

Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

Date/Time: Thursday, August 2, 2018 / 5:30 – 8:30 PM

Co-chairs: Betty Spieth-Croll, Alex Krieg

Location: City Hall, Room L280

Members Present: Brian Estes, Alex Krieg, Dustin Lambro, David Seater, Emily Paine, Betty Spieth-Croll, Nick Paranjpye, Councilmember Mike O'Brien, Ron Posthuma

Members Absent: Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Pat Cohn, Joe Laubach, Ben Noble, Blake Trask,

Guests: Elliot Helmbrecht, Mafara Hobson, Darby Watson, Brian Sperry, Jeff Lundstrom, Lorelei Williams, Maria Koentenger, Rodney Maxie, (all SDOT), Lauren Craig (King County Metro)

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:30 PM

Public Comment (2 min. per person)

Phil Reichel: I'm a 5th generation Seattleite and I've lived in Wallingford since 1972 when I was a young man. You are involved in the Move Seattle project and it involves me because I live on N 40th. What you are going to do through the Greenlake Paving Project is remove all access to my home. I'm not being flippant about that. I don't have a driveway, and you will remove the single parking spot in front of my house, and I will not be able to get street use permits to do deliveries, for moving trucks, for deliveries, because there's an arterial there that has 12,000 people. I plan to live in this house when I retire, and it may not be possible and I'm very disappointed. But, my personal problems and that issue is something I will take up with SDOT. What I'm here to talk to you about today is how SDOT through your funding is talking to citizens. They started the paving project and called it the Greenlake Paving Project last spring. You're probably well aware of that. They asked for comments, they sent out flyers to residents, they sent out mailings, and they did door-to-door with residents. I want to point out to you that Wallingford is like most neighborhoods in Seattle; it went way past 50% renters many years ago. Wallingford is probably about 55% renters, and arterials like N 40th are even higher. It could easily be discussed that by only going to residents, they missed 60% of the owners on the street. That's serious. That means they will take away our property rights without our comment. They would tell you that they took comments last spring; yes, they called it Greenlake Paving. But between the spring and last November, they did a bait and switch on us. They added the removal of parking in November, and then they renamed it, and now it was the Greenlake and Wallingford and something or other interval project. By November and February, they started to publish plans, asking for comments via email. Ironically, they misspelled the email, so they got no comments for four or six months until I myself pointed out that probably was broken. I was frantic at that point. The City says it's now a done deal. Ironically, they added another eight blocks of no parking from Latona on 40th to 7th Ave in the University area, removing 30 or 40 parking spaces, and they only sent out notices to residents again. This is after they had correspondence that they weren't getting to the people who really care. Quite frankly, we have a lot of nice renters in this city, but they don't care about parking. They care about what's going on in their lives, and they're going to be moving on in many cases in a few years. So SDOT continues to not contact owners. And in the city, most landlords, in fact all landlords, must be in the RRI program and must be registered with the City. They only have to go to another department on another floor to be able to get the information to contact owners. As this is the

oversight committee, I am challenging you to actually do some oversight and bring this to their attention and make them contact owners when they are doing major projects like this. Thank you.

Kevin Topping: I live at 6512 38th Ave NE in the Bryant neighborhood. I am a resident of the Bryant neighborhood in NE Seattle, if you don't know where that is. I along with 4,000 of my neighbors are opposed to many of the changes that are going on and are proposed for 35th Ave NE. If you don't know 35th Ave NE, it is the primary arterial for residents in that area and also Metro transit. This is a project that has already started, it's funded by Move Seattle dollars, and it substantially changes the nature of the street and the community that it's served by. This project removes bus stops, removes parking completely from one side of the street, and adds bike lanes to an already narrow street. All these aspects of the project are opposed by over 70% of the neighborhood according to SDOT's own surveys. I'll echo something the previous gentleman said: This was originally put out as a paving project with little mention of any of the other changes. The opposition – now that people are aware of what's going on – is much higher. Here are just three of the changes that make no sense. The bus stops in front of the NE branch library are to be removed, making access to the busiest branch library in the city difficult or dangerous for many seniors, children, and physically disabled people. Number two: Over half of the parking is to be removed from our neighborhood business districts, home to some of the best legacy and small businesses in our city - Grateful Bread, the Wedgwood Broiler, and All That Dance are just three of the notable local businesses that are going to be damaged by removal of parking. Adding bike lanes to a busy arterial is shown to be unsafe. And, the thing that really gets many of us in the area, is there is already a neighborhood greenway four blocks away that was installed several years ago. It connects to the Burke-Gilman Trail, which 35th does not, and was partially funded by the employers in the area. That's where they are pushing their employees to go, to not use a new project on 35th. I want to mention that public records requests have shown that even SDOT was not interested in adding these components to what was put forward as a paving project. They were not interested in this, and they were very aware of the opposition. It was pushed ahead by other parties. I'd just like to say that, given the financial pressures that are facing this body and the levy in delivering its promised goals, why not save some money and take away some of these aspects of the paving project, and put it in into neighborhoods that aren't vehemently opposed to the projects they are supposed to serve. Thanks.

Betty: We also received one comment via email related to the Greenlake Paving Project.

Elliot: If folks email me their comments, we'll print them out, and share them with the co-chairs. They requested an update on the Greenlake Way Paving Project for all of you, so we'll be giving an update responding to some of the concerns I've been getting via email and then addressing at our meeting on August 23rd from staff.

From: Eric Fisk

Sent: Tuesday, July 31, 2018 12:52 PM

To: Helmbrecht, Elliot

Subject: Ask of the Levy Oversight Committee regarding Green Lake Way protected bike lanes

Hi Elliot, thanks for the chat.

Here is the article this question is referencing:

Current plans call for adding protected bike lanes between N 45th and N 55th on Green Lake Way N and Stone Way N, with a transition to a two-way cycle track at N 52nd. This design is damaging to everyone- to cyclists, to residents, to businesses, and to drivers. We also believe it will harm both safety and throughput. If there ever was a "lose-lose" design, SDOT plans on this stretch fit the bill. For detailed reasons why, please review this article and commentary on it:

<https://www.wallyhood.org/2018/07/green-lake-50th-sdot-planning-bike-lanes-cyclists/>

We think SDOT representatives feel trapped by directives to add protected bike lanes but to do it cheaply by not touching the intersection of N 50th and Green Lake Way N. Can SDOT shelve plans for the transition at 52nd and instead explore changing the budget for this project so there can be an acceptable design solution?

Acceptable solutions include:

- extending the cycle track to the Regional Greenway interchange at N 46th or N 47th and changing the signal light at N 50th and Green Lake Way to enable that change. That design is documented here. SDOT studied this design and found it does not impact throughput, preserves parking, is consistent with the bike master plan, and is much safer for all modes of transport:

<https://www.wallyhood.org/2015/11/making-a-cycle-track-work-on-green-lake-way>

- backing off the protected bike lanes entirely and have the cycle track transition happen at the new light near 55th. Bike lanes would remain as they are today, consistent with how they work on the rest of Stone Way N down to Lake Union. Money could be redirected towards the planned Regional Greenway through Lower Woodland Park.

Thank you! -Eric Fisk, Wallingford Community Council Transportation Chair

Approve Previous Meeting Minutes

Betty: Motion to approve.

Brian: Seconded.

Ron: Just want to propose a friendly amendment to correct "bit" to "bid."

Elliot: I will correct.

Betty: Approved.

Levy, process and assessment overview

- **Assessment process overview**

Elliot: In early 2018, we completed a thorough assessment of the Levy to Move Seattle portfolio and program. In April, we released the [comprehensive assessment report](#) that you all saw. In May, we released some further [subprogram data for the 8 subprograms](#) we will be discussing tonight. Throughout April and August, we have gathered input from you and the modal boards in the form of your recommendations. After the meeting tonight, SDOT will use your input to begin working to provide a revised workplan.

- **Assessment findings**

Elliot: We found two main findings as a result of the assessment. One was that eight of the levy subprograms required further review and evaluation, so those are what we'll get to tonight. The reasons for that review and evaluation were:

1. Cost estimate increases: We're seeing costs rise regionally and other agencies are also dealing with these same factors.
2. Additional transportation priorities: In the last few years, additional priorities are also adding some challenges to this portfolio and selection of programs.
3. Funding limitations: There are certain subprograms that are having their own challenges with getting some of the partnership leverage funding that were assumed in 2015.

The other main finding from the report was that our program management, our program structure, our department structure, and systems and tools needed some attention, investment, and review. That hasn't been a focus at our meetings so far as we've really been diving into the subprograms but that's an area we intend to come back to next month, and in months ahead, to report on improvements that we're making given that assessment finding.

- **Assessment milestones by-the-numbers**

Elliot: So, you all know what your department and your co-chairs have been tasked with doing over the past few months: We released a [comprehensive assessment](#) in April and [datasheets in May](#). We're having two Council briefings; one we've already had and one is scheduled for next Tuesday, August 7. We've also had five Levy Oversight Committee meetings as you all know well. Most of those were unplanned at the beginning of the year, including this one, so thank you for finding time in your calendars. We've attended 11 Modal Advisory Board meetings as well to talk to our modal board representatives to get their feedback and input on the subprograms that we have tasked them with providing their recommendations on. Your co-chairs have come every single one of those with me, so I can't thank them enough for their leadership in this.

Subprogram feedback

- **Subprograms under review**

Elliot: This committee was tasked with the Bridge Replacement subprogram, Arterial Asphalt and Concrete (AAC) and Arterial Major Maintenance (AMM). The recommendations and subprograms we tasked for the modal boards were:

- The New Sidewalks subprogram, Sidewalk Safety Repair subprogram and Curb Ramps & Crossings subprogram (Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board)
- Transit-plus multimodal subprogram (Seattle Transit Advisory Board)
- Bicycle Master Plan (Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board)

- **Review of Modal Advisory Board/Levy Oversight Committee feedback**

Elliot: As we take a look at the subprogram recommendations this evening, we'll first look at the goals, commitments, findings from the report, and then we'll be reviewing your understanding of the findings and finally your recommendations.

Alex: Tonight, we will hopefully finalize our findings and recommendations. SDOT will then take them and in advance of our August 23rd meeting, reflect and incorporate them into a revised workplan. It's important to note that these are just our recommendations. There is a chance that SDOT disagrees with them or has a variation on what is exact in here. That's important to note and is the reason why we are not finalizing our letter tonight. Also, while I strongly appreciate the work the modal boards did to formulate these, I also think that means we have some time and space to revise accordingly. The modal representatives on this board, and I know Don Brubeck from the Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board is in the audience as well, have the space to communicate what they think, as well as the Council and Mayor, so you shouldn't feel constrained if there is something that you disagree with.

Betty: I want to echo what Alex said by saying that the recommendations that come out of the Oversight Committee will reflect what we've heard from the modal boards, but they are this committee's recommendations. We have received their input, but what comes out of tonight will be this committee's recommendations.

Alex: I think we'll be in a better position on August 23rd – or at least more typical for an oversight committee – to react to what SDOT puts together rather than try to generate this on our own. That is our job most of the time, and I can appreciate why we've been tasked to give input, but it may be more natural for us to see what SDOT puts together and react to that.

- **Levy Oversight Committee feedback**

Elliot: Like Alex said, the first three we will review tonight will be the three you are tasked with reviewing.

- **Bridge Replacement (Planning & Design)**

Alex: The goal of this was planning for the replacement of vulnerable bridges. The levy commitment was to plan and design high-priority bridge replacements to begin construction after 2024. Of the funds identified in this element, up to \$10 million of total funding (local, levy, and leverage sources) may be used for implementing near-term pedestrian and bicycle safety projects on bridges being studied for replacement (in addition to funding provided for pedestrian and bicycle safety projects in other elements).

The findings that SDOT produced were that the original budget assumed leverage opportunities which are not available. Cost estimates for planning and design work are greater than originally anticipated and some bridges are no longer the City's top priorities.

At our last meeting, we discussed our understanding of the findings which are that SDOT cannot meet the original commitment because the original funding plan for this program was \$35M and the updated funding plan is only \$15M, reflecting leverage opportunities that are no longer assumed. The preliminary list of bridges that SDOT published must be updated to reflect the current funding and priorities. Our recommendations are to develop and publish an updated list, and to allocate \$5M to complete near-term bicycle and pedestrian safety projects highlighted in the February 2018 bridge safety analysis report,

which is essentially half of the original commitment to that type. I'll now invite feedback or edits from the committee.

David: An August 2018 deadline seems ambitious.

Alex: Logistically, yes, it's strange but I have heard that SDOT can complete it by the end of August of 2018.

Elliot: Yes. We are hearing it tonight as a final recommendation – once approved by all of you – and we are presenting it to Council next week. So even though you'll finalize your letter at the next meeting, we're seeing these as final and then we can discuss it.

Nick (LOC): Is this a direction or a suggestion?

Alex: It is a recommendation.

Nick (LOC): Can they increase or reduce these amounts?

Betty: We are not the decision-makers, that will be SDOT and the Council. Generally, we should just be oversight. But in this case, we are making a recommendation. Our bylaws state that we can make recommendations when there are excess or a lack of funds.

Brian: Speaking in support of the \$5 million recommendation especially since the Council, by resolution of ordinance, suggested accelerating.

Councilmember O'Brien: I don't have a formal comment but wanted to provide some context. The original \$10M in funding was a placeholder bucket to make sure these improvements were prioritized. Speaking for myself, the \$5M of safety improvements seems like a smart set of low-cost investments and I'm fully supportive of that. It is important to note that there are major improvements that are very expensive on the Ballard Bridge that will not be a part of the \$5M. There is an additional \$10M necessary to do the remaining safety improvements on the Ballard Bridge.

Emily: The council resolution last week is specific to accelerating the Center City downtown connections, so I don't think that applies to this.

Brian: How will we be funding the council resolution?

Lorelai: \$5M of the \$15M is prioritized through what came out of the bridge safety analysis report. The remaining \$10M would go to bridge planning and design, which we'll talk more about on August 23rd. If we were to talk about using that to fund center city bike improvements, we would be taking it away from the planning and design of those bridges.

Brian: I appreciate what the council has done, but how will we fund it?

Councilmember O'Brien: Some of that will come up when we get to the Bike Master Plan.

Betty: I want to mention that as we go through this, we will not vote on each individual subprogram. We will note any changes but vote on it as a single package.

Alex: I haven't noted any changes here yet. Are we satisfied with this recommendation?

LOC: Yes.

- **Arterial Asphalt & Concrete (AAC)**

Alex: The goal for this subprogram was for SDOT to increase the number of traveler-miles on pavement assessed to be in “fair” or “better” condition. Traveler-miles represent the total number of miles traveled by all people in cars, trucks, and buses that travel on Seattle’s streets. The levy commitment was to repave up to 180 lane-miles of arterial streets. Assessment findings are that, while not a formal levy commitment, SDOT published a preliminary list of paving projects during the levy outreach period in 2015. The original budget also assumed leverage opportunities which are not available.

We found that there are significant risks facing SDOT’s ability to deliver this, in part because delivering that 180-mile commitment was going to be realized using leveraged funds from the Transit-plus Multimodal Corridor subprogram. Issues with funding in that subprogram may affect SDOT’s ability to meet that 180-mile commitment. Similar to the last subprogram, the list has to be updated to reflect current conditions. The final understanding is that the original funding plan assumed more leveraged funds than are currently anticipated, and that levy and local sources are also less than anticipated, resulting in an updated funding plan with \$15M less than originally funded across all sources.

Our recommendation is to develop and publish updated paving lists with a detailed explanation of the changes, with the focus on those now being covered by AAC funds, including annual benchmark goals by August 2018. I’ve been told that’s achievable. We would see this at the August 23rd meeting. The second recommendation is to identify near-term pavement repairs for corridors from the original list that are deferred given new conditions. Our final recommendation is to align the updated paving list with other levy subprograms to leverage and maximize the delivery of benefits and original levy commitments in its subprograms. I’ll editorialize for a second: These subprograms are linked. The reality is that delivering those other things that we value – the multimodal improvements – are done at a much more affordable scale by being incorporated into one project. As we heard, that dreaded \$12M-per-mile bike lane did other things; it wasn’t just a bike lane but was paid for out of that program. It can be harder to parse these into separate subprograms; that’s a broader lesson-learned so far. What do people think about this text? Does it reflect what we talked about at our last meeting?

Ron: I was kind of surprised that there is less local money available for this program. Why has the local contribution to AAC been cut? I don’t think the City has experienced revenue shortfalls in their general fund. We’re talking about local funds being sales tax, property tax, so why is there less local funding coming in?

Alex: The original funding plan assumed the levy commitment was \$235M, and the local was \$16M. The updated plan is \$233M in levy and \$13M in local.

Ron: I know it’s \$3M less, but it seems to me that if anything, it should be more.

Nick (SDOT): The AAC program is primarily funded through the commercial parking tax which is restricted by the City Budget Office (CBO) and City Council. Over the course of our 9-year capital improvement program budget, it has been slightly reduced and allocated to other SDOT programs. We’re only talking about \$3M here. The leverage has also decreased as we assumed significant preservation grants initially that are no longer going to materialize. The leverage is the key difference between the \$269M and the \$254M numbers in here.

Ron: We shouldn't be seeing a reduction in a variety of local sources if the city is not in a recession. I was going to recommend that we actually restore or increase local sources in this program. I understand that the numbers aren't huge, but the principle is that we voted for extra tax here and shouldn't we at least maintain the level of support from our sources? This gets to that whole issue of substitution. We can't pave our streets because we don't have enough new taxes? I would say we make a recommendation that the local sources be increased for this subprogram, or at least restored, rather than decreased.

Alex: How about, "increase, or at least restore"?

Ron: Yes. \$3M would be restoration; I'd actually like to see more, but yes "increased or restored."

Elliot: That is certainly a recommendation you all can make, but those requests go into a citywide process. I want to set the expectation that we cannot independently move money around. Local funds are not guaranteed through the full 9 years as part of the annual budgeting process. When the levy was originally put together in 2015, we had an assumption of how local funds would be allocated. It's not that there was money removed; it's that the local fund contribution was less than we estimated. Is that correct, Nick?

Nick (SDOT): If, say, next year we see an increase in revenues, then it could very well be adjusted in the future.

Elliot: The assessment shows where we are at now (for local funds).

Emily: Presumably because we are in a booming period, those revenues have increased, but we are seeing a decrease. We are skeptical that increased revenue would end up in this subprogram unless we specifically ask for it.

Alex: We all know that these recommendations are not necessarily what will happen, but they are a statement of our preference for what the department should do. Ron suggested that we say increase or at least restore local funding based on the levy funding plan, to which Nick said yes, that will change regardless.

Betty: That will change annually. But, it seemed to have changed as part of this assessment because there was less money. This was not an annual change, but feels like a reduction because of the assessment, so it feels different to me.

Nick (SDOT): Not necessarily. I can provide information on that and look into where the money went. Likely, the decision was made by Council to reallocate funds from this subprogram to another SDOT program.

Lorelei: I think what you are shooting for is that you want to see the original assumption of the local funds maintained. I think that statement is fair. There are many priorities that SDOT is balancing which is where local money sometimes does move. For one example, when we end up addressing safety issues for some of our bridges and we don't have money to do that, sometimes things like this is where money gets reprioritized. So, it is a little complicated which is why I think the intent is that we thought we had an amount but have a different amount.

Betty: Part of my attitude is restoring the public trust. This was a priority when the levy was passed so why is it not a priority now?

Brian: Councilmember O'Brien – do you have a comment?

Councilmember O'Brien: I think it's a fair request. As someone who will be receiving this request, I can tell you how I'd respond to it. It would be great to hear a little more from SDOT on how that happened. It's fair to say that while we do not have control over federal and state funds, we do have control over local funds, and we'd like you to stick with the amount in there. The Council or the Executive may come back and explain why they cannot approve the request.

Ron: The only amendment I would add is to add a "greater than or equal" sign to the \$3M

- **Arterial Major Maintenance (AMM)**

Alex: The goal was that SDOT would increase the number of traveler-miles on pavement assessed to be in "fair" or "better" condition. Traveler-miles represent the total number of miles traveled by all people in cars, trucks, and buses that travel on Seattle's streets. The levy commitment was to repave 65 targeted locations every year, totaling about 70 lane-miles of arterial street, with a repair and maintenance program run by city crews. The assessment findings were that the cost to complete levy commitments is greater than originally anticipated. This increase reflects rising construction costs due to local market conditions and added scope for replacing curb ramps as part of this work. As this work is primarily done on a "spot repair" basis, a majority of this subprogram budget needs to be allocated towards spot repairs. On average, SDOT completes approximately 38-65 spot repairs per year.

Elliot: This is another paving program that in 2015 assumed local funds through the annual budgeting process to get to the 70 lane-mile commitment. Current assessment shows that in addition to construction cost increasing and curb ramp costs, we can no longer assume the local funds because of many priorities we just talked about. Each department puts our requests out annually to the City, and we don't see this as a priority rising to the top of the list. We wanted to raise that with you all. We would typically do a \$2M BIP request each year but this is not a number we can count on moving forward. We will continue to request the funds but cannot rely on receiving them.

Lorelei: The \$36M is what we have and that has not changed from the levy ordinance. When the team put together the plan for the 70 lane-miles, they anticipated additional local funds as they had in previous years.

Alex: Your new total is \$40M, correct?

Elliot: Correct, but they anticipated more local funds than the \$4M reflected in that total.

Alex: Was the deliverable based on the \$36M or the hoped-for local funding + \$36M?

Elliot: The additional hoped-for local funding.

Dustin: Could you elaborate on the 3rd bullet point here on rising construction materials and labor, particularly given that these are City crews? I'm wondering why labor is in here.

Elliot: We are seeing all costs increasing. While the cost increase is a good thing so that we can pay employees more to keep in line with rising cost of living in the city, it does factor into estimates that were made in the past.

Lorelei: All of our crews are union and negotiate salary increases based off of the financial climate of where we live. Even though it doesn't track quite as quickly as some of the other salaries in the area, it gets reflected in the required increases that people get.

Dustin: Are the costs for City crews reflected in Move Seattle funds, or are they paid out of the general fund?

Lorelei: Our crews on capital improvement projects bill to these fund sources. Their time is billed against these projects and these funds.

Dustin: If we are going to keep labor costs in, I would like to know how much of the increase is due to labor costs.

Alex: In terms of findings, SDOT cannot make the original levy commitment in this subprogram because, after the voters approved the Levy to Move Seattle in 2015, the City of Seattle entered into a consent decree, which permits SDOT to deliver 1,250 curb ramps annually. The original funding plan for this subprogram did not anticipate these costs associated with delivering additional curb ramps, which affects SDOT's ability to fulfill the levy commitment. Funds from this subprogram were being used for more curb ramps than the original funding plan assumed due to the consent decree. The recommendations are to establish a new estimate, including the assumptions to establish new estimates and factors for how many lane-miles of arterial streets can be delivered, with available funds including benchmark goals by August 2018. We have a recommendation to count the number of curb ramps delivered using this subprogram as an outcome. And there's a recommendation to consider and propose additional measures that may be more appropriate for how SDOT delivers the subprogram, as lane-miles may not accurately capture the total range of improvements.

Dustin: I would be more comfortable if the third bullet said, "rising costs due to local market conditions that were otherwise not anticipated in 2015" because I would imagine that less money would also go to some of these other subprograms. It's too bad that we didn't assume in 2015 that workers might make more money between 2015 and the expiration of this levy.

Betty: We need to find some way to say that rising costs affect the subprograms across the board. It's in most recommendations.

Dustin: It was in the other two that we already reviewed, so that's why we could take it out here. It probably does impact other areas.

Councilmember O'Brien: The cost for crews has gone up with the Consumer Price Index (CPI) by about 2 – 3%. We estimated that this was coming but had estimated it at closer to 1 – 2%. The delta between what we would have estimated and what we're actually seeing is the de minimis in the overall scope of this. I don't think the cost of city labor is a really measurable impact on why we can't achieve this. I think the broader language that general construction costs are going up is fair.

Elliot: Replaced with "Rising costs due to local market conditions that were not anticipated in 2015."

Dustin: I'm ok with that language.

Nick (LOC): We should have those assumptions identified somewhere so we can see if they are realistic? If we assumed labor costs would rise one to two percent and now it's two to three percent, that's a 100% difference in labor cost.

Rodney: We can't control what the unions negotiate but the two to three percent won't make a big difference overall. A larger factor is that because we are the fastest-growing city in America, we can't do all of this work in the right-of-way during normal construction hours. For example, for the crosswalks downtown, we had to do it on the graveyard shift to get out of the way of all the construction and pay employees overtime to complete this work. There is significantly more overtime cost for us to keep Seattle moving well. The overall labor is a smaller percentage of the other concerns that you articulated on your finding and that Lorelei articulated.

Brian: Small change to second bullet on recommendations. I would not consider building curb ramps an outcome; it's simply an output.

Betty: I want to come back to your last slide – the last phrase regarding citywide priorities. Is that the obligation from the consent decrees?

Elliot: Yes, it is consent decree, sidewalk safety repair and other priorities. Like I said, we put these requests in and other departments are vying for them as well.

Betty: I would like to at least name some of the city priorities rather than saying various citywide priorities.

Elliot: That language is our effort to signal to you that overtime, things can also change and reprioritize.

Alex: Does anyone else have changes they would like to propose for the AMM?

LOC members: No

- **New Sidewalks**

David: The levy commitment was to build 250 new blocks of sidewalks, filling in more than 75% of the sidewalk gaps on priority transit corridors citywide with an emphasis on creating accessible routes for those with disabilities and for the elderly. The reason we are discussing it as part of this assessment is that the original levy committed to only 150 blocks of new sidewalks. Later, an additional 100 blocks of low-cost sidewalks were added to the levy without any additional funding. The sticking point here is how to build those additional 100 blocks. The pedestrian board is recommending that we use the prioritization program that already exists in the Pedestrian Master Plan (PMP) to decide the type and location of sidewalks we should build. We felt we should still retain the goal of 250 blocks in the levy, and then if we need additional funds, SDOT should seek those from Council. As general advice, we are recommending that SDOT work to reduce costs where possible and partner with programs like AAC or AMM for the sidewalk improvement program. It sounds like the 250-block goal is achievable with a split of low-cost and traditional sidewalks.

Ron: Unlike other programs we've talked about, we are talking about doing more than the original levy.

Alex: The 250 blocks became the deliverable at some point.

Elliot: Prior to the levy assessment, it's been our commitment to measure against the 250-block commitment. The past ordinance said 150, so that was noted, but the Pedestrian Advisory Board and the Department over the last several years has really made 250 their commitment and marked that 250 as the goal.

Ron: I'm from a board that was looking at seven corridors, and now we are talking about four with a little bit done on the other three. Here we started at 150, now we are at 250. I'm having a hard time with this one and would like to hold off on this one.

David: There is a large cost difference between traditional concrete sidewalk – the 150 blocks – and low-cost sidewalks, which are the additional 100 blocks added. Sometimes it's as simple as putting paint on an existing piece of asphalt.

Alex: What is possible here is, we go by the original commitment. It is not as though there was more funding put into this subprogram, it was just that 100 additional blocks were added. It is important to appreciate that we are looking at eight subprograms. Some of them are difficult to address and some are just that we need to own up to what might happen. If no one ever said there was an additional 100 blocks of sidewalk, we wouldn't be talking about this subprogram.

David: It's also important to note that the PMP would still take 300 years to complete with our current funding, even with these additional 100 blocks.

Ron: In the first recommendation in parentheses, it talks about traditional and low-cost. We could say something about 250 blocks of sidewalk even if that requires a richer mix of low-cost sidewalks. If the money is there to do 250, but they'll be the cheaper ones, we should say that.

David: The Pedestrian Advisory Board (SPAB) stance is that we have a prioritization framework in place, so we didn't want to be too specific.

Betty: "Seek additional funding" should probably be in all of them, but we should be consistent. Every program wants additional funding.

Brian: I just want to say that we should not shortchange safety. I would support the language in this. In capital, we're betting \$9M on signalization to speed up traffic. If we have a shortfall here, I have yet to see any performance measurement on what impact that program has. I'm reluctant to do anything to change the initial goals. I would advise SDOT to look at other programs that are not even on the table and determine if they are getting results, and potentially reallocated funding. I support this recommendation as stated.

Nick (LOC): It does say, "without compromising safety."

Alex: Alternatively, we could take "seek additional funding" out of the recommendations and findings and add it to the overall letter.

Brian: I'm not sure I agree.

Alex: The point is that it will be a global recommendation for all eight subprograms. Our global recommendation is to seek additional funding, especially in these eight subprograms.

Brian: I question whether they are shortchanging safety and whether we should scrutinize the program.

Alex: We should invite SDOT staff following August 23 to give a briefing on the traffic signalization program and put it in some context. There is a larger point on those 28 other subprograms that are green. Our charge in this exercise is these eight subprograms. I agree that our broader charge is to look at the entire program.

Betty: Are we ready to move on?

LOC members: Yes

- **Sidewalk Safety Repair**

David: Levy committed to repair up to 225 blocks of damaged sidewalks in our urban centers and villages. SDOT has been primarily delivering this program in spot repairs rather than blocks, so the metric wasn't very accurate. The SPAB is recommending counting spot repairs rather than blocks. We also recognize that the City recently completed an assessment of the sidewalk condition throughout the entire city, and we should use that data to prioritize repairs around the City rather than the current process. We'd also like to see a target for repairs set and tracked along with the master plan. Our recommendation is to use a metric that aligns with the work SDOT does, keep track of what we're doing, and do it in alignment with the master plan.

LOC members: No additional comments or changes

- **Curb Ramps & Crossings**

David: The levy had a commitment to make curb ramps and crossing improvements at up to 750 intersections citywide creating accessible routes for those with disabilities and for the elderly. The assessment found that the cost to improve intersections is greater than originally anticipated, which means it's harder to fund the 750 improvements. Our recommendation is simply to reduce those costs. There are also other programs that are building these items, which may complement these improvements.

Alex: What are some of the examples of cost reduction strategies?

Rodney: One potential is to centralize our design between our capital side and our crew side. Another is having more preplanned options. The real challenge is the terrain and geography create curb ramps that are more challenging than in Arizona or Los Angeles and you have to build each curb ramp so that you go into the storm drain appropriately. There are things we might try with different types of materials, maybe not going to far in the wings. Our crews are encouraged to fix a broke sidewalk up to 2 feet near a recently-replaced curb ramp and we could cut back on that.

Elliot: Would you like to add some of those strategies into the language?

Alex: Yes, for example, "centralized design" across projects. It's hard to condense, but something that speaks to what Rodney described.

Lorelei: I would phrase it as centralized design or efficiency. It's really us trying to figure out creative ways to reduce cost.

Alex: Any other comments on this?

- **Transit-Plus Multimodal**

Ron: The original goal was to deliver a network of RapidRide and multimodal corridors that improves mobility and safety for all modes, invests in infrastructure to support growth, and advances citywide equity goals. The levy commitment was to complete seven transit-plus multimodal corridor projects, redesigning major streets with more frequent and reliable buses, upgraded paving, signals and other improvements to improve connectivity and safety for all travelers, whether walking, biking, driving, or taking transit. The assessment findings were that with current funding, SDOT can deliver investments on all seven RapidRide corridors. However, the cost to complete a level of investment that aligns with the higher mobility needs of our growing city and meets community expectations is greater than available funding.

There is a nuance between transit-plus multimodal and RapidRide corridors. A lot of the levy campaign messaging was around RapidRide whereas the levy language was just transit-plus multimodal. The challenge is that RapidRide is a known thing in this city since we have RapidRide corridors already. The transit board understanding is that there isn't enough money to do RapidRide on seven corridors. The Transit Advisory Board (STAB) understanding is that SDOT faces significant risk to deliver the original levy commitment in the seven corridors. And, regardless of their ability to meet the commitment, what SDOT does deliver will not align with the expectations in the campaign (regarding RapidRide versus transit-plus multimodal). The reasons for this finding are: inaccurate funding assumptions (cost estimates for the seven corridors are no longer accurate, and in some cases are double); in addition, the original funding plan for this subprogram assumes significant federal matching funds, and the current federal funding environment is such that our assumed portion of these funds is unlikely to materialize. Increased project delivery times, local construction timelines, as well as federal funding processes are taking longer than anticipated. This creates uncertainty that all seven transit-plus multimodal corridors will be completed by the end of the levy. King County is also looking at RapidRide corridors, and in the levy timeframe, they're looking at doing four of the seven as potential RapidRide corridors. During the engagement period and after the passage of the levy SDOT's transit-plus multimodal corridor scopes expanded beyond what the levy originally said.

The TAB's recommendation is to reorder corridors and phase projects as necessary to maximize the benefits to the community within the timeline of the levy, including pursuing alternative designs that the levy funds, focus corridor improvements on elements that improve transit travel times in corridors with severely constrained funding or where matching funds are available. Where funding allows, pursue additional non-transit improvements for pedestrian safety and access to transit in all ages and abilities, bicycles included. Align this subprogram with other levy subprograms, specifically the arterial program and relevant pedestrian and bicycle programs, as well as those three resources to maximize benefits, and create a resilient network of transit multimodal corridors.

Alex: Blake sent an email that said he would like to express some reservations about this one because this is transit-plus multimodal, but the other modal boards did not weigh in. It may be true that there are not other transit subprograms, but there are a lot of resources being dedicated to extending transit in the region. He would recommend the oversight committee suggest that SDOT further evaluate this subprogram to focus its funding on a range from four to up to seven corridors depending on federal funding – limiting the number of corridors may be better than spreading limited dollars. He also noted that Madison, Delridge, Eastlake, and Roosevelt are the most critical from a multimodal perspective.

Alex: Does that accurately characterize what Blake said to you?

Brian: I think so. I think given the multimodal dimensions, we might want to take a closer look at it.

Emily: The Bicycle Advisory Board (SBAB) had the advantage of having a meeting after the recommendations were sent out. We talked about it but did not quite come to a consensus. There was strong support from some members of the bike board to approve the transit board's recommendations as is, recognizing the importance of transit currently. And then there are also folks who are concerned given the shortfalls that we're about to talk about such as putting the BMP further behind, especially on critical corridors where they are the only flat, direct route through the neighborhood. Eastlake, in particular, was brought up because there has been quite a bit of outreach to come to consensus on the bike/ped improvements, but funding as a whole was not available.

Alex: There may be some conflict between the first recommendation and the second. The first says, "maximize the benefits to the community," so that assumes the community will say what they perceive the benefits are. But then the second piece says, "transit travel times." It's possible that a community will say, "we want those multimodal elements, especially if we're talking about some of these corridors that are further out. This is one where the levy is ambitious in trying to be multimodal. Unfortunately, that forces a lot of tradeoffs in a situation like this where everyone is well-intended and wants a safe and vibrant transportation network that has redundancy of choices, but we don't have sufficient resources. I'm also sympathetic to the SBAB who sees pieces being removed after design which is frustrating. The potential gap here is \$150M which is a lot of money and stretching the \$63M in the levy across the seven corridors will be challenging.

Ron: Our recommendation is to have a corridor approach on four corridors because we cannot afford seven. The remaining three may receive a spot improvement program. Something would happen on those, but not a full corridor program. I agree with Blake.

Alex: Three of these corridors are far along and with federal processes, you commit to a scope.

Ron: Some of the shortfall is on some of the corridors that are farthest along. We were concerned that if we wait for federal money on something like Roosevelt, we wouldn't get anything done within the levy.

Dustin: In my day job, I was looking at how to spend money in the Seattle Transportation Benefit District (STB), which Councilmember O'Brien just looked at. Are there ways that we could fill the gap with STB dollars?

Ron: Yes, we recommended a change of scope in operating money so that some of those dollars could be spent to address some of these shortfalls. Council approved up to \$18M.

Alex: In a couple of the early subprograms, we published a list. Is it possible to share an update on where the corridors are?

Lorelei: Yes.

Elliot: We presented a corridor breakdown by secured and identified funding to the transit board.

Alex: Sharing that information would be helpful. It's hard to make a subprogram recommendation in seven corridors when we don't know what is going on in each of those subprograms, especially when we're talking tradeoffs. I know there was an original scope and budget in each corridor. That's a starting

point but that would give some sense for amounts for transit improvements or other. How do we make transit-plus multimodal choices going forward?

Brian: I concur. The first recommendation is a bit too vague in terms of benefits to the community. If we are truly going to phase projects by corridor, I would like more data. I would recommend not approving the first bullet until August 23.

Betty: Ron, do you have more information from the STAB to make it clearer?

Ron: There is a lot of unpacking to do. The scopes of the last three corridors are vague so doing a quantitative assessment of the benefits would be difficult. I'm nervous about saying to defer, since we have a lot of that information. The transit board has some of this information.

Brian: I am not comfortable approving the first recommendation in the way it is worded right now; it defers too much to SDOT. This also warrants a little more discussion.

Nick (LOC): Which part?

Brian: "Reorder corridors" and "maximize benefits to the community" are too vague and gives SDOT too much authority. I'd like this committee to have more direction. The transit board has more specific recommendations in this area as well.

Ron: We were clearly talking at the transit board about the four corridors that are farthest along – Madison, Delridge, Roosevelt, and Rainier – and the remaining corridors could have spot improvements.

Councilmember O'Brien: This is one of the questions I have for SDOT: Are we going to do a lighter touch on seven or prioritize fewer corridors? What I am hearing the transit board saying is, let's prioritize those four that are first in the queue. I would love to hear some clarity – reorder, prioritize – are we including seven or doing four? I'm curious where the department is too.

Lauren (King County Metro): We will be communicating our prioritization list shortly. I know it's difficult to have this conversation without that information.

Elliot: Another recommendation from the STAB is to have more regular check-ins with STAB and the LOC moving forward. Projects are in different stages, and there are irregular check-ins. We're asking for a recommendation on the subprogram now but also recognizing it's still early in the levy.

Lorelei: I would just add that we have prioritized Madison and Roosevelt by putting in applications from FTA Small Starts. That's a serious action to submit for those grants.

Alex: A new recommendation bullet that says, "provide updated information on the status of the seven transit-plus multimodal corridor projects that indicate current secured resources, planned multimodal components, and key issues and risks." Not saying by August. I have revised the second bullet: "Work with King County Metro, modal advisory boards, and the LOC to discuss prioritizing corridors and/or phasing projects as necessary to maximize benefits that take place during the levy, including pursuing alternative designs." It can't just be SDOT reordering corridors; they need to consult with King County Metro and this group. Check-ins at 10% and 30% which is the spirit of what was already emerging.

Brian: What additional information can you provide by August 23? I'm not comfortable approving.

Alex: We wouldn't solve this by August 23. What I heard from STAB was we have to wait six months on Roosevelt to hear if federal funding comes through.

Brian: The STAB has some priorities, so why aren't we using those?

Ron: We talked about four corridors as corridors, and three doing spot improvements. I think we were questioning whether to include Roosevelt as a corridor. To have King County Metro as a partner, you need the four corridors.

Alex: I'm going to write this differently for you – defer three corridors.

Ron: Yes. See some improvement on those corridors, like spot improvements, but not a mile of arterial or similar. There are other effective things to do. I live in Phinney Ridge. There is a red light that has a five-second transit queue jump – very low cost and very effective to get buses out of the curb lane with parked cars and moving down the street. In the levy, there's a transit spot improvements program.

Elliot: The presentation that we received months ago included examples of spot improvements made along Market in Ballard.

Councilmember O'Brien: I would love to hear if this group would like to prioritize Madison, Delridge, Roosevelt, and Rainier by fully dedicated resources to deploying those corridors and commit to spot improvements on the other three until additional funding is available, it would be great to hear that specifically. We should name that two of them rely heavily on federal funding.

Alex: If we say to prioritize those four (Madison, Delridge, Roosevelt and Rainier) for a full multi-modal transit-plus treatment and put aside the other three, we may not need the second and third bullets.

Ron: We wanted to get checkpoints in the 10% design, 30% design, and see what happens in the federal appropriations process; we didn't want to wait until the end of the levy to find out about federal funding. Wouldn't want to lose that piece.

Alex: More like, "produce alternative designs with levy-funded corridors."

Ron: We asked for alternatives that were more locally funded in the environmental process, so that we didn't have to wait for federal funding.

Alex: Provide updated information, prioritize those four corridors, produce alternative designs with levy funds, do we need "focus corridor improvements"?

Ron: Our board feels that we would like to see a focus on travel times, since that is how we can track and save operating costs. In terms of things we're looking for, trying to prioritize travel times and reliability if we can't do everything.

David: I am very concerned with the second part of that recommendation. Pedestrian safety and access to transit should be a given. I think that bullet is removing the multimodal intent of the levy.

Alex: As the LOC, I don't want to get into a modal prioritization scheme. The transit board has a lot more context. Transmit that to Council and the Mayor. By saying prioritize four, we can probably accomplish more of the multimodal nature. I'm going to propose that we strike the "focus" bullet.

Nick (LOC): How will we define the corridor improvement elements?

Alex: The top line is the statement of priority. We have a new set of recommendations. When could the key issues and risks theoretically be produced?

Maria: We have provided to STAB the corridor information about secured and identified funding for these corridors and status updates. This information is available now, and we're working on risks. We should be able to provide it to you by August 23.

Alex: I want to emphasize that the second bullet prioritizes those four. We should say why - because those corridors are furthest along?

Betty: We also need to add a spot improvements bullet.

Councilmember O'Brien: From a policy perspective, the alternative path would be to say that, on Roosevelt, instead of a 20% reduction, maybe a 10% reduction, a lighter touch, and do other things elsewhere. As this becomes public and goes to Council debate. This seems to be the approach you're recommending; just be very clear. I'll stay out of this one.

Ron: This is where I was having some reaction to the broader plan, and we're saying no, do four corridors.

Alex: It is a strange position for the oversight committee to be in.

Ron: The STAB has a broader mandate.

Betty: The levy does say the LOC makes recommendations when there is additional funding or shortfalls. We are making recommendations within our purview.

Councilmember O'Brien: We have made some commitments with federal funding. The LOC can say, for Madison and Roosevelt, that we think you should stick with those commitments, and see if federal money comes.

Betty: We all have the gist.

Don (SBAB): I appreciate the thought that the committee has put into this and being clear what the priorities are.

Emily: Do you feel more comfortable with this recommendation than what we looked at yesterday?

Don: Yes.

- **Bicycle Master Plan**

Emily: Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) was tasked with looking at the levy shortfall and looking to better align the levy funding with the BMP. One thing we heard from SDOT was that they wanted more flexibility with how they deliver projects. Mileage wasn't necessarily what they wanted so we worked on an alternative metric. The understanding is that there are significant risks facing SDOT funding to deliver the original commitment because it was not aligned with the BMP, been slow to construct facilities, and the pace of development leaves us farther behind on BMP implementation. And as everyone knows, the average cost to build bicycle infrastructure has been higher than what the levy assumed. Our recommendation is to work with SDOT on an annual basis to develop a 5-year BMP implementation plan with project selection taking into consideration stakeholder priorities, the quantitative analysis outlined in the 2014 BMP. When we've done this in the past, it's been strictly based on the quantitative analysis for choosing projects, so

we'll broaden that. Affect other modal development and additional funding opportunities. The new metric we came up with was to fully fund and complete a proportional share of the BMP network so that the citywide and local connector network can be realistically completed by the BMP milestones of 2030 and 2035. That broadens the scope of the levy, so there are significant shortfalls. SDOT will explore reallocating levy funds to meet the shortfall. Additionally, the City will fund projects beyond the capacity of the levy by use of partnering, grants, annual general fund transportation budgets, and revenue generation such as through permitting, transportation benefit districts and congestion pricing. We want to look at how to complete the BMP by 2030-2035 to align with the City's strategic goals and the climate action plan and meet our commitment as a board.

Alex: I would like to make this consistent with the other recommendations. I think we need to update the recommendation from "will" to "would" or "should." We need to balance expectations. If we want to document how the City will fund and complete a proportional share, the City can say that they cannot do that. Work with the SBAB to explore reallocating levy funds makes sense to me.

Brian: I had a question about the quantitative analysis outlined in the 2014 BMP. My concern is that we focus on connectivity with the recent level of bike infrastructure recently put in. Are we going to look at using that traffic stress to prioritize and make improvements within this timeframe?

Darby: We are already using that to make bicycle infrastructure decisions, in particular spot improvements, and will use that when we come back to work with the bike board for the next quantitative and qualitative analysis.

Brian: That seems like a big change.

Emily: The board has expressed a lot of interest in level of traffic stress as a metric. We would be comfortable adding that into "taking into consideration stakeholder priorities, quantitative analysis, and traffic stress." We are interested in using updated quantitative metrics.

Brian: I just focus on that because it's a better measure of bike connectivity in the city.

Betty: Are you suggesting an addition?

Emily: Inserting it into the first bullet, "Taking into consideration stakeholder priorities, level of traffic stress, and quantitative analysis"

Nick (LOC): Who are the stakeholders? Community within the improvements area, or people using it?

Emily: I think both. There are controversial projects. If you are going to build a connected network throughout the city, you can't skip connections where there are people who don't want a connection to be made. However, we need to take community input into account. Board meetings discuss improving community outreach and process.

Brian: Regarding the third bullet about reallocating funds. The Council recently met – how do we fund that? Should we reference it?

Betty: Use completion of the BMP as a metric and develop a funding scenario to accomplish that by 2035.

Alex: I edited to say documenting how SDOT will fully fund and complete.

Betty: Not recommending that they fully fund it. You want completion of the BMP by 2035.

Emily: We don't want to just say complete the BMP and end up with 40% of the BMP completed at the end of this levy and leave more than half of the BMP implementation for the 10 years between the expiration of this levy with the expectation that we'll go to the voters and ask for even more money.

Betty: Right, but if you use the BMP as a measure to take consideration for this levy funding and beyond, it ends up being proportional. There's a simpler way to say it.

Ron: How does the BMP relate to the levy? Is the levy providing most of the funding during this 10-year period?

Elliot: The BMP subprogram in the levy funds the majority of the BMP during the levy.

Ron: Did the levy provide adequate funding for the BMP before the assessment? I'm concerned we're resetting the bar now.

Elliot: It is adding a commitment. The original levy commitment got us to about 50% of the citywide network which is different from the entire BMP.

Don: The levy has always been one of the sources of funding for the network and the other programs in the BMP – education, enforcement, etc. Looking at the budgets of the last few years, the levy funds focused on protected bike lanes and neighborhood greenways. There's no progress being made on those. As stewards of the BMP, the board is saying, "mind the gap." There are no bus lines from downtown to Northgate that have a gap where you have to get off and walk for a while. To get to the citywide network for all ages and abilities by 2030, we should have 80% done in these 9 years. The City has an existing commitment from 2014 by Council resolution and ordinance to build that full network. Even with our ask, there would still be 390 miles of that network left to build in the next 11 years. In 2018-dollar costs in the plan, currently double construction cost escalation; that's a lot more than the City is spending now. Our concern is that the city not rear-end load this, or push out the deadline to 2050. It's our responsibility to point that out and ask for filling gaps.

Dustin: Comment on bullet point three and the second sentence. I like the language here, but I'm wondering if that is more of a global recommendation. "Additionally the City will fund..."

Emily: That is similar to "seek additional funds" which I would feel comfortable bringing up to the overall recommendation.

Betty: SDOT will explore reallocating levy funds is the broadest thing we are saying.

Emily: I would be comfortable making that a global recommendation. If there are programs that either have a surplus or are not performing and could fund other programs with shortfalls.

Nick (LOC): I thought reallocating was not allowed.

Betty: This committee can recommend it.

Brian: We strongly encourage SDOT to reallocate funds to prioritize pedestrian and bicycle safety. There are several programs in this levy that we're not looking at, and we have no idea if they're affected. That's within the committee's purview, and we should be looking at it now. I'd like to know what the traffic optimization program is doing.

Lorelei: We've been focusing on these eight subprograms right now. We are working on a workplan that talks about all the subprograms. We have heard you.

Brian: We are three years into the levy, and we don't know about some of the programs, yet we are sacrificing pedestrian and bike safety because of it.

Elliot: We do owe you those answers. This is a moment in time where we are providing you an update, and it'll be a status report that we come back to.

Ron: I'm not buying that we are sacrificing pedestrian and bicycle safety. The levy said they would do "X" for pedestrians and bicycles.

Brian: There was overselling of the levy, and I acknowledge that. This language should be stronger.

Betty: I would like to really focus in on the BMP recommendations. I would suggest we remove this third bullet and we talk about seeking additional funding in a more global sense, and talk about reallocation in another assessment that goes beyond these 8 areas. Safety has to be a priority across all modes.

Councilmember O'Brien: My suggestion would be to not pit different buckets against each other and reallocation starts to do that. It's clear that the TMP, BMP, and PMP are not fully funded. The levy plays a significant role in all three, but clearly does not do so adequately. We can call that out somewhere outside of these eight bullet points. Say we need to find additional revenue, which we're constantly looking for, such as transportation impact fees or congestion pricing or a host of other things outside the purview of this group. It's fair to make a statement in here that if there are pieces of this levy that are not meeting goals or the goals are unknown, we should consider suspending those programs, and look to other priorities. It is important to note as well that safety for all users is a top priority.

Betty: I'm not clear what we are left with on your recommendation.

Alex: Thus far, work with the SBAB on an annual basis to develop an implementation plan etc., and then document how SDOT will fully fund and complete a proportional share of the BMP network and programs. We move that reallocation piece to the global piece.

Councilmember O'Brien: I believe SDOT will be updating us in September on the updated implementation plan. Is there enough to call out some priorities?

Emily: The near-term priorities that we discussed were filling in the gaps that Neighborhood Greenways and Cascade have put out. There is also strong support for finishing the downtown network. We could lay those priorities out more specifically.

Councilmember O'Brien: The original commitment was on mileage. We know that downtown is more expensive than other places in the city. We could say something about trading the number of miles for the quality of miles, and we'd like to see prioritization of the downtown bike network and connecting urban villages. That specificity would be helpful.

Emily: We did have language at one point that we were willing to exchange quality for quantity.

Don: Costs are variable. For protected bike lanes, the one at N 92nd is \$3005 per mile; downtown is \$12M per mile.

Councilmember O'Brien: And you even have Pike/Pine at the opposite end of that spectrum as well.

Don: There is a giant range. We had talked about not just picking the low-hanging fruit to get the most miles but to do a mix of easy and cheap and difficult and expensive so that we are doing a proportional share of the bike master plan projects and help connect the downtown and citywide network. You could word it as “prioritize the downtown bike network and connecting urban villages on the citywide network.”

Brian: Can there be a separate bullet about prioritizing safety?

Betty: That will be a global bullet.

Nick (LOC): If you were given \$10M, what would you do first?

Don: If we follow this, we would prioritize the downtown bike network and something that connects urban villages on the citywide network.

Nick (LOC): Are those discreet villages or within the footprint of a village?

Don: The city has designated urban villages like Northgate, West Seattle Junction. Just like a bus would travel from those areas into downtown, we would want bike lanes to go into downtown.

Betty: Do these three revised bullets look ok?

Brian: I would be more comfortable adopting this when we see our global recommendations

Betty: With this, we are done with all these subprograms.

Councilmember O’Brien update

Councilmember O’Brien: My staff has been working with SDOT on a resolution that we will be considering on August 7 in our committee. The resolution states

A RESOLUTION related to the Move Seattle Levy; establishing principles for developing a revised workplan for Move Seattle Levy projects to ensure transparency, accountability, and thoughtful community outreach.

The resolution talks through how the Council is proposing to prioritize this process. This is intended to reflect what I’ve heard from community members in these forums over the last few months. It is not necessarily designed to be the work of this group, it’s the Council work, but I am interested in hearing from you and have invited the co-chairs to be at the committee on Tuesday, August 7, to speak to your process. I wanted to make sure you all had this. There is a version posted online which is probably a little different than this one and will likely be a bit different than the one we will look at committee. I wanted to invite you all to provide feedback to me directly in the next few days once you have a chance to read it. You can also provide feedback to your co-chairs. You are also welcome to come to the committee meeting and provide public comment. The plan would be that this will be voted out of committee on Tuesday and go to the full council the following Monday. The resolution asks for a full report back to the Council Committee the first week in December on addressing the things we are raising. This is another milestone in the iterative process that we are doing and it’s also an attempt to elevate publicly how the Council is responding to the City. If folks have comments, I would be happy to take them now or you can follow up by email later.

Brian: We have had a performance-measure sub-committee that has met a few times but I would suggest that this resolution task SDOT with developing more robust performance outcome measures for the levy rather than building a bunch of stuff. For example, how is SDOT showing that they are improving safety? The dashboard just shows that SDOT is building a bunch of stuff but what does it all mean, what is the outcome of all of this. That is the issue and I think SDOT is falling short on delivering on that. I would suggest you have a bullet in here tasking SDOT to develop performance outcome measures.

Councilmember O'Brien: I appreciate that Brian and tend to agree. Would you be interested in sending me some language?

Brian: Yes.

Councilmember O'Brien: Great, if you can send me some language, I will message it with SDOT so we can all be clear about what we are talking about.

Betty: I would encourage anyone to come to the committee meeting on Tuesday, August 7, at 2 PM and send comments directly to the Councilmember's office.

LOC letter

Betty: You all have seen this electronically. This is the framework of the letter that we are going to transmit to the Mayor and the Council. It gives a contextual history for what we were called to do. Some of this is the framework of the letter and then we reference the recommendations in terms of moving forward. What I have heard tonight is that we want to add at least three more things:

1. The City seek additional funding for all subprograms
2. Public safety should be one of the highest priorities when any prioritization of projects takes place
3. If there are areas in the other parts of the levy that were not addressed that may not be delivering in the ways they promised or aren't delivering in ways that benefit the public, we could reconsider reallocating money

Elliot: I don't want to sell these other programs short because we have not given them time to present. They have performance measures and data that we can bring you all, we've just been really focused on these eight for the last few months.

Betty: What we are looking for tonight is that we are headed in the right direction on this letter. We'll send an updated draft before August 23rd, so we can finalize this on the 23rd. We will now take a vote on the recommendations and those will be set.

Alex: Send edits to us by next Friday, August 10.

Betty: We will also send this out to the people who are not here tonight.

Betty: With that, we call for the vote on the recommendations.

Brian: I make a motion to approve the recommendations.

Ron: Second.

All in favor, none opposed and no abstentions

Brian: I just want to say very briefly on the letter that I come to SDOT's defense on the ADA consent decree and not anticipating those costs. Also, I totally agree with this and think that SDOT should consider some kind of cost range when developing cost estimates. There has to be a little more sophistication with how they do cost estimates.

Betty: We are largely providing comments and recommendations on the programs. SDOT knows it has work to do internally as well. Some of those tools and the ways they need to adjust how they are doing business are completely in line with our recommendations.

Elliot: We've been doing a lot of work in the last six to eight months that has taken a back seat as we have looked closely at these eight subprograms but we're happy to provide you more information. I want to reiterate my thanks to all of you for, not only, all the work you've put in tonight, but over the last four to six months. We started the year with the survey of all of you and one of the things we heard was that you didn't fully understand the levy, the programs, and all the details. I think that the silver lining to all of this is that you have all taken a master course in the levy at this point.

Betty: At least eight of the subprograms.

Alex: Our next meeting will be a Q2 finance meeting on August 23, include a revised program-something and the letter. It could also potentially be longer than two hours.

Elliot: We also have a finance sub-committee meeting on August 9 to review Q2 data.

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
Provide an update on the Greenlake Paving Project at the August 23 meeting	Aug. 2	Elliot	Complete: Elliot added to presentation and agenda for August 23 meeting	August 23
All subprograms: Note assumptions in one-pagers (for example: if we are assuming inflation at 2-3% moving forward in estimates)	Aug. 2	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to incorporate into workplan	Fall 2018
AAC: Develop and publish updated paving lists with a detailed explanation of the changes, with the focus on those now being covered by AAC funds, including annual benchmark goals by August 2018.	Aug. 2	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to develop list	August 23

Action item	Meeting	Lead	Status	Deadline
AMM: Establish a new estimate, including the assumptions to establish new estimates and factors for how many lane-miles of arterial streets can be delivered with available funds including benchmark goals by August 2018.	Aug. 2	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to establish a new estimate	August 23
SDOT staff to give a briefing on the traffic signalization program for context	Aug. 2	Elliot	Elliot to add to future agenda	Tracking
Transit-Plus Multimodal: Provide the corridor information about secured and identified funding for these corridors and status updates, risks.	Aug. 2	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to provide information in August 23 presentation	August 23
Bike Master Plan: Document how SDOT will fully fund and complete a proportional share of the BMP network and programs each year	Aug. 2	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to incorporate into workplan	Fall 2018
Share Oversight Committee Response outline with committee	June 21	Levy co-chairs	Complete: Elliot shared outline with committee and plan to finalize letter on August 23	Mid-July
Provide data on how the construction costs have increased (example: how much the cost of concrete has increased since the beginning of the levy) to add to AMM recommendation	June 21	Elliot	Elliot to work with Office of Move Seattle to provide data	July 9
Develop a separate one-pager re: consent decree with more information to link to in the LOC AMM findings	June 21	Elliot	Elliot to work with staff to develop one-pager for committee	July 27
Request for AAC paving list for 2021- 2024 projects by 2019	June 7	Elliot	Complete: Provided on August 23	August 23

Action item	Meeting	Lead	Status	Deadline
Develop guiding principles for the next levy	June 7	LOC	Tracking	TBD; LOC to determine
Consider extended meetings to review priorities and draft recommendations	May 24	LOC co-chairs Elliot	Complete: August 2 and 23 meetings extended	TBD
Keep committee informed on Fautleroy progress	May 24	SDOT	In progress: Elliot to keep the committee updated as the Mayor and Councilmember Herbold continue community process to identify near-term safety improvements	Ongoing
Provide subprogram options for LOC and modal boards to consider	May 24	SDOT	Complete: Options provided at LOC and modal board meetings	SBAB - May 31 SPAB – June 1 STAB – June 1 LOC – June 1
2017 Move Seattle Report	April 24	SDOT	On hold until after the assessment	TBD
Data on how SDOT tracks cumulative progress or delay for projects	Feb. 22	Elliot	In progress: Elliot to work with team to send data to LOC	June 21
Data with breakdown of striping and how SDOT determines whether to stripe or restripe a road	Feb. 22	SDOT	In progress: Elliot provided initial data via email to Blake Trask	June 1
Further discussion about SDOT responses to the CDM Smith Report and follow-up in 2018 and when the committee can expect an update	Feb. 22	SDOT	Updates included as part of assessment work	Ongoing
Add cumulative deliverable count to SDOT annual report	Feb. 22	SDOT	Elliot to track and add	TBD
Add discussion to future agenda regarding performance measures on the levy dashboard	Feb. 22	SDOT	Elliot to add to future agenda	TBD
Review policy regarding posting meeting materials online	Feb. 22	LOC co-chairs Elliot	Elliot to add to future agenda	TBD

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: 8:30 PM