

Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting

[Levy Oversight Committee bylaws – adopted April 2017](#)

[Move Seattle Levy legislation, approved June 29, 2015](#)

Date/Time: Tuesday, April 9, 2024 / 5:00 – 7:00 PM

Co-chairs: Geri Poor, Kevin Werner

Location: Video Conference, in-person at Seattle City Hall - Room L280

Members Present:, Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Alexander Bejaran Estevez, Tyler Blackwell, Lisa Bogardus, Clara Cantor, Samuel Ferrara, Dennis Gathard, Inga Manskopf, Jessica Nguyen, Kevin Werner, Donna McBain Evans (Bicycle Advisory Board), Delaney Lind (Pedestrian Advisory Board), Geri Poor (Freight Advisory Board), Ashwin Bhumbra (Transit Advisory Board), Councilmember Rob Saka (City Council), Saroja Reddy (City Budget Office)

Members Absent: None

Guests: Francisca Stefan, Bill LaBorde, Meghan Shephard, Kris Castleman, Serena Lehman, Dan Anderson, Kalen Carney, Margo Iniguez Dawes, Katie Olsen (all SDOT), Heather Marx (Councilmember Saka's office)

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:01PM

Welcome and roll call

Geri P: Conducted roll call for committee members.

Public Comment

Geri P: Asked if anyone wanted to give public comment.

No public comment. The LOC received one written comment letter provided via email shortly before this meeting.

Agenda item #1: Meghan Shepard presented an overview of the [Transportation Levy Proposal](#).

Inga M: Why is an outcome for Vision Zero ("VZ") not "reduce deaths and serious injuries" to zero by 2030?

Francisca S: VZ is an important program and this proposal increases funding for measures as part of a safe systems approach. David spoke about this in the last LOC meeting. The proposal will scale up on known measures (e.g. no turn on red) that have evidence to reduce deaths and serious injuries. This is in addition to work on safety corridor projects. Good point.

Clara C: To clarify on Safe Routes to School (“SRTS”), "similar levels of funding to the current levy" means not inflation-adjusted since 2015? Will that get us fewer school projects?

Meghan S: We don't anticipate a reduction in investments in SRTS projects. This program receives funding from other sources such as school zone and red-light camera ticket revenues.

Jessica N.: Are there any process outcomes for the levy? (for example, mode shift, community engagement, safety, etc.) All of the outcomes shown are focused on completion of projects.

Meghan: The Seattle Transportation Plan (“STP”) sets out the vision for the future of our transportation systems aligned with our goals. The Levy proposal puts forth and funds projects that will help us achieve the goals of the STP.

Dennis G: I don't see any mention of foundation issues of the Ship Canal bridges, and don't see specifics about which 5 selected bridges.

Meghan S: The bridge section is coming up next.

Lisa B: Looking at the “outcomes” of Major Street Maintenance, if we are paving 38% of the busiest streets in poor condition, does that mean there is still a large percentage not being addressed?

Meghan S: Yes, we are looking at the intersection of busiest streets and poor condition, and the proposal would repave 38% of those streets.

Dennis G: Is repair of bridge foundations part of this Levy? What if a bridge goes down? How does the city address that?

Francisca S: The investments in bridges that are part of this proposal are based on recommendations that came from the bridge audit. The preventative maintenance program proposed would help address the needs of our bridges.

Dennis G: How is the city handling big projects that don't fit within the Levy?

Meghan S: A bond levy is often used for specific projects, grants and federal funding could also come into play.

Francisca: The proposal aims to address the highest priority work that is needed.

Alex B.: What is the city doing to ensure the workplan for 5 bridges and structures that are being prepared for future replacement doesn't change?

Meghan S. These are excellent questions. It may be helpful to bring the bridge experts in to learn how the proposal fits with the recommendations of the bridge strategic asset management plan.

Alex B: When SDOT and the Mayor's office were constructed this levy, were there considerations given to other funding sources? This appears all property tax based.

Meghan S: We looked at all tools currently available. For example, we also considered sales tax, but property tax is a more progressive revenue source. Our focus is on the tools that we have available to us at the time.

Donna E: Question about bicycle program. Is all of the money for connecting schools to greenways, rather than connecting existing gaps in the protected bicycle lane network?

Megha S: The proposal would expand the overall bicycle network and fill in connections gaps and.

Clara C: You cite 5 new neighborhood greenways; do you have a sense of where or how long those projects might be? (In chat: For comparison the MS levy proposed 50 mi of new PBLs and 60 mi of NGW. I understand moving away from those hard metrics, but it makes "5 new projects" seem pretty lame.)

Meghan S: We do not have those details yet, but now is a great time to provide feedback and weigh-in.

Kevin W: I struggle to connect outcomes in Climate & Resiliency to transportation. Why just 3 low pollution neighborhoods, why not the whole city?

Donna M. (In chat): The \$49 million is for climate projects "in addition" to mode shift. Seems like there should be some specific goals in how we accomplish this mode shift.

Francisca S: We didn't want to leave electrification out. We are interested in leveraging funds where possible to scale up these investments. We needed a big strategy to try and touch a lot of things.

Ashwin B: Mode shift would do more for climate goals than a \$49M investment in pursuing electrification.

Clara C: Vehicle transportation is 2/3 of our carbon emissions. Seems like the percentage of spending should reflect the desire for modeshift. How do we expect to double transit ridership if our investments in making transit efficient and reliable is to improve 2 corridors and add 2 new routes over 8 years?

Meghan S: There is new service coming on-line soon and these projects will open up access to the new light rail stations increasing transit ridership.

Ashwin B: Frequency and reliability of the transit system is key. It's concerning that there are only 2 large transit projects in this next Levy. How did we get to \$1.35B? With the Seattle Transit Measure ("STM") set to expire soon, are we considering a renewal of that?

Ashwin B. (In chat): dumb question perhaps someone can answer in the chat, no need to stop the presentation for this - the levy as it currently exists is very likely to pass and a large part of what goes into crafting the levy is to be as sure as possible that it will pass.

If the levy were to unexpectedly not pass in November, what would be the next steps? Would the city (if we assume that the city will still try to pass a version of the levy) likely propose a revised levy to be voted on the following year? Not sure what the procedure here is. I guess I'm wondering that if the levy proposal fails, what's the soonest an alternative could be put in place?

Meghan S: STM will be a decision that gets made as we get closer to expiration. We have a lot of data to help us inform what routes get investments. We specifically called out two major routes, one that could become a RapidRide route. We surveyed \$1.3B and \$1.7B, while we did see support for both, we saw the necessary support levels to pass at the \$1.3B amount.

Donna M.: Comment on People Streets and Public Spaces. When I think of neighborhood spaces I would like to see more fundamentals changes to the streets, consider closing streets to cars, create a walking boulevard, we could do a lot more.

Sam F: Repaving and bridge maintenance is a lot about keeping things in operation. Something other than a property tax levy is something the city should think about. Seeing the condition of the roads we just need more money for them.

Clara C: I like to see that we are talking about lighting and expanding neighborhood street fund. Looks like we are cutting pedestrian and transit compared to the prior Levy.

Geri P: Congratulations on getting to this point and having something to share. The Levy is important and there is a great for the Levy, we should do more to find all the funding sources.

Councilmember Saka: Two questions. First, I'd like to better understand sidewalks. I am seeing that 345 blocks of sidewalks were built since 2006, and in this Levy 250 blocks of new sidewalks will be built. Does the 345 include sidewalks and sidewalk alternatives?

Meghan S: Yes, the 345 includes both traditional and sidewalk alternatives.

Councilmember Saka: Second question: Potholes, specifically the proposal to repair them within 72 hours of them being reported. How does that vary from what it is today?

Meghan S: The amounts set forth will allow us to fill more potholes and contribute to our ability to respond within 72 hours.

The next step is that Mayor will take the feedback received during the public comment period and put together a transmission to City Council.

Agenda item #2: Committee business

Kevin W./Geri P.: Proposed shifting May meeting back one week to May 14.

No comments or objections from the committee.

Bike Board; Donna M.: Received reports on Vision Zero and the Aurora Ave project. The Aurora Ave project is very early in design, there is a long way to go. Looking at sidewalk improvements, landscaping, bike lanes, and dedicated bus lanes.

Ped Board; Delaney L.: Received reports on Vision Zero and the Aurora Ave project. Plan to also review Route 40.

Freight Board; Geri P: Received reports on Vision Zero and the Aurora Ave project Vizion Zero and Aurora. The board is looking for new volunteers.

Transit Board; Ashwin B: Received updates on Vision Zero and the Aurora Ave project. King County Metro service change updates reviewed in the next month.

Meeting Minutes: March 2024 minutes – *Approved.*

Adjourn: 6:57PM

Action items

Action items below capture tasks from previous meetings. Completed items will remain on action item tracker for one additional set of meeting minutes to capture “complete” status and will then be removed.

Action item	Meeting	Lead	Status	Deadline
Invite Bridge subject matter expert to future meeting to discuss Levy proposal and bridges	April	SDOT	Working	Summer 2024
Bridging the Gap (BTG) sidewalk investment breakdown – traditional vs alternative sidewalks	April	SDOT	Completed; Bridging the Gap Levy funded just traditional sidewalks.	

What's the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) range we are trying to achieve?	March	SDOT	Working	TBD
---	-------	------	---------	-----