

**Citizen's Transportation Advisory Committee**  
**Meeting 8 - Summary**  
**June 9, 2011**

**Welcome**

**Public Comment**

- No one signed up to speak

**Co-Chair Report**

- Review of \$20 Vehicle License Fee (VLF) Allocation Letter
  - Any changes?
  - Concerns were expressed about the current allocation. Didn't believe the letter represented what they had heard in the community – too heavy on maintenance. Would be more comfortable if recommendation was for one year not two years.
  - In the end, committee was comfortable with recommendation and the two year review period.
  - The group was clear that they were starting with a clean slate for any possible ballot measure recommendation and that the group should send the \$20 VLF letter as written.

**Community Engagement Update**

- Committee was briefed on what was heard during the community engagement process for the group – phone survey, on-line survey, roundtables, workshops and comment letters received from various groups.
- Key themes—Biggest Issues/Priorities
  - Invest in safety for all users
  - Improve transit speeds, reliability, frequency, connectivity
  - Balance maintenance with new projects
    - Repave streets, repair potholes, replace deteriorating bridges
    - Build new projects (i.e. complete streets, bike lanes, faster bus service, rail to connect neighborhoods)
- Key themes—Funding
  - Most people are willing to pay for transportation priorities
  - Strong support for VLF
  - Emerging interest in tolls/user fees
- Focus groups
  - Are being scheduled mid-July to clarify which projects the community would prioritize funding based on CTAC's recommendation to the Mayor and City Council
- Social justice stakeholder interviews

- To make up for low turn-out at the CTAC social justice roundtables, stakeholder phone interviews will be conducted and input shared at the meeting on the 21st.

### **Potential Ballot Measure**

- Need to make some decisions today – pulled together a list of consent items based on what we have heard from committee members.
- Consent items
  - The committee is interested in making a ballot recommendation to the Mayor and Council in time to be placed on the November 2011 ballot, should the Mayor and Council make that decision
  - The committee will recommend a package using the remaining \$80 VLF authority
  - The committee will recommend that the Bridging the Gap Oversight Committee serve as the oversight committee for the new \$20 VLF funding proposal and any future ballot measure.
- Committee members also asked that they have a discussion around tolling. Possibly providing funding for a study through their recommendation.
- How long will this new funding be in place? Does it go on forever? Yes, however, the Transportation Benefit District would have the authority to repeal.
  - Ballot measure can be written to have the fee end at a certain point, i.e. when projects are complete, or after bonds are paid off (if used)
- If we put forward a proposal that recommends the full \$80 VLF, how would the council decide what to cut if they went for a lower funding level? Additionally, aren't we really looking at \$100 long-term?
  - Suggest we focus on projects not increments
  - Committee could consider prioritizing investment recommendations
  - Bond vs. no bond
- As a committee should we make recommendations for future funding options?
  - That would be a good discussion item after July
- Funding options/buckets
  - Look for projects that connect neighborhoods and modes and help resolve conflict among users
  - Need to look at the color of money and how it is allowed to be spent
  - Make things run more efficiently
  - Look at projects that impact underserved areas and those projects that encourage pedestrian travel
  - Look at ways to link projects to land use as a way to prioritize
  - Enhance transit – look at east/west connections, newer forms of transit and find enhancements that are good for everyone
  - Complete Streets has to play a role in whatever moves forward
  - Need to think about who is paying the VLF and be thoughtful about what projects might benefit them

- Huge demand for transit. Need to focus on the corridors with greatest demand
- Look at neighborhood greenways and pedestrian connections
- Work with the county on exercising the local option gas tax
- See attached chart for the committee's first funding percentage ideas [ I think recommendations is too strong a word – these were just individual members thoughts – we've used them to come up with ranges and highs/lows – but it didn't seem like the ranges were recommendations]
- Committee directed staff to put together options based on the discussion heard at the committee. Look at projects that provide opportunities for leveraging.
- Other ideas
  - Provide funding for a freight plan
  - Look at options for using utility money to leverage street trees and stormwater
  - Consider alternatives for sidewalk installation – are there less expensive options?
  - Current bus system is not effective and costs are high for those with mobility challenges – need to look at alternatives
  - Need to honor what we have heard from the community – work to connect neighborhoods (Greenways, reducing conflict)
  - Look at establishing a “Mode Shift Opportunity Fund” for neighborhoods
  - Look for opportunities to expand the walking school bus concepts
  - Consider funding multi-modal projects that are stalled due - needed road improvements that are not currently fully-funded
  - Focus on projects that need to be finished to complete a “network”
    - Mercer Corridor Project – finish Mercer West
    - Streetcar – connect lines

Analysis of federal spending from 2009's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) show that funds spent on public transportation were a more effective job creator than stimulus funds spent on highways.

### **Next Steps**

- Staff was directed to pull together funding options based on the committee discussion

**Next meeting:** June 21, 3:30 – 5:30 p.m., Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 1600