

## 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, May 14, 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, Tyler Blackwell, Alex Bejaran Estevez, Clara Cantor, Samuel Ferrara, Inga Manskopf, Jessica Nguyen, Kevin Werner, Delaney Lind (Pedestrian Advisory Board), Geri Poor (Freight Advisory Board), Ashwin Bhumbra (Transit Advisory Board)

**Members Absent:** Lisa Bogardus, Dennis Gathard, Councilmember Rob Saka, City Budget Office Delegate Saroja Reddy

**Guests:** Francisca Stefan, Bill LaBorde, Meghan Shephard, Kris Castleman, Serena Lehman, Dan Anderson, Kalen Carney, Eleen Trang, Katie Olsen (all SDOT)

**MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:06PM**

### Welcome and roll call

Kevin W: Conducted roll call for committee members.

### Public Comment

Kevin W: Asked if anyone wanted to give public comment.

Katie O: An email was sent in for written comment.

### Agenda Item #1: Q&A with Office of Ethics and Elections; Wayne Barnett

Wayne Barnett presented to the LOC about ethics and elections guidelines as the levy proposal is deliberated upon, and if and when it becomes a ballot measure. Guidelines are as follows: In general, board members cannot use City resources to promote or oppose a ballot measure. Board members have similar guidelines to City employees during this time *when they are acting in their capacity as a board member*. However, they are *not subject to these guidelines if they are working and communicating on their own time*, not on behalf of the City or in your role as a board member. Guidelines include:

- *Before Council has voted on the proposal*, boards are allowed to send a letter to Council regarding the levy proposal, including comments, support/opposition, and request to approve/oppose the proposal for the ballot.
- Boards are not allowed to address comments to the public, so you cannot recommend that the public votes for or against the ballot measure as a board member.
- If someone asks you a question about the levy in your role as a board member, you should focus on the facts, rather than opinions or adjectives. The facts of the levy [are summarized in this document](#), and [the full proposal can be found here](#). An example of using adjectives would be something like, “This levy would meet critical needs and make important projects happen”.
- Members are allowed to speak on the levy proposal in their personal capacity, like as a neighbor or resident. In order to make it clear that you are not speaking as a board member, you should not identify yourself as a board member or be sure to make it clear you are not speaking in your official capacity.

Rachel B.: Can you say more about the difference between sharing information versus promoting?

Katie O.: A good resource to use to differentiate between facts and promotion is the Levy proposal document. The information in that document is factual in nature only.

Rachel B.: If we joined a committee that promoted the Levy we would be doing it as individuals?

Wayne: Yes.

**Agenda Item #2: LOC Leadership Team Debrief on Council Presentation; Geri, Kevin, Lisa, Rachel**

Kevin W.: We had the opportunity to address Council. We summarized the LOC’s letter and used a similar presentation to what we used when we presented to the Transportation Committee. We covered 8 broad recommendations. We received questions from council members about the LOC recommendations. The presentation seemed well received. In the same meeting, Council heard from SDOT and the Mayors office.

Geri P.: Many councilmembers expressed appreciation of the service made by LOC members.

Alex B.: Good job Kevin and Geri. I am following up on Councilmember Woo’s question about if this is a version of the Levy that we would recommend. What is the proper avenue to address this?

Kevin W.: We could have some discussion about areas we could call out that are meeting our recommendations in the letter.

Geri P.: We haven’t done that work to compare. That wasn’t the specific job.

Inga M: Did they ask any questions about other funding sources? Was there any discussion about that?

Kevin W: It wasn't a focus to discuss other funding sources.

Rachel B.: The Levy can only do so much.

Meghan S.: The levy proposal also includes a transportation funding task force to look into funding options for our needs such as sidewalks and bridges. We will share more later in the evening during the presentation.

### **Agenda Item #3: 2023 Annual Report**

Serena L.: [Presented the 2023 Annual Report presentation](#). Kalen C. presented the financial summary and related data.

Rachel B.: Can you go back to slide 10 and talk about Safe Routes to School? Was there a new safe route at each school?

Serena L.: The intent is to make an improvement at each school, it can mean a lot of things but is not always a "route," so it could be a crosswalk improvement. We are on track to complete a project at each school.

Inga M.: Regarding spending, was the other funding source planned to exceed levy funding? Do we need levy funding if we have all this other funding?

Kalen C.: Yes, all programs generally have local or other funding. A good example is grant funding. We want to leverage local funds and take advantage of as much grant funding as possible. If that was the case, you may see only a small portion of spending with levy funds, and the other portion is other funds. Other funding sources are contributing to spending these projects.

Inga M.: Is SDOT really good at getting other funding?

Kalen C.: We have been successful at getting grants.

Inga M.: What do you attribute that to?

Kalen C.: We have a very diligent team that tracks, seeks, and secures funding.

Serena L.: I will point to Francisca to speak to the grant scene. We have had some time to get projects going in design which makes us able to go out for grants.

Francisca S.: Beauty of levy funds is that you can get projects started down the path of design, which allows you to have a stronger more competitive grant application. I.e. Madison has substantial and large spend.

Inga: What do you anticipate for 2024, spending down?

Serena: We have many projects go into construction this year and spending will tick up, and will roll over into 2025 into contractor delivered projects.

Inga M. Like in years past, you expect some projects to go into 2025, and therefore spending.

Francisca S.: One of the things we committed to was that anything contractor delivered was under contract this year. That signals a commitment to do that spend and SOW. We recognize concern that lack of spending indicates lack of commitment to the project. We will see a ramp up in 2024 and into 2025, it will fall off very quickly. RRJ, E Marginal and Rt 40 will be the ones continuing beyond. Other areas are like a spigot, which will turn off and cease spending entirely.

Inga M.: As of May 14, 2024, are you on track for spending?

Serena L.: Our Q1 report will show spending.

Francisca S.: We had major breakthroughs that are allowing us to deliver. We have been working on getting spend plans more accurate over time. There is optimism about being able to spend. We have moved into next steps in many projects. You'll see some delay in summary numbers, but you'll also see project progress and spend overall.

Geri P.: Even though this is 2023, where are we looking forward in 2024. We will be interested in seeing more.

#### **Agenda item #4: Transportation Levy Proposal**

Meghan Shepard presented an overview of the [Transportation Levy Proposal](#). The focus of today is what changed between our submittal to the Mayor's Office and what was presented to council. Mayor's transportation proposal is a \$1.45B proposal.

Clara C.: Will there be further specificity drafted before this levy goes to voters, or are these initial lists what we'll have going to the ballot?

Meghan S.: At this point the city council may make changes; they may add specificity, change funding amount, or move programs around. Specificity would be added through council process.

Inga M.: Question regarding funding: what is the impact of general fund on transportation funding? I also have questions on the proposed task force. Also, how will the ongoing hiring freeze impact ability to deliver?

Meghan S.: Ordinance does include a general fund floor. The proposal is what we can deliver with the Levy funds, and if we procure additional grant funds we can do more work. For the most part the levy commitments are tied to the levy dollars. Over the last nine years we have built up our delivery capabilities, and we feel well poised to deliver on the proposed levy.

Francisca S.: We look to prioritize position for exemption request, depends on the position. We are keeping an eye on it for delivery of the levy.

Inga M.: Specific outcomes of Task Force?

Meghan S.: Intention of the Transportation Funding Task Force, sidewalk repair there are policy changes that could be looked into. Near term recommendations to help inform answering some of those questions.

Geri P.: Could you speak to the highest and second highest equity areas?

Rachel B.: I see the Task Force would explore additional funding measures. What is the product of the task force?

Meghan S.: Yes, that will be a very likely outcome. The TTF is proposed to be comprised of stakeholders throughout the city bringing their perspective, including communities dependent on a bridge, and communities with lack of sidewalks.

Kevin W.: Having some focus on the proposed text of the ordinance would be helpful.

Serena L.: Want to set expectations that there will be another ramp up; it won't be consistent spending all 8 years.

Clara C: Is there the possibility of those members representing equity-focused groups or areas to have stipends for participation in the LOC?

Meghan S.: There is work underway at the city to look into the feasibility of something like that.

#### **Agenda item #5: Committee business**

Kevin W.: Skipping modal board reports.

No comments or objections from the committee.

April 2024 minutes approved.

Adjourn: 6:58PM

**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	Completed; Bridge SMEs were present at May meeting to answer questions on bridge aspects of proposal as needed.	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