cases we are talking about doing less, so if we have an example where we are doing more then I think that should be reflected. People think they are getting less when for curb ramps they are getting more.

Blake: With the consent decree, is it that now there is no flexibility with the curb ramps and you build them all which leads to higher costs or is it that there is additional scope of curb ramps added to the program.

Rodney: The previous criteria was if you pay a certain level of money for a project, you trigger the need to build the curb ramps. The city did not pay in those areas if they did not have the additional money to pay for the curb ramps and deferred construction of those curb ramps until a later date. In this consent decree we can no longer do that.

Blake: So, the curb ramps on AMM are within the scope of these projects but you no longer have the flexibility to defer them? It is not as if the consent decree is saying you must do extra beyond the scope of the levy.

Rodney: The difference is with AAC, crews pave a whole corridor. When you design and contract it, you complete the whole corridor.

Alex: It does sound like what you said created an incentive to not make those improvements and defer it, and I would imagine there are examples where a curb ramp was deferred more than a couple of years because there weren't resources to do it. I think we can acknowledge that the city should do curb ramps because community members with limited mobility should have freedom of movement as much as possible.

Goran: This conversation is good, and I have two comments. First, to Ron's comment, yes, the cost-per-mile is higher, but we get more value with the added curb ramps. Second, going back to Blake's comment, if we touch the road, curb ramps are now required, and it is no longer discretionary. Remember, through the consent decree we are legally required to do a certain number per year which has put more pressure on the ADA sub-program. It is not just this program doing curb ramps, but other programs as well and it must add up to 1250 per year over 18 years.

Betty: Is there money identified for all of that through the nine years of the levy?

Goran: Right now, we are in decent shape, but 4-5 years down the road it will be a fiscal challenge.

Betty: You're reminding me that I asked your predecessor, former Director Kubly, about this last April, and he said we have money for the first 9 years but not after that.

Blake: What other programs does SDOT, with its discretions, defer pedestrian and bicycle improvements, when doing roadway maintenance and curb ramps? I think that this gets to the heart of some of my questions and concerns about accounting in the department about how dollars are being spent and who pays for different projects. At what point are we deferring without maintaining certain facilities because they are not a part of the scope of the project?

Rodney: To clarify, before the consent decree, all the ADA curb ramps that were triggered were put in a spreadsheet and were replaced, they were just not always replaced within the same year. I did not mean to indicate that we did not replace those curb ramps.

Emily: When you talk about the 1250 per year that are required, are they coming out of various sub-programs? Are all curb ramps that count towards the 1250 coming out of different levy sub-programs?

Goran: We get to count every curb ramp that is constructed in the city, including those constructed in the private sector. Bottom line is that we are doing the right thing by fulfilling the consent decree and these curb ramps add value.

Emily: To Blake's point, it can increase the cost of other sub-programs that you wouldn't necessarily think are related. Am I correct that ramps on 2nd Ave were a portion of the cost of that project?

Goran: Yes, because those ramps needed to be ADA-compliant.

Betty: When I read this suggested option, it doesn't feel different from what you already do. What is the difference?

Elliot: This suggested option was meant to be a start to begin bouncing ideas back and forth. We wanted to clarify what we are doing in the option and the second paragraph, "As this program has a successful track record of meeting their annual goals, SDOT will set an annual lane-mile paving target within available funding and track progress with the Levy Oversight Committee throughout the year" highlights the great work the crews have consistently done in this sub-program to deliver their annual target each year. We've made it clear that the 70-miles is unattainable with current funding. We could have provided an updated lane-mile estimate but due to the different variables that you have heard, it makes us hesitant to put up another number today.

Betty: As hesitant as you are, I would hope that by the time you get to the end of the assessment, you are much more specific than this. When you bring us options, I would like to see clear options if you want our guidance and recommendation.

Alex: What is implied here is that you will no longer refer to the original levy commitment but will have an annual target instead. We know that we will probably be able to meet that target because annual targets are easier to meet than 9-year targets. The funds are going to produce good outcomes, just not the levy commitment. It is important to mention 70 lane-miles and 65 targeted locations as background to how you arrived at your recommendation, even if you can no longer meet it.

Betty: I agree, and at the same time, I think you should put some numbers to what you can accomplish, over the course of the levy. I know that's scary – obviously, you have had a bad experience with having numbers out there that were not good numbers. Instead of not putting numbers out at all, maybe put out better numbers.

Alex: Also, add the curb ramps to your new levy commitment since that was not a factor in the original levy commitment.

Joe: Maintenance and Repair has 10 projects, 3 are red and 7 are green. At some point, shouldn't we be discussing moving some of the greens to an orange or a yellow to fill some of the red projects and get closer to the original commitment. I don't expect us to answer this tonight, but I feel like that should be part of the discussion. For example, one green checkmark is to reinforce 16 vulnerable bridges. I don't want to be the guy that says let's just do 14 but what if we could just do 14 and deliver AMM commitments which has proven to be a successful program. I realize I'm throwing something out that could make this discussion more complex, but it seems to me that it should be a part of the discussion.

Goran: I understand the question and understand why you are asking it. It's a very legitimate question. We did not go there at the staff level for two reasons. One reason was that we did not want to move the

goal posts beyond where we identified that goal posts were not working. I wanted to be clear about the original commitment and where we stood compared to that original commitment. The second reason is that the green sub-programs do not have surplus funding. Shifting priorities and moving money around is a policy decision that I was not comfortable with staff pursuing alone. The Oversight Committee can make that recommendation but that would be a recommendation that I would take to City Council and the Mayor's Office.

Betty: This option is not off the table, but I think we'll keep moving so that we can get through the other sub-programs.

Goran: One clarifying comment before we move on. The advice we heard from the committee is that the suggested options seems vague and ambiguous, and we need to translate it into a specific goal that is measurable.

Betty: Yes, and I agree with Alex to make sure that you reference the original levy commitment and include a few notes on why SDOT cannot meet the original commitment. Also, add the curb ramps number.

- **Arterial Asphalt & Concrete (AAC) Sub-program**

Ted: The original levy commitment was to repave up to 180 lane-miles of arterial streets. I also wanted to note that while it is not on the slide, any paving work done through the seven transit-plus multimodal corridor program counts toward the 180 lane-mile commitment. The budget for paving along the seven corridors is partially funded by the AAC sub-program. The findings are:

- While not a formal levy commitment, SDOT published a preliminary list of paving projects during the levy outreach period in 2015.
- SDOT is confident that we can still meet the original levy commitment to repave up to 180 lane-miles of arterial streets within available funding but will need to revise the original project list to better reflect priorities based on pavement conditions and travel volumes.

Councilmember O'Brien: I would imagine that one way to achieve the shift in being able to still pave 180 lane-miles within available funding is to shift from concrete to more asphalt roads?

Ted: I would need to take a look.

Councilmember O'Brien: If the asphalt ones are higher priority, then it makes sense, but we may get criticized so we will want to own that up front.

Alex: How was the preliminary list generated? Was it a data-driven exercise or politically-driven exercise?

Rodney: We have a paving engineering group who sets priorities based on the roads that are failing. The one thing that is unusual about Seattle is 60% of our roads are concrete and only 30% are asphalt. Most major cities have 95% asphalt and 5% concrete. Our old standard was to do a 6 – 7-inch pour for concrete roads but with the buses breaking down the roads we have updated to a new standard of a 12-inch pour with dowels to connect to extend the life of a concrete road to 30 years. If you must do some base repair on the road, asphalt will cost the same as concrete. It is only if the road is in good enough condition that you can do a 2-3-inch mill-and-overlay of asphalt that would be significantly cheaper. It's important to remember that there were many more projects than were able to make the cut for the levy.

Alex: Were the projects that made the cut the highest priority or were there projects that jumped up for political reasons?

Rodney: We prioritized the multimodal streets first as there were more improvements from the levy being built on these streets.

Ted: To move on with the findings – the original budget also assumed a level of leverage which is no longer considered feasible. The levy assumed \$18M in leverage which was primarily comprised of federal preservation grants. We only have received 3 of those for projects through 2020 so we want to be less aggressive in our assumptions. SDOT has \$253M - \$254M to deliver the AAC sub-program. Current estimates show that after spending \$37M in the first two years of the levy, SDOT has \$216M - \$217M of remaining. To date, we have repaved 55.4 lane-miles with the \$37M in two years. These projects are primarily mill-and-overlay asphalt projects. While the budget is lower than originally anticipated, SDOT believes they can deliver 180 lane-miles within available funding. As Rodney mentioned, when the paving list was developed, they tried to align paving needs on the multimodal corridors with when those projects would occur. Most of these projects are concrete projects in the later years of the levy because the multimodal corridors take many years to plan and design.

Ron: Last night at the transit board, we were briefed on RapidRide corridors and it appears that one of the big cost drivers in that program is pavement which was assumed to be in the RapidRide budget. If we don't prioritize money for paving on these arterial corridors and decide we can't afford the corridors because they don't have money for concrete, then we have created a problem for the RapidRide program in how we are allocating the pavement work.

Alex: To me, this is a larger point around the dependencies between sub-programs. For example, if you don't do this paving project, it impacts a multimodal corridor.

Ron: We heard yesterday that SDOT wants to ask Metro to pay more. Metro can pay for the service and the buses, but they are likely not going to be willing to pay for concrete.

Alex: Madison Street which is part of the Madison RapidRide program is 11 lane-miles that will be counted in the AAC 180 lane-mile commitment. There is substantial risk with Madison due to federal funding, and even if we do receive the small-starts grant, there is still a cost delta. So, I don't know if I believe that SDOT can deliver those 180 lane-miles with the 11 miles of RapidRide uncertainty. Also, recognizing that we have public from 35th Ave NE here, can you also speak to whether the bike facilities for 35th Ave NE are being counted somewhere else?

Ted: Yes, the bike facilities on 35th Ave NE are counted in the Bicycle Master Plan sub-program. The 11 miles on Madison would be the most at risk because it's not budgeted in AAC. If that project does not happen, we are still close to 180 lane-miles. The original paving plan did include a small amount of money in the AAC sub-program for paving on each of the other corridors – a very small amount of Roosevelt and nothing on Delridge. As we look to prioritize paving needs in 2020-2024, that will be a part of the discussion.

Betty: I would like to ask Goran, how did you deal with these interdependencies as you were going through the assessment?

Goran: It was not clear in the levy language or how we had been managing it how everything was interconnected. The relationship between AAC and the multimodal corridors is a good example. We spent time understanding those relationships and need to help you understand how the programs are interconnected. For example, we should prioritize paving the corridors when adding RapidRide.

Alex: What you are proposing as the suggested option is to modify the published paving project list based on standard prioritization including current pavement condition, travel volumes and unfunded paving needs on transit plus multimodal corridors to meet the commitment to repave 180 lane-miles with funds available. The piece I struggle with is - this project list may need to continue to be updated to reflect the highest priorities throughout the Levy. When updated, SDOT will share with the LOC. My question is when will it be updated?

Sue: Typically, we would not do a 9-year plan. We can typically do the next 4-5 years but at a certain distance, it is more difficult to determine priorities. We update our paving project list every three years. With our pavement prioritization, we look at whether it is along a freight corridor or whether it is a multimodal corridor, etc., and then we try to distribute pavement projects equally across the city.

Goran: Every 2-3 years we would review the project paving list. We would ask you to make adjustments to that list based on what Sue just described.

Alex: This is one where it strikes me that it will be hard to make a recommendation on this without knowing some of the other recommendations, particularly the transit-plus multimodal. Thinking more holistically about lessons we have learned from this process, maybe don't publish 9-year lists next time?

Sue: I would agree that it is not helpful to produce a 9-year list.

Blake: I have a question for Betty. Bridging the Gap (BTG) was a nine-year levy but somehow we made it through with a specific project list?

Betty: There were very different conditions – it was a smaller levy and the economic conditions were very different at the time. What I heard one of the SDOT staff say a few meetings ago was that it was chaotic, but we managed to pull it off. In other words, a variety of reasons have tipped this one into a different place – not only the economy, but the size of the levy, and unfortunately the way it was constructed.

Dustin: The projects documented on the [data sheet that go through 2019](#), is this list from the levy or has it been updated since?

Ted: These were all projects that were on the original list. These are about half of the projects and it is the next half – the 2020-2024 that are being evaluated.

Goran: We should be clear, we don't expect this list to change drastically every 3-4 years. What I would like from the committee is that what we say is accurate and that this list cannot be cast in concrete for 9 years because things will change and that there is an overlap with different programs. This group may decide that we should do more concrete on multimodal corridors to ensure that we are functioning well for the long-term. That would have an impact on this list and the number of miles. Just acknowledge that the relation exists.

Dustin. I would want to have a list by 2019 for the 2020-2024 paving projects.

Alex: It would be helpful to see the 9-year paving list.

Elliot: It's [online](#) and we can send it.

Dustin: I do think it's important for voters to know what the 2020-2024 list.

Ted: That would be easy to provide. We can put it together and then highlight what we have done to date, so you can see what projects are remaining, recognizing that priorities may change.

Alex: It would help me to understand what is in jeopardy on that list and what isn't on that list that may need to go on that list.

- **Bridge Replacement Sub-program**

Jeff: The original levy commitment is to plan and design high-priority bridge replacements to begin construction after 2024. Of the funds identified in this element, up to \$10 million of total funding (local, levy, leverage) may be used for implementing near-term pedestrian and bicycle safety projects on bridges being studied for replacement (in addition to funding provided for pedestrian and bicycle safety projects in other elements).

The findings are that while not a formal levy commitment, SDOT published a preliminary list of bridge replacement projects during the levy outreach period in 2015. It listed 13 different bridges. While SDOT does plan to meet the levy commitment, cost estimates for planning and design work are greater than originally anticipated and the original project list needs to be revised to better reflect the city's top priorities. The original budget assumed leverage opportunities which are not available.

Alex: What does it mean when it says BRAC grants are no longer assumed?

Jeff: BRAC is a funding mechanism that stands for Bridge Replacement Advisory Committee (BRAC). They anticipated in 2015 that SDOT would get \$15M in BRAC grants. These grants are federally funded but WSDOT is the decision-maker for that program. We have been told that the likelihood of getting dollars from that program is very slim. Therefore, we only have \$15M in levy dollars for this program. With this funding, SDOT will prioritize available funding to meet the levy commitment by advancing planning and design for bridges that are most vulnerable and in need of replacement.

In your [handouts on page 22](#), there is a list of bridges that was in the original campaign materials. They reevaluated bridge priorities and have deferred 39th & E Pine St Bike/Pedestrian Bridge and N 79th St Tunnel to a future levy and reprioritized Jackson St and University Bridge N Approach as the 9th and 10th bridges on the list.

Betty: I did not read the article about the Magnolia Bridge but is that a result of this work?

Goran: Yes, the \$1M alternatives analysis was a part of this program. The Magnolia Bridge will cost about \$400M to replace and we will not be able to afford that which has caused concerns in the community.

Betty: This \$1M was spent to determine that.

Goran: Part of it was spent but there is still more work to do to finalize the alternatives analysis and develop a recommendation.

Betty: It is apparently your number one priority in the city.

Goran: It was a priority to understand what the situation was and assess the alternatives due to the high cost of replacement.

Blake: The Ballard Bridge pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements, what is that?

Jeff: In the levy it says that up to \$10M of total funding may be used for implementing near-term pedestrian and bicycle safety projects on bridges being studied for replacement. We are recommending using \$5M for bicycle and pedestrian improvements since we have less funding than originally anticipated. So, the suggested options we are coming to you with are to:

- Prioritize available funding to advance planning and design for bridges that are most vulnerable and in need of replacement. This project list may need to continue to be updated to reflect the highest priorities throughout the Levy. When updated, SDOT will share with the LOC.
- Allocate \$5 million in funding to complete near-term bicycle and pedestrian safety projects on bridges, including the Ballard Bridge. The Ballard Bridge was one of the top priorities in 2015.

Blake: Where is the city in seeking leverage from the West Seattle to Ballard Sound Transit process?

Goran: It is true that there is a lot of relationship between our bridges and what happens on the Sound Transit 3 alignment. Sound Transit is currently working with the city and stakeholders to reach a preferred alignment by early next year. Many of their options involve bridges. Sound Transit doesn't have enough money to do the things we want to do so they are asking us for money. When we are looking at them to help with our projects, those conversations are not going anywhere. We are likely going to have significant issues with the preferred alignment that will require financial participation by the city and none of that has been accounted for.

Councilmember O'Brien: It's still early in Sound Transit's process and the cost analysis is rough at this point. Generally, there is an expectation that there will be gaps and we are not yet sure how those gaps will be filled. The idea of having a moveable bridge is causing a lot of stress for folks along that corridor due to the impacts on traffic that could have and the impact on having a high bridge can also be problematic due to the grades and where it would touch down. Everyone loves a tunnel, but they are usually expensive. My sense from talking with SDOT is that the Ballard Bridge needs replacement within the next couple of decades. As Sound Transit further develops their plan, it will be important to coordinate, particularly as Sound Transit is looking at the same spot where SDOT would build a parallel bridge. I have not seen anything where Sound Transit will be able to address meaningful bicycle and pedestrian connections across the canal. I think it is likely that we will be using the existing Ballard Bridge for a while and it's more about how we make improvements on that bridge at this time.

Jeff: On [page 22 of your data sheets](#), we have outlined how we would spend that money on those bridges.

Emily: When you say the \$5M for ped safety, including the Ballard Bridge. Is that the \$5M of the required \$11M for the shields or spending on other projects?

Councilmember O'Brien: No. This \$5M would be spent on moving forward with 8 of the 9 projects proposed on 4 bridges across the city. We'll have to find an additional \$10M for shields. It would also be good to have a list of these projects and the ones that we weren't able to do in red on the bridge replacement list for clarity.

- **Sidewalk Safety Repair**

Ted: The levy commitment is to repair up to 225 blocks of damaged sidewalks in our urban centers and villages. The findings are that:

- SDOT has been counting “one block” as equal to one full block face of a sidewalk, or multiple small repairs totaling a typical block face (i.e. 1,500 square feet). If it continues to be measured this way, the funding allocated to this subprogram will not be adequate.
- A majority of the sub-program budget is and needs to be allocated towards spot repairs that make sections of sidewalk safer and are a priority for the city. On average, SDOT completes approximately 1,000 spot repairs per year.

SDOT has \$18M to deliver the Sidewalk Safety Repair sub-program. Current estimates show that after spending \$4M in the first two years of the levy, SDOT has \$14M of remaining funding. SDOT will work with the Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board to recommend how this deliverable should be measured within available funding. I want to give a little more information on how this program is delivered. The Sidewalk Condition Assessment was done in 2017 noted 156,000 in maintenance needs on sidewalks. The program is spending 37% of its budget on shims and bevels to correct some of those needs. As the levy is currently structured, we do not get to count that work towards the deliverable. We do have a supplemental funding request in for an additional \$3M per year.

David: Speaking for myself, it makes sense to measure the way we are delivering. I just want to make sure that we are not losing out on what was planning to be built in the original commitment. I would want the spot repairs to add up to roughly the 225 blocks of what was originally planned.

Alex: I agree that this is one where a bad measure was picked at the beginning and may have been defeating. This one also might benefit from visual evidence that shows where a spot repair corrects a tripping hazard.

David: The Assessment Report was fantastic, and we have written a letter to Council and SDOT requesting that we follow up on the recommendations in the report to address the worst problems that it uncovered.

Rodney: Over the last three weeks, we did 3,000 shims and bevels. Many of these programs were already maintenance programs within SDOT before this levy was defined sub-programs in a certain way and there may have been some things that were lost in translation. The sidewalk safety program was always designed to make a sidewalk safe quickly.

Betty: I don't think it's too early for SDOT to think about what measures would work well for the next levy and how it would tell a better and a clearer story.

- **Curb Ramps & Crossings**

Jeff: The levy commitment is to make curb ramp and crossing improvements at up to 750 intersections citywide creating accessible routes for those with disabilities and for the elderly. I want to highlight that the measurement is intersections, not curb ramps. Our findings are that:

- The cost to improve intersections is greater than originally anticipated. This increase reflects a rise in the cost for curb ramps, and that most intersections require multiple curb ramps as compared to other lower-cost improvements such as curb bulbs and/or pedestrian push buttons.
- At the current average rate of four curb ramps per intersection, this subprogram is underfunded.

SDOT has \$64 – \$65M to deliver the Curb Ramps & Crossings sub-program. Current estimates show that after spending \$10M in the first two years of the levy, SDOT has \$54M - \$55M of remaining funding. SDOT recommends implementing strategies to reduce the cost of designing and constructing curb ramps; and measuring crossing improvements funded by the Pedestrian Safety program to deliver this sub-program within available funding.

The good news is that we have just started analyzing the completed intersection improvements from Q4 2017 and we are starting to average a bit less than 4 curb ramps/intersection. This red flag may be shifting to an orange flag. SDOT will have to do their work to keep costs down to complete this deliverable. SDOT is delivering curb ramps at 84% of intersections which counts toward the consent decree. If we can identify areas where AMM is doing work, we try to coordinate with that program as well.

David: The pedestrian board and I would be interested in hearing more about these cost reduction strategies. I also have a question that is not unique to this sub-program - I know that there is a certain cost threshold for a project that determines whether it can be completed by city crews or whether it can go out to bid. I also know that the bids are typically significantly more expensive than when the city crews build the projects. Has there been discussion about raising that threshold?

Goran: Yes, there has but it is a state law.

Councilmember O'Brien: We talked about it just today to put a strategy in place with our government relations staff, other cities, regional and state partners to begin these discussions.

Jeff: I wanted to address your question about cost-reduction strategies. Are strategies include:

- Designing lower-cost intersection investments such as curb bulbs or paint-and-post curb bulbs
- Following the federal ADA guidelines for Maximum Extent Feasible (MEF) documentation, when appropriate
- Utilizing specialized curb ramp designers and construction contractors to reduce the cost
- Other lower-cost intersection investments, as appropriate

Alex: This seems like another question on how we will measure going forward.

- **Levy Assessment Next Steps**

Elliot: We wanted to take a step back and reflect on what we heard from you and modal boards. We heard you needed more time and so we wanted to spend the remaining month of June with you to review data. Heading into late June and July, we'll have meetings with you and the modal boards to start formulating recommendations. If we need an extra July meeting, we can add that in there. That all leads us to early August where the modal boards send recommendations to you all at this table and you formulate your final recommendations to SDOT at a TBD scheduled meeting on August 2, giving you guys the month of July to put together your recommendations.

Betty: Is the August 2 date set?

Elliot: I've reserved this room on the feedback that we would need that meeting. That allows all of the modal boards to go through their July meetings as well, so they can spend this month discussing details and another month discussing recommendations. We would then take what you give us on August 2 and put together a workplan set of recommendations for the remaining years of the levy. We then spend September talking through these draft recommendations with the public, both in Council and through some online outreach. Your section of work would be done at the end of August. We hear what the public has to say and how that correlates with the draft recommendations, make any adjustments needed, and do a final report to the Mayor and City Council with a final workplan.

Betty: If we finalize our work in August, I think we as a group need to talk about how we are going to respond to all of this. I think it's in a couple of different ways. I was originally thinking that you would have a report that we could in part respond to.

Elliot: Yes, that would come after outreach.

Councilmember O'Brien: In the Council process, I would love to have representatives from this committee at the table. There would be an opportunity to have a comment letter which could be made public at that time.

Betty: So, we have a couple of different times to respond. We will need to collect our response as we provide feedback on these 8 sub-program areas and then we will have a chance to respond after the whole thing is done to the Council.

Councilmember O'Brien: Early August is a chance to shape what SDOT will produce. Then, SDOT will get some public comment. You can then come back to Council and respond to how they responded to you and obviously advocate to the extent that folks have differences in opinion.

Alex: The question I have is what if SDOT does not like our recommendations? Some are straightforward, and some are not at all. We are going to make recommendations that are beyond our capacity to make.

Betty: Looking at this schedule, if modal boards take until July to finalize their recommendations and we are done by August 2, how does that work?

Elliot: They would have to send you their recommendations by the Friday before you meet on the following Thursday. Their recommendations would be due to you on July 27.

Alex: Emily, the Bike Board met on Tuesday. How do you feel about this schedule?

Emily: I'm not confident that we will be done by the end of our July meeting. Based on our meeting last night, there is still a lot of data from SDOT that is needed before we make recommendations.

Alex: I want to be at a point where we can make recommendations in early August. My concern is that they will not be fully-formed.

Dustin: What is driving this timeline?

Elliot: This timeline is reflective of what we felt was necessary for you all to get information to make an informed decision and wrap this up.

Betty: It is a fine line of continuing iterations and getting it right.

Dustin: This seems fast to me, and I'm not just saying that because this is my second meeting.

Goran: It's a tricky balancing act – the department would like to put this behind us so that we have a clearer road map moving forward. We also want to give you the time to do it right.

Alex: We have been charged to make recommendations about sub-programs. But we can't just make these recommendations without commenting on broader issues around the broader trust issue with SDOT, concerns around transparency, and lessons learned. It sounds like we would do that in the late August/September timeframe. Can we get to August 2 with specific enough recommendations that allow SDOT to move forward? I think we should try and adjust accordingly.

Councilmember O'Brien: For council timing, we are on recess the two weeks prior to Labor Day. There is a 3-week window where we do work before shifting to budget for 2 months. There is also a window in late November/early December. Since there is not a specific deadline, there are ways to phase this. I care most about reestablishing a commitment to hold folks accountable and doing that in a way that we can communicate with the public and earn back some trust. I worry about having 6 months of silence where that festers.

Dustin: I hear what you are saying but the last thing I want is for a report to come out in October and get smeared in the press that says, "Seattle failing on another levy." I think there is a way to engage the public in this process in September, but I would rather wait until November/December for something to come out.

Goran: I wanted to add to what Councilmember O'Brien said. A key objective of this process is restoring public trust. A big part of this exercise with going back to levy commitments, while it may seem nuanced, is our effort to restore public trust. Second issue is that, after August, I will no longer be here, and the City will have to vote on a new levy at some point. I think it would be very helpful for this committee to draft some guiding principles on what the next levy should look like.

Betty: My concern about you leaving is that you did so much work on this and led the effort on transparency, towards public trust and reassessment. I am just wondering how we can have your voice as part of the final product. I would like to thank you for pointing out what was real, digging in and owning up to it.

Goran: I will give that some thought.

Elliot: What I heard from today is that we have some work we can do on the options before our June 21 meeting.

Betty: I also wanted to add that I would love to hear from the modal boards are three things that the board wants out of the sub-program

Emily: We want projects that will complete the network and enough projects so that the BMP implementation plan can be completed by 2035.

Alex: We should keep the June 21 meeting to discuss our sub-programs and empower our modal boards to give an update on their recommendations.

Elliot: Also, one thing we are working on for future meetings is how we move forward in our reporting to you and reporting to Council. We'll be looking for feedback on that as well and whether you feel it is adequate. This is really demanding a monthly meeting moving forward and we are starting to map out when you get updates on certain parts on the levy.

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 |
|--|---------|-------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Adjust Bridge Replacement, AMM and AAC recommendation to be clearer and more specific, include number commitments and reference the original levy commitment | June 7 | Elliot | Complete: Elliot to work with Office of Move Seattle to further refine options | June 15 |
| Adjust bridge priority list to show all nine projects (8 funded in green and 1 unfunded in red) | June 7 | Elliot | Complete: Elliot to work with Office of Move Seattle to update this list | June 15 |
| Provide additional details on the \$18 - \$33M of additional funding needed for the AAM sub-program so the committee can understand how the number was developed | June 7 | Elliot | Complete: Elliot to work with Office of Move Seattle to provide additional details | June 15 |
| Request for AAC original project paving list (note which projects have been completed to date) | June 7 | Elliot | Complete: Elliot to send to committee | June 15 |
| Request for AAC paving list for 2021- 2024 projects by 2019 | June 7 | Elliot | In progress: Tracking to ensure that committee is provided list in 2019 | 2019 – specific deadline TBD |
| Develop guiding principles for the next levy | June 7 | LOC | Tracking | TBD; LOC to determine |
| Consider extended meetings to review priorities and draft recommendations | May 24 | LOC co-chairs Elliot | In progress: Elliot to coordinate with LOC co-chairs on which meetings need to be extended | TBD |
| Schedule July meeting | May 24 | LOC co-chairs Elliot | Complete: July meeting is no longer needed; Elliot to coordinate with co-chairs on scheduling early August meeting | June 11 |

| Action item | Meeting | Lead | Status | Deadline |
|---|----------|-------------------------|--|---|
| Keep committee informed on Fautleroy progress | May 24 | SDOT | In progress: Elliot to keep the committee updated as the Mayor and Councilmember Herbold continue community process to identify near-term safety improvements | Ongoing |
| 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 31 SPAB – June 1 STAB – June 1 LOC – June 1 |
| 2017 Move Seattle Report | April 24 | SDOT | On hold until after the assessment | TBD |
| Data on how SDOT tracks cumulative progress or delay for projects | Feb. 22 | Elliot | In progress: 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 |
| Review policy regarding posting meeting materials online | Feb. 22 | LOC co-chairs Elliot | Complete: Elliot to add to future agenda | TBD |

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: 7:35 PM