

# Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

**Date/Time:** Thursday, November 29, 2018 / 5:30 – 7:30 PM

**Co-chairs:** Betty Spieth-Croll

**Location:** City Hall, Room L280

**Members Present:** Todd Biesold; Rachel Ben-Shmuel; Lisa Bogardus; Joe Laubach; Councilmember Mike O'Brien; Ron Posthuma; Saroja Reddy (for Ben Noble); David Seater; Hester Serebrin; Patrick Taylor; Erin Tighe (substitute for Seattle Transit Advisory Board)

**Members Absent:** Brian Estes; Ben Noble; Emily Paine; Nick Paranjpye; Betty Spieth-Croll; Blake Trask

**Guests:** Dan Anderson; Monica DeWald; Elliot Helmbrecht; Linea Laird; Nick Makhani; Kris Castleman; Rachel McCaffrey; Lorelei Williams (all SDOT)

## MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:30 PM

### Message from the Director

Linea noted that the Department was excited to share both the [Q3 2018 Report](#) and their newly released [Updated Workplan](#) that lays out a clear plan for the remaining years of the levy. Linea also added that both reports showed the Department's commitment to transparency moving forward. The last thing Linea noted is to pay attention to media and the [new SDOT website](#) regarding the newly named "Seattle Squeeze." She encouraged Committee members who did not feel informed to reach out to her.

### Introduction of new board members

Rachel B. led introductions and welcomed new board members, Patrick Taylor and Todd Biesold. Patrick Taylor is the new Levy Oversight Committee Bicycle Advisory Board and Todd Biesold is the new Levy Oversight Committee Freight Advisory Board representative.

### Public Comment

**Ryan Packer:** What is missing from this reporting is how we are doing on safety. The Levy dashboard is broken. I think it's worth noting that we're checking all the boxes, which is great, but 23rd Ave Phase 2 is kind of joke in terms of being a Vision Zero corridor if you look at what has actually been done there. Fourth Ave is in the completed category – you can go outside this building and look at what that did. I wonder if there is a way to look at effectiveness of money being spent and how it's impacting Vision Zero and how we report on that because it does not look like we are heading in the right direction on that top-level measure. Right now, I don't think the general public has access to that information.

### Staff Report

Rachel M. shared an updated committee roster which included information on the appointing authority that would be responsible to appoint a new member at the end of a member's term.

### Distribute and Approve Meeting Minutes

Rachel B. noted that the October meeting minutes are shorter than the August meeting minutes for ease of review/approval. The Levy Oversight Committee approved both the August and October meeting minutes.

## Co-Chair Report

Rachel B. noted that the committee has been trying to recruit a co-chair for a few months and announced that Ron Posthuma had been nominated for co-chair. The committee proceeded to approve the appointment. Ron has been serving on the Levy Oversight Committee as the Transit Advisory Board representative and his experience includes work with the US Department of Transportation, King County Department of Transportation, and Puget Sound Regional Council Transportation Policy Board. Rachel B. noted that, with this appointment as co-chair, he can continue to bring his experience to the committee.

## 2018 Q3 Report

Rachel M. began with an overview of the new format and explained that it included a summary; New evy ID number for all Levy programs; performance and financial detail by program; performance and financial detail consolidated; and program status included as summary text.

Rachel M. highlighted that summer months are typically busy construction months, and in Q3 several projects achieved substantial completion, including the Rainier Valley Greenway, 6th Ave and University Way paving, and four of nine Neighborhood Street Fund projects. In addition, construction progressed significantly on the new Lander St bridge.

Rachel M. introduced Nick Makhani to discuss the Q3 report finances in more detail. Nick began by introducing the new Interim Finance Administration Director, Kris Castleman. He then shared information on budget and expenditures, highlighting the expenditures in 2018 for the Move Seattle portfolio. SDOT received \$170.9M in all funds at the beginning of 2018, with \$115M of this funding going to Move Seattle projects. Nick highlighted council-approved supplementals, budget transfers, and carry-forward which led to a revised budget of \$209M in all funds. As of Q3, Move Seattle has spent \$108.1M which represents 52% of the revised budget. He explained that “abandoning” is an accounting term meaning funds were removed from this year’s budget and re-appropriated to future years. Some of the largest spending by categories, include:

- **Safe Routes: \$10.7M**
  - Bicycle Safety: \$2.8M
  - Transportation Operations: \$2.2M
- **Maintenance & Repair: \$13.4M**
  - Arterial Roadway Maintenance (AAC): \$6.6M
  - Paving Spot Improvements (AAM): \$2.2M
- **Congestion Relief: \$23.4M**
  - Multimodal Improvements: \$7.4M
  - New Sidewalks: \$5.2M
  - Lander Overpass: \$4.3M

Nick noted that in Q3 of 2018, spending was \$12M below the planned spending which helped inform updated Q4 plans highlighted in the updated workplan.

Rachel M. explained some additional reasons for the gap in spending/delivery in five programs.

- **Safety Corridors:** This program includes the NE 65th Safety Corridor Project and the Vision Zero Spot Improvement Contract which are currently in construction and started late due to contracting delays and an operator strike.

- **Neighborhood Street Fund (NSF):** Several of these projects were completed in Q3 but several in the north-sector are still underway. The north-sector projects were contracted together with the North Seattle Greenway Project and experienced contracting delays. In addition, these projects were near a school and work closest to the school was prioritized over the NSF projects to avoid impacts to students while in session.
- **Arterial Roadway Maintenance:** Several large paving projects have been experiencing contracting delays and delays due to additional coordination during design for complete-street elements
- **New Sidewalks:** Some projects experienced contracting delays, and 30th Ave NE Sidewalks was delayed due to a sinkhole discovered during work
- **Lander Bridge:** Experienced contracting delays but construction is now underway

Lorelei added that SDOT does not want to continue moving its goal posts throughout the year. SDOT began 2018 with \$190M as their spend-plan goal. Due to contracting delays and additional constraints that have been discussed over the past few months, SDOT anticipates spending \$145 - \$155M by the end of Q4 rather than \$190M.

Lorelei highlighted program/project delay themes and how SDOT was responding. A few issues she noted were contracting delays; project packaging and contracting methods; and department capacity pressures. Lorelei noted that SDOT is updating standard specifications and adjusting advertisement schedules to address these contract delays. In addition, Lorelei explained that for the last few months, she has been meeting with the AGC to discuss the barriers for contractors. Through these meetings, SDOT is working to understand what the City can do and what it can require to reduce the contracting delays. SDOT is also advertising contracts as much in advance as possible, rather than counting on contractors being able to change their patterns. In addition, Lorelei noted that, to address the issue of project packaging/contracting methods, SDOT will carefully review projects before packaging and consider alternative methods for delivery. To address department capacity pressures, SDOT will do a departmental and regional workforce analysis with the updated workplan. She highlighted the need to depend on consultants and contractors to continue to help with work.

Ron asked if there was any concern that breaking large contracts into smaller ones will make them less desirable? Lorelei responded that this is a possibility, since projects under \$1M don't get as much attention in such a busy construction market.

Joe asked why there was such a big disconnect between the larger \$7M he recalled being approved for NSF spending and the spending to date shown in this meeting. Nick explained that the total budget represented \$5M and spending to date is \$3.8M, meaning SDOT will not spend the total original budget in 2018 for the reasons stated. Lorelei explained that the total amount Joe may be recalling was for a three-year period, whereas the \$3.8M spent to date of \$5M is for 2018 only. Any funds not spent in 2018 due to delays will carry forward to 2019 for the same projects as they complete construction.

Patrick asked for an update on the bicycle safety progress. Rachel M. explained that a lot of the bike safety projects are tied together with paving so many of the reasons for delays are the same.

### **Levy reporting schedule**

Rachel M. explained that SDOT is committing to developing the Q1, Q2, and Q3 reports within two months of the end of the quarter, with an annual report in April of the following year. She added that

SDOT has been focused on the workplan this year and will belatedly publish the 2017 Annual Report in December. These reports will be available online for the public.

### 2018 Updated Levy Workplan

Elliot began with a brief review of where the team has been, including noting that SDOT incorporated the feedback and comments received from the Committee and modal advisory boards as they developed the Updated Workplan. Elliot noted that it was a milestone report for SDOT to reflect a more readable, digestible plan with far more details than were included in August. He noted there are not many substantive changes between this report and what was shared in August, but rather improvements in readability and format.

David noted that getting a 60-page report two hours before the meeting is frustrating because he was not able to read it in advance and won't be able to have a well-informed discussion. He requested that future reports be sent to the Committee in advance.

Lorelei explained that SDOT staff do not expect that meeting attendees have read the report and highlighted the enormous time pressure to finalize the report by this meeting. She also added that in February, the Committee can certainly spend more time reviewing it in detail. This meeting was meant to serve as a roll-out of the report so that the Committee could see it before Council discussed the report further in December.

Councilmember O'Brien mentioned that one of the deadline drivers was to share this report with the Council by December 1 and SDOT worked to meet the November 29 deadline so that SDOT would have the opportunity to review the report with the Committee. He expressed understanding that the process is moving very fast and there is a lot of information to digest but also noted that the Committee received the report at the same time as Council

### ***Bicycle Master Plan (BMP)***

Lorelei began by discussing the BMP. She first explained that SDOT originally planned to include a project list but felt uncomfortable with publishing a list that would be immediately revised during the Bicycle Master Plan Implementation process currently taking place. The implementation process will put a list into a format similar to the workplan and this list will be included in future Move Seattle Workplans. Lorelei also reminded the Committee that SDOT is focusing on mileage that aligns with the goal of making downtown and citywide connections, as the Committee discussed.

Joe asked what a risk register was. Lorelei responded that projects have a formal risk tracking method that quantifies risks, mitigation tactics, and potential impacts. She also noted that SDOT is working to incorporate risk register information into the spend plan process.

Lorelei continued to explain the assumptions and risks in the BMP program, including that most 2018-2020 projects are currently in design, some projects – like Madison BRT – are funded by other programs, and limited right of leads to trade-offs for communities.

Patrick commented that SDOT highlights the Rainier Valley Greenway as a major success. He noted that he rides it every day and doesn't feel his safety has significantly improved though he recognizes the benefits of new pavement and the newly-installed curb cuts. He asked if all of those improvements were a part of the BMP funds.

Monica answered that because neighborhood greenways include pedestrian and bicycle improvements, costs are often shared between programs. She did not know the exact breakdown for this specific project but explained that this type of project is typically split between multiple funding programs. Elliot added that the paving portion of this project was paved by the microsurfacing program.

Elliot ended the update on BMP by adding that SDOT has accomplished 23 lane-miles since Levy inception.

### ***Arterial Roadway Maintenance (AAC)***

Lorelei explained that SDOT made the choice to add Delridge and Eastlake paving projects to the paving list to align with upgrades along the transit corridors. Lorelei noted that SDOT anticipates completing 162 lane-miles with the current list, just short of the 180 lane-mile commitment. The lane-mile count and list does not include paving work on Madison as it is part of the federal grant application. In the paving program, SDOT has also reserved contingency that, if not needed, can be used to reach the 180 lane-mile original commitment.

### ***Paving Spot Improvements (AMM)***

Lorelei explained that the original 2015 levy commitment was 70 lane-miles. The current plan projects completing 44 to 52 lane-miles. In the 2019 budget, SDOT received an additional \$2.4M that is not accounted for in the workplan as the workplan accounts for money that SDOT currently has. If that type of additional local funding is available each year, there is a good possibility of meeting the original levy commitment.

### ***Multimodal Improvements (Transit-Plus Multimodal)***

Lorelei noted that there are no changes in the workplan to what was discussed at the October LOC meeting but that each corridor has been given a clear schedule. The biggest risk is whether SDOT receives Federal Transit Administration funding for the Madison and Roosevelt projects.

Erin noted a concern with a red checkmark being applied to both the broader subprogram and each corridor and asked in the future that an icon be placed by each corridor to accurately reflect the status of the individual corridors.

Hester asked where detailed information on each project could be found. Lorelei responded that for Madison and Roosevelt, the best place to go are their individual [project websites](#). She also noted that as Fremont, Market, and 23rd are still in the early stages of development, that information is still in development. Maria also added that each corridor will go through a planning and development process with its own unique outreach process. SDOT has heard feedback about being clearer about the tradeoffs and funding which will be considered as these projects move forward.

Lorelei continued with the overview of the Multimodal Improvements by noting that there was also insight in the workplan of the funding details for each corridor. She added that King County Metro is hoping to add RapidRide to Rainier before 2024.

Erin asked how SDOT and Metro are working together, and if Metro would be undoing any of the work SDOT is doing or if their work would be complimentary.

Maria noted that SDOT is now actively engaging in conversations with Metro about how to proceed and anticipates coming back to the Seattle Transit Advisory Board in Q1 2019 to provide an update. She noted that King County is committed to making this investment in Rainier RapidRide.

### ***Review of Move-Seattle green sheets***

Lorelei presented list of green sheets and highlighted key items:

- The proviso for SDOT spending on Ballard Bridge pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements codified what the group had talked about for safety improvements on bridges.
- There is a new Capital Improvement Project for 35th Ave SW paving which does not yet have funding.

Lorelei noted that details on these green sheets are available online. Elliot explained the workplan will be released in April moving forward. This will give SDOT the opportunity to incorporate City budget process updates into the workplan.

### ***Workplan risks***

Lorelei noted that SDOT still has risks in delivery of the levy with the current construction climate and other risks associated with each subprogram. She highlighted that it will be an ongoing process to manage risks and SDOT takes this process very seriously to ensure that work continues to progress.

### ***Spend plans***

Lorelei explained that the workplan includes detailed spend plans that make up every subprogram. Behind these spend plans are detailed spend plans for each project within that subprogram. SDOT will continue to evaluate the risks on each project and recalibrate spend plans as needed.

### ***Ongoing coordination with SPU/SDOT***

Lorelei explained that SPU and SDOT are continuing to coordinate work because when SDOT makes pavement upgrades, it provides an opportunity for SPU to do necessary but not always in SDOT's timeframe. Lorelei noted that she meets regularly with her SPU counterpart to coordinate and identify where there can be cost-sharing opportunities and savings for the two agencies.

### ***Next steps***

Lorelei explained that the updated workplan is the launching point for quarterly updates to the Mayor's Office, Council and Levy Oversight Committee, along with annual updates to the workplan. Elliot noted that the report is highly transparent, and acknowledged the Mayor, Council, and SDOT leadership for their commitment to honesty and transparency.

Hester asked why the Graham Street timelines don't currently match up and what will happen with the money for this project. Lorelei explained that the Mayor would like the project to move forward and SDOT has been evaluating if there are things that would make sense to do in advance of Sound Transit's work, or if SDOT would pay Sound Transit for some of those project elements.

Lorelei emphasized this workplan is one more step forward in transparency. Recognizing that things will change, SDOT will be able to speak to the full picture of this plan. Linea thanked the team who worked on this report and apologized that the report was not shared in advance but also highlighted that SDOT knew it was right for the Committee to get the report as soon as it was available.

## **Paving Program Lessons Learned**

Dan Anderson introduced himself and explained that in Spring 2016, SDOT started launching projects through the paving program that also included new street design layouts, "rechanelization." He explained his presentation is to share with the committee what has public outreach/engagement strategies have worked well and what lessons SDOT has learned.

Dan explained that there are two primary kinds of paving projects – maintenance projects and paving projects with rechanelization. Maintenance projects feel less like a disruption to the community as it is primarily maintaining the road. Outreach for those types of projects typically include helping the community through construction. The other bucket – paving projects with rechanelization – can change the entire character and look-and-feel of a neighborhood. On these projects, there is typically a higher level of community involvement during project planning and design.

Dan noted that staff use the BMP as a guide on how to deliver projects that add bike facilities to streets, including within a paving project. That process is iterative and designed to help the department prioritize projects through the implementation process.

Dan also explained that he works with communities to understand their priorities before determining what the street will look like. Some of the feedback SDOT received was that it was not being transparent with community members on the improvements these projects would make. Dan highlighted an issue that has come up consistently with communities – project naming convention. The projects were referred to as paving projects because that is the program and primary budget line item for the project. However, community members found this misleading when the work would change the layout of the street so SDOT started providing more detailed names of the project.

Dan also explained that they had made some adjustments in the outreach tools offered to the community. The paving projects were conducting drop-in meetings to make in-person interaction as convenient as possible for neighbors. However, the teams heard from certain neighbors that they did not feel heard unless they could share their opinion in front of their neighbors through a Q&A session at public meetings. Dan added that SDOT received excellent direction from the Department of Neighborhoods to show people that they have been seen, heard, and remembered.

Dan also highlighted that parking is often an issue for neighbors when it comes to rechanelization. SDOT is working to be consistent in defining parking space and how it communicates utilization rates and potential changes. He explained that his biggest lesson-learned in all of this was to not share information about parking unless it has been triple-checked so that the project team does not lose credibility.

Patrick emphasized the need to reach renters and people who don't show up to public meetings. He attended a public meeting in Eastlake recently and did not feel it was representative of the neighborhood. He also asked if the outreach being conducted is creating more rationale for cancelling bike projects and highlighted a concern on the Bicycle Advisory Board that the City is giving up on projects in the face of opposition. He added that the Bike Master Plan is a document that has been adopted by City Council and should have weight on future projects moving forward.

Dan explained that he has found online surveys and Facebook ads as some of the best ways to reach people who do not typically attend public meetings. These are cost-effective ways to reach targeted

audiences, and he noted that online feedback is weighed the same as feedback collected at public meetings.

Councilmember O’Brien expressed appreciation for the approach Dan outlined. He emphasized the importance of being honest and transparent with the public. He acknowledged the City makes difficult policy decisions but that they are based on good reasons around safety and climate benefits. He noted that historically, the City has not done outreach well and people are often upset with the outreach process more so than the policy. He expressed hope the City can stick behind these policies and use the tools Dan shared.

Joe commented that there is often a conflict between community feedback and Vision Zero. He shared that he has been to a few community meetings and SDOT presentations and thinks that SDOT can do a better job emphasizing Vision Zero in the decision process, including better education and graphics.

Erin commented that she notices one of the biggest problems is that SDOT or other outreach partners have not done enough to acknowledge the trade-offs that are inherent in these projects both from a fiscal standpoint and from the space there is to make improvements. Lorelei highlighted the 23rd Ave project as an example of being more explicit about the project tradeoffs, which worked well. Erin emphasized that public outreach can never happen too early in a project’s timeline.

**New business**

No new business

**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
Request for bike project list to be clear about which projects will be counted in the levy BMP deliverable commitment of 110 miles vs. which projects may be in other subprograms (i.e. Northgate Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge)	Aug. 23	Rachel	This request will be addressed in the 2019-2024 BMP Implementation Plan, tentatively scheduled for completion in Spring 2019.	Ongoing
Develop guiding principles for the next levy	June 7	LOC	Tracking	TBD; LOC to determine
Keep committee informed on Fauntleroy progress	May 24	SDOT	Rachel to keep the committee updated as the Mayor and Councilmember Herbold continue community process to identify near-term safety improvements	Ongoing
2017 Move Seattle Report	April 24	SDOT	To be published/posted on Levy webpage in December	December 2018

**MEETING ADJOURNMENT: 7:20 PM**