



Jessica Szlag, Co-Chair
Clint Loper, Co-Chair
Izzy Sederbaum, Secretary
Dylan Ahearn
Jeff Aken
Jodi Connolly
Alfonso Lopez
Lara Normand
Merlin Rainwater
Kristi Rennebohm Franz
Ester Sandoval
Michael Wong

Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

Date/Time: 6:00 pm, February 5, 2014
Co-Chairs: Jessica Szlag, Clint Loper
Recorder: Lara Normand
Location: Seattle City Hall, Room L-280

Minutes Distribution List:

See Attachment A

Members Present:

Merlin Rainwater, Michael Wong, Clint Loper, Jeff Aken, Jessica Szlag, Jodi Connolly, Izzy Sederbaum, Ester Sandoval, Lara Normand

Members Absent:

Dylan Ahearn, Alfonso Lopez, Kristi Rennebohm Franz

Guests:

Liz Sheldon (SDOT), Ben Hansen (SDOT), Fred Young, Mike Schwindeller, Tim Backoff, Art Brochet (SDOT), Kyle Rowe (SDOT), Tom Fucoloro

MEETING CALL TO ORDER

6:00 pm.

Jessica announced that Clint Loper is now co-chair of SBAB, and as such will alternate with Jessica in leading the agenda at each monthly meeting. Clint Loper then called the meeting to order.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Introductions were made by all in attendance, including the neighborhood in which they reside.

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment provided

The Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board shall advise the City Council, the Mayor, and all departments and offices of the city on matters related to bicycling, and the impact which actions by the city may have upon bicycling; and shall have the opportunity to contribute to all aspects of the city's planing processes insofar as they relate to bicycling.

- City Council
Resolution 25534

PRESENTATIONS

Time: 6:10

Topic: *Pavement Management*

Presenters: Liz Sheldon and Ben Hansen, SDOT Pavement Management Program

Purpose: To give an overview of the pavement management network and budget, as well as decision-making criteria for prioritization of projects

SDOT's pavement management network consists of just under 4,000 lane miles (1,500 arterial, 2,000 non-arterial lane miles), and is roughly equivalent to just under 50% of SDOT's total assets.

Every 3 years or so SDOT performs an assessment to review and rate the condition of existing streets, using the following ratings to develop a pavement condition index (PCI):
Good/Satisfactory (not in need of maintenance other than minimal or preventative)
Fair/Poor (needing some rehab, like an asphalt overlay)
Very Poor/Serious (needing to be fully replaced from base up)

SDOT is currently finishing up its 2013 arterial assessment, expected to be completed next month – this presentation is based on 2010 data. A little over 50% are in Good/Satisfactory condition, about 9% are in poor condition and 3-4% are considered failing and in need of replacement.

Program surveying non-arterial streets for the first time this year – hoping to have data compiled by June 2014.

Bridging the Gap budget (from 2007-2015) helped stabilize the Arterial Asphalt and Concrete program by providing a budget of \$20m/yr – prior to which a heavy backlog of maintenance was steadily accruing due to budget shortfalls

Additional budget comes from Arterial Major Maintenance fund (\$6.1m), Non-arterial maintenance program (\$1.6m), and arterial crack-repair/preventative maintenance (\$2.2m), for a total annual budget of about \$30m.

Program has had to borrow money from other funds (interfund loan) to improve busiest downtown arterials such as 2nd Ave, 4th Avenue and Stewart.

Overall, haven't been able to get to a funding level that will significantly reduce deferred maintenance levels. Projected shortfall in 2014 with current funding levels is \$800m in deferred maintenance, with PCI falling. \$50m additional would allow PCI to hold steady and deferred maintenance would remain the same. Need \$80m additional per year to reduce deferred maintenance levels and raise PCI.

Strategies:

Continued 3-yr condition assessment of arterials helps show where greatest need falls, and helps SDOT develop cost effective maintenance strategies -- notably preventative maintenance -- which can be performed for a fraction of the cost of reconstruction (i.e. spending \$1 for resurfacing vs. \$5 for replacement of same area).

Project Selection Process:

- Grouping and consolidating projects for cost effectiveness (some areas may not seem high-priority but fall between high priority areas)

- Analysis of use areas with aim to provide maximum benefit to maximum number of people. SDOT's analysis looks at: traffic volume and ADT (avg daily trips), and designated Bike Routes, Freight Routes and Transit Routes,
- Attempt to balance work geographically
- Funding is never enough to do all that they want – but where possible, they look at grants available or cross-over funding from other depts. (work on 23rd is a good example - \$10m in grants acquired)

Repair Process

- Spot work crews – focus mainly on the worst fixes. Street maintenance division has paving crews (67 FTE's) working on pavement and sidewalk construction, curb bulbs, traffic islands, speed humps, restoration in coordination w/utility companies. Fixed 13.6 lane-miles (74 sites) in 2013.
- 24/7 Operations and Emergency Response (25 FTE): focus on spills, snow-storms, de-icing – 3 locations distributed throughout the city
- Daytime maintenance Operations (39 FTE)
- Day-to-day tasks such as potholes, shimming sidewalks, trimming vegetation,
- Chip seal program has been re-instated after 2 years of non-funding (greatest contribution to preventative maintenance)

Questions, Comments, Answers:

- **SBAB:** are these funding levels being discussed in light of Bridging the Gap funding renewal? A: don't know yet – cannot count on this.
- **SBAB:** can you speak more about cost-benefit analysis and how bike facilities fit into that process. A: Program has to make difficult choices and cannot focus on one mode. SDOT looks more at streets with heaviest use, specifically transit, due to structural stress caused by buses and trucks. SDOT almost always prioritizes those streets with multiple modes sharing the ROW, in order to benefit greatest number of users.
- **SBAB:** if a bike rider called in for a pothole repair in a bike lane, what is protocol? A: If daytime pothole repair crew can fix they will – if it's too big, they will call in appropriate spot repair team – may get added to major arterial repair program. Do their best but have to make difficult decisions. Knows of several arterials that need to be repaved and have for years. Budget for paving is an expression of public priorities and public will. Where we stand right now – this is where we have decided to be.
- **SBAB:** Is it true that Bridging the Gap covers fixes for travel lanes but not the shoulders? A: No, not true. Ex: Rainier Ave repave program – repaving of travel lanes only was a result of need to fix potholes where filling potholes was no longer an option after repeated attempts. Another example was Sand Point Way – had to drop area of lanes fixed due to stormwater code (greater than a certain

amount of paving triggers greater cost to mitigate). Conversely, there are streets where most work focused on bike lanes, like E. Marginal Way.

- **SBAB:** Noted that since bikers are more vulnerable to conditions of degraded pavement, bike routes – specifically those shown in BMP should be considered as part of prioritization process.
- **SBAB:** Are priorities set by what can be accomplished using in-house labor? A: SDOT looks at what the need is and the right mechanism will be to address. Have a whole spectrum of projects and crew. Crew work is limited by dollar amount – \$90K per job, and is more effective to use city crew for city jobs. Lose flexibility when you go out to bid using public process for larger capital projects – can't effectively work to address emerging needs.
- **SBAB:** Any prioritization based on disabled or elderly users/differently abled users? A: sometimes this aspect is overlooked. However, since the street is part of the pedestrian realm, esp. at crossings, all renovation work is updated with ADA curb ramps, and also efforts are made at early design to see if there are overlapping needs (ie. Sidewalk safety people, bike group, utilities). Where overlapping funds are available, pavement program tries to package into project.
- **SBAB:** Are bike lanes paved with same or different material as travel lanes based on what wear is expected to be? A: Concrete lasts longer w/out preventative maintenance, even though asphalt has better characteristics for bikes. Comes down to what modes will be using – i.e. buses need concrete because they are so heavy.
- **SBAB:** Regarding Greenways, the new Non-arterial assessments are a positive addition, but the low budget of \$1.6m doesn't sound positive. A: These will be a challenge to prioritize, but saving grace is that about 50% are concrete and will need less maintenance, and won't be subjected to as much stress from heavy vehicles.

Time: 6:50

Topic: *Northgate Pedestrian/Bicyclist Bridge Briefing*

Presenters: Art Brochet, SDOT

Purpose: Briefing on progress of design, funding and outreach; looking for feedback from SBAB on preferences

Scope of project: Sound Transit Light Rail Station to include a re-development of the Northgate Transit Center (by King Co.) and a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge which will cross I-5 at 103rd street. Area served includes surrounding North Seattle residents, North Seattle Community College, mall users. SDOT also wants to develop a cycle track along W. side of 1st, and a multi-use path north of 103 as far as Northgate Way. Also planned is a Greenway on 100th between College Way and Fremont Ave N.

Project Status/Schedule

- In Preliminary Design and Environmental Assessment Phase
- Currently working developing a preferred alignment and bridge type.
- Need room for trucks to pass under, and I-5 is 20-feet above surrounding grade, so getting ADA accessibility is going to be very challenging; Ramping vs. elevator

might mean a run of 1000-1500 feet or possibly more (vs a city block at 400 feet long)

- Will be challenging to try to connect to Light Rail station, due to elevation of guideways, and connection to mezzanine restrictions
- Design firms such as Alta Planning, KPFF and LMN architects are looking at route alternatives
- Looking at design requirements and criteria (some set by WSDOT, such as height, lighting, etc)
- Community Engagement process – will be holding open houses in Spring and presenting draft alignments
- Refinement of list of proposals for type and alignment in Fall
- Recommendation for preferred type and alignment set for end of this year

Project Funding

SDOT and Sound Transit have each committed to providing \$5m, if the project is fully funded by 2015. If funding goals cannot be met, then Sound Transit would use money for other bicycle and pedestrian improvements in vicinity.

SBAB asked to comment on several questions, including:

How important is it to have the bridge connect to the Light Rail station?

Who are neighborhood stakeholders who should be involved?

What additional bike facilities will be needed/are desired to be incorporated?

What lessons can we learn from other cities, or good precedents we can look to?

What features would make this attractive for intensive use?

Where/how should the bridge connect to the ground on East and West side?

Questions, Comments, Answers:

- **SBAB:** Where is funding coming from? A: Testing the waters, trying to figure out if project is a priority, given expense. SDOT Planning level estimates are \$25m or so. Sound Transit estimate is \$18m, but may not include all elements.
- **SBAB:** How much space would the ramp take up? A: Looking to save both length and real estate. Should there be an elevator at one or both ends? Elevators expensive to operate and build, but ramp would take up a lot of land and the longer it is the more expensive it is. Need to weigh options and think about who it is being designed for.
- SBAB noted that this discussion has not changed much from what was presented two years ago. Progress toward bike/ped bridge came from bike proponents lobbying for connectivity as part of light rail station planning. Comments should be weighed with fact that there has already been extensive outreach and feedback.
- **SBAB:** What is timeframe between when bridge is built and light rail station is projected to go online? A: Goal is for bridge to be in place before light rail station is up and running. Light rail station design is at 90% so probably not going to change much.

- **SBAB:** Is there an interim plan for connection between construction of two projects? A: Alignments would provide both a touchdown and a link to the bridge. Station designers are happy to make the connection but not everyone wanting to use the bridge will be headed for the light rail. Station is not going to be operated 24/7. Need to have multiple flows of traffic without all going through light rail station. Still not clear that a direct connection will be feasible, but there are multiple options where bridge could touch down.
- SBAB noted that it is important for bridge to cross over all lanes of traffic, including 1st Ave.
- One SBAB member questioned emphasis on north end projects, in the interest of equity for the city. Another asked how we could interface and provide feedback for Sound Transit earlier in the design process, as with other light rail stations recently reviewed.

Time: 7:25

Topic: SDOT 2014 Bike Map update

Presenters: Kyle Rowe, SDOT

Purpose: Briefing on progress map design updates; looking for feedback from SBAB on preferences and suggestions for future changes

Scope of project for 2014 is minor updates only – updates on fast track to be printed for 2014 Bike Expo. Includes changes to the physical network map on front, making sure all major facilities shown, and updating colors due to comments on last (2013) version.

[Reviewed 2013 legend color and symbols in presentation] Noted that there were no neighborhood Greenways or protected bike lanes shown. Also, it is hard to see difference between bike facility and arterial street symbols

Proposed Changes in response to previous comments:

- Multi-use Trails have a new dark blue (high contrast) color; aim is to help the “backbone” of the bicycle network read clearer and pop out.
- All on-street facilities are in same color family (light blue); cycle tracks differentiated with a black border
- Arterial/non-arterial in yellow so don’t read as strong on page
- Greenways are very dark green
- Dotted lines for signed bike routes (symbol kept only on non-arterial/arterial routes that are not designated bicycle facilities)
- Chevrons for uphill/downhill the same

Back side of map:

- “Big Picture” graphic too busy – simplified and cleaned up
- Includes legend for map
- List of Bike Shops removed – didn’t have locations on maps and feedback was that these weren’t used much or people now look on phones

Questions, Comments, Answers:

- **SBAB:** Are we assuming that all users have smart phones now? A: Map has symbols for Bike Shops, which is more helpful because they are location specific; also, maybe we can use space to highlight BMP programs or explain Greenways
- **SBAB:** Used 2012 map to get to unfamiliar locations and found it very confusing. Asked why are arterials/non-arterials on map at all? They are commonly used but not great bike facilities – don't show access to or within city parks. Another SBAB member noted that many people do not know most efficient way to get to public waterfront locations, and should be incorporated in future map changes
- **SBAB:** Noted that protected bike lane (light blue w/black border) looks too close to other facilities and that because it is part of backbone it should read as strong as Multi-use trail symbol. What is shown as yellow vs. light blue on the ground is actually painted pavement vs. non-painted routes. Not that much difference on the ground between the two – painted lines do not make it a much safer route.
- **SBAB:** Noted that Portland uses red for arterials– high stress level – shows where high traffic or gap in facilities are. One member suggested that we clarify somehow that arterials be used with caution. A: All light rail currently shown as red. Consideration for minor updates is that yellow recedes and calms down – red pops off map (not desirable).

SDOT Arterial/non-arterial graphic representation has been a subject of questions/debate internally as well. Trying to show that there is some preferred route over other streets. Kyle asked that SBAB members email him on route clarification, especially on arterial/non-arterial. Kyle.Rowe@seattle.gov

Next Steps

- 2015 version updates will be started as soon as Expo is over.
- BMP will be used, rethink how people use a map.
- Working w/GIS class at UW, will do some tests of sample groups, will be looking at how Google map use compares.
- Will look at how all ages and abilities routes are highlighted and differentiated with symbology.
- Online map is currently accessible, but will think about future accessibility (mobile apps)

A member of the public commented that he is new to the city and has used the bike map many times to get oriented and find the best route – was very appreciative of the guidance provided by the map, coming from a place that has nothing like this.

SDOT: preference for large versus small map size? **SBAB:** Depends on how many you can print – the more the better. Washington Bikes is main distributor, but can be used for any bike promotion event. One SBAB member suggested looking at City of Vancouver's pocket-sized map in addition to larger-print, more easy-to-read map.

Additional agenda item/facility update by Kyle Rowe:

Installation of bicycle facilities coming soon to Wallingford:

- Addition of Sharrows along Latona between 45th and 50th.
- Bike box at intersection with 50th
- Right-hand turns not allowed for vehicles

Time: 7:50

SBAB UPDATES AND NEXT STEPS

Jodi had concerns about safety of design for new S. Atlantic St. overpass, and submitted a comment. She made contact w/WSDOT to get an update on project, and included Jessica and Clint in email correspondence. In general, is wondering how SBAB can be involved earlier in big projects that affect bike and ped safety – even if they are beyond our city advisory scope. Who at WSDOT should we be in contact with – and how WSDOT and SDOT are communicating on such overlapping issues. SDOT: Emily will look into contact information.

Tom Fucoloro (Seattle Bike Blog) has sent an email to Genevieve Stokes, who is lead on communications for WDOT waterfront projects – he informed her that city has a board and that they can review projects with SBAB before design goes too far.

Lara reported on Waterfront project meeting – will forward her notes to SBAB for information.

Clint noted that during the SBAB retreat it was generally agreed that an extra half hour at end of meetings was needed to go over new business and asked if everyone was on board with that. There were no objections.

MEETING ADJOURNMENT

ATTACHMENT A

Meeting Minutes Distribution List:

Edward Murray, Mayor, City of Seattle

Andrew Glass Hastings, Transportation Advisor, Office of the Mayor

City Councilmember Tom Rasmussen, Transportation Committee Chair

Goran Sparrman, Interim Director, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)

Dongho Chang, City Traffic Engineer, SDOT

Emily Ehlers, SBAB Liaison, SDOT

Kevin O'Neill, Planning and Urban Design Manager, SDOT

Sam Woods, Manager, Bicycle and Pedestrian Programs, SDOT

Sara Zora, Transportation Analyst

Diane Sugimura, Director, Department of Planning and Development (DPD)

Bernie Agor Matsuno, Director, Department of Neighborhoods (DoN)

Allie Gerlach, SDOT Communications

Meeting Presenters

City of Seattle Council Transportation Committee Members

City of Seattle Neighborhood District Coordinators

SBAB Members

Individual Meeting Attendees