

	\$6.8 mil (\$20 VLF)	\$27.2 mil (\$80 VLF)	\$34.0 mil (\$100 VLF)
Ped.	\$1,700,000 (maintenance)	\$2,040,000 (7.5%)	\$3,740,000 (11%)
Transit Capital	\$900,000 (new projects)	\$12,240,000 (45%)	\$13,140,000 (39%)
Bike	\$1,200,000 (\$900,000 new projects + \$300,000 maintenance)	\$680,000 (2.5%)	\$1,880,000 (5%)
Preservation and Safety	\$3,000,000 (exclusive of ped/bike maint)	\$6,800,000 (25%)	\$9,800,000 (29%)
Access/Mobility/ Major Projects		\$5,440,000 (20%)	\$5,440,000 (16%)

DISCUSSION

Bicycle/Pedestrian Allocations

I think it is important to arrive at some “proportionality” between bicycle and pedestrian projects. I have given more weight to pedestrian projects because:

- Implementation of the Pedestrian Master Plan is estimated to cost more than 3.5 times the cost of implementing the Bicycle Master Plan
- While it is difficult to determine what percentage of the population uses bicycles as a means of transportation rather than recreation, one indication is the recent mode split study conducted by Commute Seattle. This survey shows that 3% of the people

who commute into the Center City do so by bicycle, while 8% walk, and 40% use transit.

- Bridging the Gap has provided more money for bicycle projects to date than it has for pedestrian projects. And in our initial allocation of the \$20 VLF, we provided no money for new pedestrian projects and we provided \$900,000 for new bicycle projects.

Our telephone survey shows that investment of new dollars in access/mobility and preservation/safety is substantially more important to people than investments in new bike/ped projects. Therefore, I have allocated more dollars to those two “buckets” than to the ped/bike “buckets”

Transit Allocation

I have allocated a substantial percentage of the VLF to transit capital projects because:

- Commute Seattle’s mode split survey shows that 40% of the people who commute into Center City do so on transit. There is a belief (which I share) that if transit were speedier and more reliable, more people would use it.
- Our telephone and on-line surveys indicate strong support for speedier, more reliable transit. Inadequate transit is the #1 problem identified by survey respondents (although not the #1 priority for new investment, interestingly enough).
- Transit does not benefit in any substantial way from Bridging the Gap. Twice as much BTG money has been spent on ped/bike than on transit.

There has been some discussion about transit access issues. Not everyone lives within walking or biking distance to transit. I believe some of this can be addressed by coordinating transit service with land use planning. Communities that are already dense or that are slated for more density should have more transit service. We simply will never have a bus on every block. But what we need to do it to encourage density where existing transit investments have been made, and to ensure that new transit investments serve communities that are already dense or are slated for growth.

Preservation and Safety

I have allocated more to “preservation and safety” than many other members of CTAC III because:

- We have a \$1.8 BILLION maintenance backlog. If we can’t maintain our existing infrastructure, we will be faced with a far more costly replacement tab.

- Our surveys show that the #1 investment that respondents believe we should make is “paving street/repairing potholes”, and the #2 is “repairing/replacing aging or deteriorating bridges/overpasses” [although this was not consistently high across all sectors of the city], with #3 being “improvements to most heavily used roads”
- The condition of our roads affects all modes of transportation: feet, bicycles, van/car pools, transit and automobiles. Preserving and improving the condition of our roads benefits everybody, not just automobile users.
- If we are going to undertake new bike/ped/transit/road projects, we need to be sure there is money to maintain these new investments.

Access/Mobility/Major Projects

I believe that we should allocate some funds for this purpose because:

- Our survey respondents identified “improvements to heavily traveled roads” as appropriate for new transportation funding. Across all sectors of the city, this was identified as a high priority.
- As I have mentioned before, we need to complete projects that are only partially completed in order to recognize the full benefit of our previous investments. One example is Mercer West. The investment in Mercer East is approximately \$180 million. We will not realize the benefit of that investment if we do not complete the Mercer Corridor all the way to Elliott Ave. Additionally, if Mercer West is not completed before work on the North Portal of the tunnel begins, there will be major gridlock in the city. Mercer is used by about 53,000 vehicles a day so it is certainly one of those “heavily traveled roads” mentioned by survey respondents. Mercer West is one of the top priorities listed on SDOT’s list of major capital projects. And it is also listed on SDOT’s list of 2011-2012 freight projects. On completion, the Mercer Corridor will be one of those “complete streets” which serve pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and cars. There may be other examples of partially completed projects which should be completed.
- There seems to be a lot of interest in pilot projects of various kinds (alternatives to transit service; ways to get people to transit who are not able to walk/bike that far, etc), and I share that interest.
- It seems to me that we need to have some money available for access/mobility/major projects in order to achieve some semblance of geographic/other equity.

Modal Plans

In the bike, ped and transit projects, I would give great deference to the priority projects called out in the Bicycle Master Plan, the Pedestrian Master Plan, and the soon-to-be-completed Transit Master Plan, respectively. I do not feel qualified to develop some independent list of priority projects; the people involved in developing the Master Plans

spent much time and energy on them, and I don't feel that we (CTAC III) can hope to achieve the same level of expertise as those folks acquired in the course of developing the plans.

\$20 Million "Rubble Yard" Proceeds

At this point, it is not clear where these proceeds will be invested. If they are invested in "Preservation and Safety" and in the completion of the Mercer Corridor and other major projects, then the allocations for these categories could be reduced and devoted to other categories.

Bonding

I have not attempted to calculate the impact of bonding some of these VLF revenues. I leave that to smarter people!