

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, February 4, 2020 / 5:30 – 7:30 PM

Co-chairs: Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Ron Posthuma

Location: Seattle City Hall, Room 370

Members Present: Ron Posthuma, Inga Manskopf, Joseph Laubach, Samuel Ferrara, Hester Serebrin, Patrick Taylor, Alex Rouse, Lisa Bogardus, Vicky Clarke, Councilmember Alex Pederson, David Seater

Members Absent: Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Todd Biesold, Nick Paranjpye, Ben Noble

Guests: Rachel McCaffrey, Nick Makhani, Lorelei Williams, Sam Zimbabwe, Karen Melanson, Julius Rwamashongye, Brian Sperry (all SDOT), Elliot Helmbrecht (Mayor’s Office), Aaron Blumenthal (City Budget Office), Toby Thaler (Councilmember Pederson’s Office)

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:30 PM

Public Comment: None

Agenda item #1: Introductions

Each person in the room introduced themselves by stating their name, organization if applicable, and their role or position related to the Move Seattle Levy.

Agenda item #2: Public Comment

None

Agenda item #3: Approval of Meeting Minutes

Ron P: Suggested the committee decide to approve or not approve of meeting minutes from October, November, and December 2019 committee meetings. The committee voted to approve all three meeting minute documents.

Agenda item #4: SDOT Budget Update

Nick M presented an overview to the committee on SDOT’s adopted 2020 budget. He reminded the committee that at the October committee meeting he reviewed Mayor’s proposed budget and that Council deliberated in November and added additional items before the budget was approved. The Move Seattle 2020 budget of \$301M comprises 42% of SDOT’s total budget. The Mayor proposed adding \$6.1M and the Council added \$2M for protected bike lanes (PBLs), redirected from Megablock proceeds, and added \$200k for new sidewalks. Then there was \$7.85M which is a timing change, a technical action, council pushed that money forward to 2020, with a proviso that stipulates specific locations where the funding must be used. \$311M was then adopted for the Move Seattle portfolio 2020 budget.

Ron P: I want to remind everyone that the committee did advocate for more of Mercer Mega block proceeds going to the Move Seattle Levy program. The \$2M is in line with that request.

David S: Was the \$2M in addition to the Mayor’s proposal?

Nick M: Yes, it was in addition to the Mayor’s proposal.

Vicky C: On the timing change, on the council side, what does that mean?

Nick M: Originally, the spend plan for the \$7.85M of Megablock proceeds was over 2021 to 2023. CM O'Brien stipulated that money be spent in Beacon Hill and South Seattle. To do that the funds needed to be shifted to the 2020 budget.

Vicky C: So the funding needs to be spent faster and in a specific location.

Hester S: What are the other two funds?

Nick M: You are referring to the increased revenue, from school zone cameras?

Hester S: Yes

Nick M: That was increased revenue from school zone cameras due to a higher volume of income.

Hester S: And the bottom one, Move Seattle appropriation?

Nick M: That is a timing change. We are moving money from future years to 2020.

Nick M shared potential impacts to the Move Seattle portfolio due to the passage of I-976. The City and other parties have appealed this initiative and an injunction is in progress. Depending on the outcome there will be some policy issues to address. More to come on this. The Workplan had a section for Local Funding for each of the 30 programs, with VLF \$20 revenues totaling \$25.7M in the years 2020-2024, or 1.4% of the total work plan over 9 years. This is a list of programs that the VLF money is budgeted to and if funding was impacted, the actual programs impacted would need to be decided. Nick also reviewed potential impacts to grant funding.

Ron P: Could someone speak to what the City is doing with the State legislature on this? Specifically, the issue of mobility grants.

Sam Z: There's a lot of work looking at transportation revenues overall. This won't likely be resolved this session. A lot of this is work we need to do after we see the outcome of the litigation around I-97. I don't think this impacts us for 2020 yet. It's something we need to look at as we go forward.

Ron P: Isn't the State taking a slightly different approach, saying they are not going to do some work.

Sam Z: They have sent us a letter on the Route 44 project saying hold on a second. They said they are pausing system expansion projects and focus on safety and state of repair projects. We have a temporary injunction on I-976 taking effect so the status quo continues. If we are not successful, we would not have the vehicle license fees, Nick mentioned this, and would have to pay back fees since November. We are trying to balance that risk and continue to move things forward.

Ron P: It's good that it's not a very large number for the city compared to the state. But the state grants are more in question.

Sam Z: And for some of those larger projects we can't go to construction without those leverage resources. That's not quite an issue today though.

Lorelei W: We might have to shift priorities on these projects to continue moving them forward.

Alex R: I feel like we have had to shift priorities and schedules already with the reset.

Patrick T: As a citizen, I see media articles on the big multi modal projects which seems concerning. Can SDOT comment on this?

Sam Z: We were notified last fall of an audit initiated by the US Inspector General. Got a subpoena for records related to 6 projects, that they later clarified was only four as there was only four that received federal funding. We are working to provide documents that respond to this subpoena, and we'll continue to work through that with USDOT, which is separate from FTA and they don't see this impacting our ability to access FTA funds.

Alex R: There was also information on Madison in the Seattle Times.

Sam Z: They are very separate. The audit is not related to our FTA readiness review that we have been going through. The readiness review is part of every small starts grant and this is our first time accessing the capital improvement grant program through FTA. We went through the readiness and risk review and we have found it very helpful. The headline said we were not ready, but you have to check all the boxes to be ready and some of it is clarifying language between SDOT and FTA terminology differences. We plan to respond and get those details back to FTA over the next couple months. Julius, Lorelei and the rest of the project team have been very diligent in understanding what the FTA needs in responding.

Agenda item #5: Transportation Network Company (TNC) Tax Revenue Overview

Nick M presented information on the TNC tax revenue that adds a 51-cent fee for all trips originating in Seattle, and expectation for 2020 revenue and LOC's role. Lorelei clarified this is the first conversation getting into the meat of what it is going to mean for the Committee to oversee the TNC tax revenue.

Inga M: Is this how the Council will introduce projects? I wonder where these 2020 listed projects came from.

Elliott H: TNC was originally to fully fund the Center City Streetcar project. \$56M would be going to that project. Through the budget process the Council prioritized this list of projects for 2020 within the realm of budget work. Part of the discussion tonight is to talk about this committee's role in annual budget process. We see this as a one-time thing and future revenue would be dedicated to the streetcar.

Alex R: \$3.3M is projected for 2020 and all of it's allocated. What will happen if revenue is higher/lower?

Elliott H: This committee is responsible for providing feedback on levy revenues and I would suggest modeling something similar for this TNC tax as well. We knew with this amount of revenue coming we knew we needed an oversight group; you all are already established and having gone through the reset; the work and reporting seems similar.

Alex R: Are we part of the budget process in reviewing the projects?

Elliott H: No, these projects were already in the budget.

Lorelei W: We've had some internal discussions and we are thinking this would work similar to the Levy where the projects have been identified and we work with you on reporting and getting your input on the status of projects and do a similar type of regular reporting, using a similar structure we have set up for the levy. In the same fashion the committee has made recommendations to the Mayor and Council and weigh in and you could continue to do the same thing.

Ron P: Are any of these 2020-TNC-revenue-funded projects levy project?

Elliott H: No, they aren't.

Alex R: Market to Mohai is a Neighborhood Street Fund project we did not select.

Ron P: We wrote to Council that it was important to keep this fund fairly broad, in terms of how it could be used, because we are short on levy projects. As one member of this committee, it's too bad someone decided they had \$3.3M to do new things when we can't do the things, we already told people we were going to do. Can we get an estimate of what the build cost is for these 2020 projects that are receiving \$3.3M in funding next year? If we need to come up with \$15M in the next budget cycle to finish these instead of doing some of the arterial repaving or multi modal corridor projects or bike projects or whatever, I think that's an issue.

Sam Z: Like Elliott said this is to fully fund the streetcar project. This happened this year because we didn't have a s great a need for funding in 2020 for the streetcar.

Hester S: Are you saying this is a one-time allocation of projects other than the streetcar and all future revenue will go to the streetcar?

Alex R: The language says the revenue is supposed to go to fund transportation and transit. I'm just trying to understand our role in oversight. Do we want to discuss which projects should get funding or if funding should go elsewhere? Is that overstepping? Can things be changed?

Lorelei W: We are proposing semi-annual TNC tax revenue reports, showing actual revenue received and indication of where the funding is allocated, as applicable. We can also provide more detail on the work plan for these projects and what the streetcar needs are.

Joseph L: Move Seattle is different from TNC. Move Seattle has established collection and enforcement of taxes. TNC is going to have to develop its own revenue collection procedure, enforcement and audit. It might be worthwhile to learn how that works.

Lorelei W: There's a group in the City that does that.

Sam Z: I don't think you need to be concerned with that as FAS is working on that.

Sam F: First revenue would come in October?

Nick M: Yes, that's about right.

Sam F: So, money might be spent on these projects ahead of time.

Sam Z: Yes, but we are going to take a conservative approach to that.

Ron P: We may need a separate working group/subcommittee. Its nature is not clear to me.

Inga M: Is there a list of projects that were eliminated during the reset?

Lorelei W: The 2018 Workplan lays out what money we have, what leverage we can count on, and what we can do with that. There are many programs we feel we will deliver on. But when it came to transit corridors, as an example, we stated we are planning to go after FTA grants for Madison and Roosevelt. Delridge we have funds for the other 4 corridors have smaller scope. That was an adjustment in scope. The paving program, original 180 lane miles but based on the money we have we can deliver 162.5 lane miles. It was us being clear about what we can deliver. There were a few paving projects, 130th, Roxbury that we took off the list due to lack of funds.

Elliott H: And it's changed some as we have additional money in this year's budget.

Lorelei W: So, some work is coming back.

Ron P: Which is one of the points we made when we did the reset, we should be looking for money to backfill these projects that were promised to the voters. One of the reasons I was not pleased to see the council applying money to new things that we didn't promise in the levy. I don't even think some are transportation projects.

Agenda item #6: Modal Board Reports

David S: At the December meeting the pedestrian board raised concerns about proposed changes to 2nd and Denny, specifically impacts to the channelization and sidewalk width. Also, the board has concerns that the Denny ITS project could be worse for pedestrians, i.e. ped issues along Mercer St. The board is pleased about the Vision Zero future 25 mph sign installations in the future, lots of things to get us back on track. AT the next meeting next week, the board will hear about Thomas St. project and North Downtown Mobility Plan. The board is reviewing resume's for replacement board members.

Alex R: The Transit board wrote a letter to the bike board about scooter share, pedestrian safety, and scooter safety. Also wrote a letter about Seattle Transit Benefit District priorities to make sure people have access to frequent and reliable transit. Like that STDB has paid for some capital improvements in addition to transit service. At the next meeting we are Transit Plus Multi modal corridors by Maria at SDOT. Last meeting, we heard from ST and Metro about the Northgate transit station and Metro's

restructuring and changes to 30 routes for the light rail opening. Rapid ride J Line (rt. 70 Eastlake). The TAB submitted a formal letter in the Fall in support of the environmental assessment. Would LOC write a letter of support by February 14th, the deadline for comments on the environmental assessment? Any support would be helpful.

Ron P: Liked that TAB's letter is clear on priorities and is balanced on transit, bike and pedestrian movement. And prioritizes other modes over parking. Do we want to model off the TAB letter?

Inga M: What about bike and pedestrian boards, are they weighing in on this?

Patrick T: We should look into this. I'm sure we would support this. I feel great about this letter.

Alex R: The transit board wrote a letter in support of the Rapid Ride J Line project and we could submit something similar.

Ron P: If we have consensus someone could make a motion.

Alex R: Motioned to approve the letter with edits discussed at this meeting and submit it by February 14, 2020.

Sam F: Seconded the motion.

Ron P: The letter was voted and approved w/ edits we discussed today. 9 yes, 0 no, 2 abstained (Lisa and Alex P). 3 absent.

Patrick T: The bike facility at Thomas goes from fully protected to partial protection and creates confusion for both drivers and pedestrians. This confusing and we should try to avoid those situations. We had a joint meeting with the pedestrian board, and we share a lot of interests. We are pretty enthusiastic about the Vision Zero changes and action the City is taking. At our retreat we refreshed ourselves on roles and relationship w/ council. We talked about the BMP.

Lorelei W: We too would prefer to always have a protected bike lane, but we end up with changes due to constraints like funding, right of way or other.

Patrick T: I understand those constraints. I want to commend SDOT and the office on the recent Mayors press conference on 4 major bike projects.

Ron P: Do you want to say anything Councilmember?

Alex P: Thank you for your work & looking forward to working with you. I wasn't on the council when those 7 projects were funded by TNCs so it's good to hear that you prefer to have levy funded projects funded before new projects, that is good feedback for Council.

Agenda item #7: Committee Business

Ron P: I may go to groundbreaking for Northgate Ped Bridge, one of the levy projects.

Sam F: At the retreat we discussed are the letters we write being read, when we send letter to Mayor or Council, are they being acted on? We looked at other letters from other groups, transit boards, bike boards, to see what's out there. There's a wide range. We don't always need to write a letter. We can simply tell this group. The Transit Board does a lot of thank you notes. We could CC mayor's office & council on letters like that. Also, I heard at the retreat are letters being read and acted on? Should we be following up. We could talk to CM Alex, as follow up, and get his feedback on how it was received. In terms of protocol we would have two meetings to write a letter. Then review and comment period. Co-chairs would be responsible for making the edits and finishing the letter. Then vote on the final letter.

Alex R: On the TAB we don't involve the co-chair.

Sam F: The operating procedures states that the co-chairs sign every letter.

Ron P: When the letter is done it goes to Rachel for final formatting.

Alex P: I will abstain from this letter.

Rachel M: I would encourage a secretary to support the co-chairs.

Sam F: I am happy to help with following up and making sure it's getting done.

Rachel M: Sam will keep track of further letter writing. Alex will draft the J-Line letter. Keep in mind, if you communicate with a quorum it's a public meeting.

Sam F: Reflection Letter for 2019 needs to be finalized by March 20. It can be drafted between now and March 20 meeting when we can finalize the letter. So, we should come up with a brief outline today.

Inga M: What is this letter for?

Ron P: This is our letter in response to the City's Annual Report. It's a formal task per the ordinance.

Sam F: The 2018 letter may not be best example for the 2019 letter due to mostly talking about the reset and restoring public trust. We can include what worked, didn't work and what's the path forward from here. Let's discuss other topic ideas, I'll take notes to work on first draft.

- Alex R: From a transit perspective, SDOT's been really transparent about the relationship with FTA & FTA grants. That seems like a highlight from the transit side.
- Ron P: I would agree. There's been more transparency which is very helpful.
- Inga M: Continued support of Vision Zero as we have seen an increase in deaths last year.
- Ron P: I would add we are a growing city and more important that we emphasize the goals of Vision Zero especially as modes shift and more people are walking and biking and getting to a from the bus. We'll be lucky to get that number down due to city growth and we are asking people not to have that big piece of metal around them more.
- Vicky C: Neighborhood Street Fund, that was a really good process and the DON outreach was notable. It helped up with our decision making and prioritization of those projects. I wasn't part of the selection process 2 years earlier, but I feel that the comments on this committee that it was a much more improved process and we could reflect on that in the letter.
- Inga M: What we did with are smaller work groups, we looked at equity more, and I think that informed that increasingly we are taking equity into account and SDOT did that too.
- Alex R: Highlight that some of the NSF projects should have been funded by SDOT's general fund. These high collision corridors shouldn't be coming through by neighborhood advocacy and it should be a priority of the city.
- Patrick T: From the bike side, the last implementation plan was passed, and some priority projects were added, but it was disappointing that there were unfunded. Except some funding was found for some through the Mercer Megablock sale. Including crucial connection to SE Seattle which is a top priority.
- Joseph L: Every bike counter hit a new record in 2019. Should congratulate the city on making these improvements and pointing out these are worthwhile investments.
- Vicky C: Releasing a draft 2019 BMP Implementation Plan help build trust with the Durkin Administration. It started a conversation with the community. And that felt good to the community.
- Alex P: This is a good opportunity to raise the issue of the new projects funded through the TNCs to the Council, so they don't do it again.
- Ron P: Particularly if we find out there is a \$30M tail to those projects.
- Inga M: There was an increase bikes, transit and pedestrian and in transit ridership. This all reflects on Move Seattle investments.
- Patrick T: The % of single occupancy vehicle has dropped in Seattle

- Ron P: It's not about how much money spent but spent but the things that matter to people. You can see in the data the increase in mode share. Also, previous comments made by LOC in SDOT blog post regarding **accelerated rate of arterial preservation work**.

Sam F summarized the letter topics. Inga volunteered to write a section on Vision Zero. Joe volunteered to write a section on bike safety. Sam F offered to draft and outline and prepare a draft letter in the next weeks and distribute for comments to have the final completed in March.

Ron P: We could have a half hour on the next meeting's agenda to review the letter and refine it.

Agenda item 8: Upcoming Agenda Topics

Ron P: Next month we are getting a long briefing on the transit plus multi modal corridors.

Rachel M: The March meeting, there is Committee Biz, Transit Plus, SDOT Race and Social Justice Change Team. In April we would bring in a transportation equity work group. And then in March we will share our 2020 Spend Plan & Planned Accomplishments. This is what we rank ourselves against for the year.

Rachel M: I don't think we'll have time to talk about TNC in March. It is not on agenda for March or April LOC meetings. Tentatively in May there is time to discuss TNC.

Ron P: One of the things we have been talking to Rachel about is that at every meeting we have a focus on levy oversight responsibilities like Nick's budget report today, quarterly report, those kinds of things. A second column a substantive topic like the modal board reports, and that would be other topics like the Race and Social Justice Initiative. One from each at every agenda.

Agenda item 9: Announcements and New Business

Ron P: Any Announcements or new business? None

Adjourn: 7:20 pm

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
Identify topics and questions for follow-up Vision Zero presentation	May 7, 2019	LOC		Tracking
Develop guiding principles for the next levy	June 7, 2018	LOC		TBD; LOC to determine