

Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee
Meeting 2 - Summary
February 17, 2011

Welcome

Public Comment

- No one signed up

Co-Chair Report

- Discussion about timeline for the committee's decisions
 - It would be tough to get on the ballot in 2011
 - An August ballot measure is extremely rushed and a November ballot measure would compete with the Families and Education Levy
 - Committee members asked for information on how have other transportation levy measures fared when there has been more than one funding measure on the ballot
 - Bridging the Gap (BTG) and Transit Now were both on the ballot together in 2006
 - Staff noted that Council seems willing to work with the committee to adjust the Committees June deadline – Committee members asked staff to talk to the Mayor and Council to confirm this item
 - There was also concern expressed about timing relative to the BTG renewal in 2015. BTG provides steady funding for key items and members were concerned about how their recommendation might impact the levy. It would be good for any new measure to have been in place long enough to show the public the value they are getting for their money
 - Are there any pressing needs that need to be addressed sooner rather than later?
 - Transit Master Plan won't be complete, but projects may be identified before it is finished.
 - Vagueness might not serve a ballot measure well
 - Consider that King County Metro may put a \$30 VLF increase on the ballot
 - Co-Chairs recommend that the committee split their work into two parts – VLF recommendation and ballot measure recommendations
 - Not all committee members were ready to commit to extending the deadline and splitting the work this way
 - Some mentioned additional milestones should be added to the timeline

Seattle's Future – Vision and Values

- Update on Comprehensive/Climate Action Plans
 - Plans derived from the vision for Seattle, this vision drives planning

- Working to combine both plans because climate goals should be built into all city planning
- Transportation Strategic Plan (TSP)
 - The TSP describes SDOT's vision and strategies, issues of importance, guides decision making, and shows how SDOT will deliver on commitments
 - Four elements: the Sustainable City, the Equitable City, the Productive City, and the Livable City
 - How does this plan relate to the charge of the committee?
 - It is important to understand if the committee's vision for Seattle's transportation future is in line with our guiding documents Equity is a challenge for how we accommodate growth - Some communities unfairly bear the brunt of growth
 - The Four City Model works well. We need to make sure small businesses are protected
 - For example, you encourage people to live in dense urban villages and to walk, bike or ride transit. These are the people exposed to fumes, noise and collision dangers caused by those not living in the Urban Villages and driving
 - How are the Ped/Bike/Freight/Transit Plans integrated into the TSP? Are their lists of projects we can review?
 - The TSP is the umbrella over the model plans
 - The Bicycle Master Plan has facility recommendations for key corridors and the Pedestrian Master Plan identifies high priority roadway and crossing-the-roadway improvement areas
- Vision and Values
 - The Pedestrian Master Plan did a good job with vision – will help steer CTAC 3 decisions
 - Need consistent language in all the plans, use the Four City model
 - Talk more about equitable distribution
 - Keep in mind that some car trips are out of necessity. Urban design encourages people to drive because it is easier and large parking lots are provided. Can't ignore the car.

Community Engagement Plan

- There was some confusion on whether surveys would/should test ballot measure messages or gather input on people's values and priorities. Conclusion was can't do both and more than one survey would be good.
- Tracy Burrows reminded the group that other surveying efforts were underway that might supplement the CTAC community engagement effort.
- Need to share possible revenue sources -besides vehicle licensing fee- with the committee.
- Survey and round tables could test which funding sources resonate with people (user fees, property levy, etc.)
- Committee agreed the community engagement objectives were ok, but would add text that acknowledged input would be gathered from a good cross-section representing the Seattle population.

- Invite various [city boards](#) to send a letter with projects and priorities they would like considered (freight, pedestrian, bicycle, immigrant and refugee, housing levy, planning, people with disabilities, women's, urban forestry, aging and disability, public safety, SPU creeks drainage and wastewater, etc.)
- Make sure all materials and activities are accessible. Events should have wheelchair and bus access and online materials should be accessible as well.
- When telling the 'transportation story' consider using actual peoples' stories. This is more compelling than listening to government woes of not having enough funding.
- Use [Four Cities model](#) when discussing key values that motivate the public to care (keep language consistent with plans for easy cross reference and less confusion).
- Survey should include cell phone users to make sure you reach a large variety of people.
- Consider adding opinion leaders and typical voters to 'audiences' on checklist handout.
- Holding focus groups for specific ethnic groups was considered, but the group agreed that round table discussions at pre-existing meetings would work better.
- The Committee agreed that Option 1 was the best approach and recommended adding a couple of public meetings to the first box.

Other/Next Steps

- Need more time to discuss items as a committee—like how to allocate the \$20 VLF- and less presentation time
- Some members feel strongly that they need the context being presented to get up to speed on the plans and large quantity of information and be able to make informed recommendations
- Committee members were encouraged to read the summaries of the plans being presented at each meeting – links to these plans have been sent in previous emails and are available on the library page of the CTAC web site: <http://www.seattle.gov/transportation/ctac.htm>
- Future presentations will assume due diligence by committee members was done in advance
- Co-chairs agreed to carve out time for discussion among committee members on future agendas
- Members should email Dawn.Schellenberg@Seattle.gov with other key milestones to include on the timeline

Next meeting: March 15, 3:30 – 5:30 p.m., Boards and Commissions Room (L-280), City Hall