

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, November 1, 2022 / 5:00 – 7:00 PM

Co-chairs: Inga Manskopf, Samuel Ferrara

Location: Video Conference, in-person at City Hall

Members present: Inga Manskopf, Sam Ferrara, Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Dennis Gathard, Joe Laubach, Jessica Nguyen, Kevin Werner, Geraldine Poor, Lisa Bogardus, Saroja Reddy (City Budget Office), Alex Pedersen (City Council)

Members Absent: Stephen Sawyer, Maria Sumner

Guests: Ryan Packer (The Urbanist), Joy Okazaki (Kubota Garden), Don Thornton, Ellen, Jayme Powers, Laura Baumgartner, Hannah Thoreson (City Council Staff), Katie Olsen, Serena Lehman, Francisca Stefan, Kalen Carney, Monica Dewald, Simon Blenski, Christiana Farrell, Margo Iñiguez-Dawes (all SDOT)

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:00PM

Welcome and roll call

Sam F.: Conducted a roll call for committee members and an overview of the agenda.

Margo Iñiguez-Dawes: As new SDOT Levy Equity Coordinator, introduced self to the LOC.

Public Comment:

Sam F: Asked if anyone wanted to give public comment.

Ellen – Resident of Rainier Beach. Spoke on behalf of project 16 (55th Ave S Sidewalk). Lives one mile from Kubota Garden, has noticed an increase in visitors to the garden over the years. Over 90% of visitors drive. Parking lot for Kubota Gardens does not fit everyone and cars spill over into neighborhoods. 55th Ave has drainage ditch and no sidewalks, people walk down center of road to avoid and is dangerous. Strongly support sidewalk on 55th Ave S, encourage additional safety measures on crosswalk.

Joy Okazaki – President of Kubota Garden: Shared presentation and images of current status of project 16 (55th Ave S Sidewalk). Kubota Garden is located in a residential neighborhood. Shared pictures of narrow street on steep hill with limited visibility. Crossing onto Renton Ave is dangerous. Consider funding the project.

Don Thornton: Spoke on behalf of N 128th paving project, Haller Lake loop. Many families utilize area and visit park. Lots of traffic cutting through the loop area. No sidewalk, no good walking path; Haller Lake community club supports this project.

Agenda item #1: Neighborhood Street Fund 2022-2024 Cycle Discussion and Voting

Simon Blenski presented – [NSF 2022-24 Cycle Project Selection](#)

Kevin W.: Why the LOC does this in the first place? Ordinance doesn't mention LOC overseeing this process.

Monica D.: Process came about to be more equitable. Went through a communication outreach process and was agreed upon that the LOC would select the projects for the last two cycles.

Sam F.: All projects mentioned in public comments are currently ranked above the line. Project 7 currently ranked 12th, and is along the Rapid Ride J (RRJ) route; maybe there is an opportunity to incorporate it into the RRJ project? Projects 5 & 6 are potentially Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) projects; can that program look into them? Current selections all have Community Votes listed as high and medium, and current voting agrees with initial SDOT rankings. Really like the poll; we didn't have this last time.

Kevin W.: Overall process looks reasonable; relied heavily on information received from SDOT. Given history of NSF are we recommending these projects to SDOT or does the LOC have the authority to decide?

Sam F.: Essentially this is a recommendation that SDOT will follow; not set in stone if something changes.

Joe L.: Pretty sure LOC is the final decisionmaker; what we decide will go to design and construction.

Sam F.: Any comments about what is not selected?

Rachel B.: The LOC has been involved in this and emphasized the equity need. Despite not being in the legislation, I feel good about role LOC has taken. Both SDOT and community are comfortable with the fact that the LOC is non-partisan and looking at it from a whole city perspective and equity standpoint. Makes sense for the LOC to continue to be involve in NSF project selection.

Kevin W.: Thanks Rachel, appreciate the history. A concern is that if someone challenges a decision about this process and makes a case that the LOC doesn't have authority. SDOT asked for our opinion, and we gave it to them.

Sam F.: In the event of an issue with the selection, SDOT would have to answer to those groups, not the LOC.

Inga M.: About process: I visited most of the sites. I changed my mind by seeing some projects in person. I support going back to the way it was before and visiting sites in groups. It was hard to go to all of the sites. It will help promote more discussion among small groups and we can be more active in the future selection process.

Sam F.: Agree with Inga's comment.

Joe L.: Is there anyone who ranked a project high, but didn't make it into the ones up for selection? If people liked a project and it is coming up low in the ranking, I think we should still discuss.

Inga M.: All my top 10 are on the list except for one.

Sam F.: Familiar with Roosevelt Way project, seems like it could be part of RRJ, and not take NSF money for it. RRJ could look at it as part of their body of work. Also, SRTS ones feel like an opportunity to fund elsewhere.

Inga M.: Process question: results indicated 9 people completed the survey, but out of how many possible? Are Councilmember Pedersen (Council) and Saroja (CBO) included?

Katie O.: Yes, there are 13 active members right now, and CM Pedersen and Saroja included in that count.

Saroja R.: I did not vote, due to working for CBO. Looking at projects, I agree with the current rankings.

Lisa B.: I did participate, and I'm wondering about Roosevelt Way. I didn't put it in high category. I didn't visit sites, just relied on descriptions. Can anyone give more detail?

Simon B.: Regarding project at NE 41st and Roosevelt. There is a proposal to add a new pedestrian signal across Roosevelt and Eastlake. Planned RRJ stations nearby. Pedestrian signal at crossing is not in J line scope. Project would add new pedestrian signal. Safety ratings are based on historical collision data.

Sam F.: I see a safety need; there is a lot of traffic in the area. Close to other RRJ project; it seems like a synergy to add scope to it, and that could be more cost effective.

Joe L.: I like Project #14, but it is just below the current threshold. I did not visit the site in person. I like it because it is part of a trail. The trail crossing is used by lots of cyclist/pedestrians; looks like trail crossing is poorly designed right now, with no protection. I ranked this project in top 5. Inga - you visited the site, any thoughts?

Inga M.: That was up higher on my list but didn't want to take any others off my list. I went out during the middle of week, saw all sorts of people using the trail. Lots of families using the trail. Wouldn't want to displace other projects.

Sam F.: Project 13 is also a trail enhancement, higher equity but lower safety rating. Inga any insights? Similar in price would it make sense to move.

Inga M.: Happy with how things are right now.

Simon B.: Addressing question in chat from Margo Iñiguez Dawes "*What happens to projects that aren't selected? Are they ever eligible for funding again?*" We reports back to SDOT on what was and wasn't selected. Projects may get reconsidered through other programs in the future, they may have a second or third life if not selected now.

Sam F.: Any other comments?

Dennis G.: Could not figure out how costs were developed. \$600k looks like just stripping. In general more detail on cost estimates and safety needs would be helpful.

Sam F.: Historically how true were the cost estimates to the actual costs?

Simon B.: A lot of estimates were very high level. Fair amount of contingency added. For the prior round, in general cost are coming in accurate to estimates.

Joe L.: Let's approve the projects selected and change ones below the line to be alternates.

Sam F.: That's a great idea.

Councilmember Pedersen: Appreciate the discussion. In terms of money and projects that don't make cut off. I did submit a budget amendment to cover the projects not funded. Expecting an updated revenue forecast from the City but not expecting it to be positive. If CBA is partially funded could cover one project below the line. Can we agree that as funding becomes available we can go in order of the list?

Sam F.: Seems reasonable to me.

Inga M.: For things like Roosevelt can that be rolled into other projects, maybe from underspend?

Councilmember Pedersen: Good point about wrapping into other projects; some of the ones making the cut could also be funded in other programs. There's also a sidewalk fund, and other funds, there are funding line items throughout the budget that any of these could go to.

Sam F.: Hopefully the CBA can fund additional projects.

Inga M.: This shows how people are very interested in their communities. To put NSF applications together takes time and effort. People in the neighborhoods care about these projects. Supports this type of program.

Sam F.: Are we ready for a vote? I move to approve the top 9 from initial rankings. Any second?

Geri P.: Second.

Sam F.: All in favor? Yes. Any opposed? No. Any abstained? No. Poll was a good way to work through list; very helpful.

Agenda item #2: Committee business

Sam F.: Typically hold officer elections in December meeting. Co-chair is expiring, Kevin has expressed interest. Vice chair may become open position, Secretary is open position currently not filled. Co-chair helps set agenda, lead meetings, some additional work outside of meetings; it's a good way to get involved. 1-2 coordination calls per month, not a terrible amount of extra work.

Subcommittee and modal board reports –

- **Freight Advisory Board** (Geri P.) – Hoping to meet new SDOT director. Had large turnover in members. At next meeting, will hold elections for board.
- **Pedestrian Advisory Board** – No member present for update.
- **Transit Advisory Board** – No member present for update.
- **Bicycle Advisory Board** – No member present for update.

Meeting minutes for approval

Sam F.: Approval of minutes from October meeting

Geri P.: At the top of page 3, I want to edit to reflect what I said, which is that I'd like to encourage unique design solutions in manufacturing and industrial areas.

Sam F.: Minutes not approved; will revisit next month to approve with November minutes.

Adjourn: 6:10 PM