

**SEATTLE PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD**  
**Retreat Minutes**  
**Saturday, May 16, 2009 (noon - 4 p.m.)**  
**Mithun, 1201 Alaskan Way, Seattle, WA 98101**

**1. Call to order and introductions (12:15 pm)**

SPAB members in attendance: Tom Williams (Chair), Mark Bandy (Vice Chair), Leanne Do (Get Engaged), Christina Bollo, Celeste Gilman, Kristen Lohse, Vanessa Lund, T. Frick McNamara, Jon Morgan, Seth Schromen-Wawrin, Ben Smith

Absent: Lindsay Pescheck (SBAB liaison to SPAB), Howard Wu (Secretary)

Presenters: Barbara Gray (SDOT), Jennifer Wieland (SDOT)

Guest: Paul Neibanck (former Board member)

**2. Seattle Pedestrian Master Plan Presentation (Barbara Gray and Jennifer Wieland, SDOT)**

Barbara Gray thanked the SPAB for the invitation to discuss the plan at the retreat. She informed the group that since plan was uploaded to the City website it had been downloaded 2,278 times (3 days). The website also made “top 5” list at SDOT.

Since SPAB members are familiar with the plan and most have reviewed it already, Barbara continued by addressing specific questions that SPAB chair, Tom Williams, shared with her prior to the meeting.

**Public outreach & reactions**

- Barbara described SDOT’s public outreach and general reactions.
  - *SDOT has been out to 15 or 16 public events in the last week and a half. So far, there have been some very thoughtful comments. In general people have been extremely pleased and supportive of the project. People have shared support for and against certain tools. “All way walks” are an example. A lot of comments generated about people’s specific streets. Mostly the conversation has been around moving forward and how other city departments get involved.*
  - *There have been helpful discussions about branding. When people see improvements in neighborhoods, they may see it as a Bridging the Gap improvement. There’s a branding piece that is not yet figured out. There are also education and encouragement programs. There’s a potential for a campaign that I think we need to lobby for. I don’t know whether that is a critical thing or not. I’m not sure how plans resonate with a broader audience. (Barbara)*

*Italicized comments are paraphrased versions of actual discussion. When known, comments have been attributed to specific individuals.*

### How does the Pedestrian Plan relate to the Bike Plan?

- *If people ask, we talk about implementing the plan. We name specific goals. We can talk about our metrics and goals. But it's not the same type of plan. I do think we need to talk about what is the brand and how good is the brand. (Barbara)*
- *A lot of the routes and trail points are similar. I think there are opportunities to brand, perhaps, in connection with the projects supported by the bike plan. (Mark)*
- *The whole package should be sold jointly. I think this isn't even a vision – it's a future state. The plans are a blueprint for how to get there. If you have a brand of the overall thing. We won't solve it today - but we should think about the level of effort around branding and messaging. (Barbara)*

### How should the plan be branded?

- *I think there's value in saying "brought to you by..." (Celeste)*
- *I think we've branded the Bridging the Gap (BTG) stuff. It has a logo – every time you see the construction sites, you see the logo, etc. (Barbara)*
- *Pre-branding is helpful. (Gave examples of state efforts.) Maybe we need to come up with a logo that is more articulate of this future state. Maybe we need to brand it in specific terms? (Ben)*

### What's the connection to Bridging the Gap and building a shared brand?

- *One of the action items is a consideration of a levy or funding package. One of the reasons mayor and council are excited about these plans – this helps them understand the gap that has to be filled. We demonstrate that we can use money wisely through BTG. Hopefully you've built a constituency/ support. Now let's increase the investment. (Barbara)*
- *I don't hear a lot of undercurrent or negative comments about Bridging the Gap. (Barbara)*
- *Except Mercer... not necessarily tied up with Bridging the Gap. (Tom)*
- *The biggest risk moving forward from BTG is that the state system has been getting worse. This winter has been ridiculous. There are far more potholes and stuff. The dollars aren't going to go as far. Between the bad winters, etc. and we're still only in 3 years. There's still year 4 and 5. People are going to ask what you are spending money on. One of the benefits of bike master plan was you saw tangible improvements right away. Sidewalks and improvements are exciting for some, a small group of people. But most won't notice them.*
- *I think the idea of a shared brand has a lot of traction. One of the things that comes up a lot is people ask about how this relates to the Bike Plan. People want to see both implemented. They want to see an overall system – not one for bikes and one for pedestrians.*
- *There may be a need to connect the bike plan to the pedestrian plan. (Mark)*

- *The plan will help us sing from the same song sheet. In past years, there's been very limited coordination around priorities. This helps us to say, we've done the assessments. You're right – there's a lot of similarity between priorities for bikes and pedestrians. (Barbara)*
- *There was a discussion at our school about redistricting and talks about reasonable walking distance. School district decisions about what's accessible should be related to these plans. (Mark)*

### **How will the plan be integrated across city departments?**

#### **SDOT**

- *The people who make decisions about what gets built are on board. People are using this system. Within SDOT, things are going well. We'll have to be the owners, and keep the fires lit. There's no convincing needed with this group. Data is something they are comfortable with. They know and use GIS. They aren't threatened by the list. (Barbara)*

#### **DPD**

- *Outside SDOT, we coordinate most closely with the Department of Planning and Development (DPD). We're trying to come up with a workable multi-modal assessment tool for private development. That's huge. What goes on now with transportation impact analysis is really all about auto trips. We don't have the tools for anything beyond that. I went to the transportation research board and looked at their new tools. But it doesn't do a complete streets sort for you. It doesn't integrate safety. We're actively meeting with them to look at models. Redmond has a better model. San Francisco has a better model. We're talking to them. (Barbara)*
- *We need to go back and train the design review and plan reviewers. We're in the process of working with them to help them with guideline revisions. We expect to do this during this year - perhaps September. (Barbara)*
  - *Perhaps they could come to SPAB to give a presentation/ follow up? (Mark)*
  - *Cheryl Sizov would be the person to invite. (Barbara)*
- *We plan to have a new tool in the comprehensive plan by 2011. Impact fees have been hot potatoes. The political climate is challenging. (Barbara)*
- *I'd tie back to the bike plan and pedestrian plan. If you can tie them together as a brand and convince people that an impact fee would get people to that place. (Mark)*
- *With South Lake Union and Northgate, we have an opportunity to do this. Developers haven't taken advantage of the tools in some other important areas. (Barbara)*
- *The Department of Neighborhoods is an important point of entry. Our discussion with them is to use these materials/resources as tools. Hopefully this will provide some baseline data for them. (Barbara)*

### Seattle Public Utilities

- *We have a good relationship with Seattle Public Utilities. We are working together on some issues to work out regarding drainage – pervious pavement. Sometimes policies go in place before kinks are worked out – with SPU, they’ve asked us to help with combined sewer overflow projects. They’ve asked for some of our lists. We have good relationships at staff and management level. (Barbara)*
- *I’ve known several projects around coordinated capital planning. They’ve never stuck. I believe the only way it ever will work is if it’s done through regular communication. We need to share improvement lists and get people in the room together and really think out far enough in the future to coordinate. We have our paving program out 9 years. Even just that – we send the list off to SPU. Of course, they have other priorities for safety, etc. But the conversation needs to happen. Also, there is a joint executive team – management – that works on coordination. (Barbara)*
- *RE: drainage issues -- cost was an issue. SPU required that under a certain size. There’s new stormwater size that will help. Drainage is enormously expensive. The top tier projects – 90% of cost is sidewalks and big chunk is sidewalks. But we can do things like urban rain gardens and better ponding. We’ve also talked about detention banking. (Barbara)*
- *There’s an unprecedented collaboration for urban open space on Bell Street. It’s really one or two people who are helping make it happen. They’re putting in new infrastructure and they’re working with Fire Department – which is concerned with access. It’s a linear park, downtown. (Barbara)*
- *The roadblocks are things like, who will maintain, who will be liable. It takes a project like this to show that it can work. It’s like Highpoint. The question is, “How do we do this with sidewalks and neighborhoods?” (Barbara)*
- *If you can get Bell to work – you can sell it to the public. I think things can be frustrating for the taxpayer... so many departments, hard to navigate. If you can get a win, you can get political support, etc. (Tom)*
- *Bell is important. Taylor was done by a private developer. Now Bell will be one that public agencies have done together. Now private developers will see that it may be worth the risk on their project. (Barbara)*

### Parks

- *That brings us to the Parks Department. We have some work to do. Jurisdiction/ land ownership is sometimes an issue. Sometimes there’s a union or lack of union between transportation and recreation. They also have their own design standards which are different than the rest of the city. If you do something adjacent to a park, the standards are different than ours. Things are improving. We wouldn’t have Bell Street without their leadership. (Barbara)*
- *Parks has the ability to buy property – but having activities on their property can be challenging – street vendor restrictions are an example. We’ve had people from*

*public health very involved in this process. When we need to deal with things like vending in parks – we need to bring people together from these different groups. I think it makes sense to bring people together on specific issues and projects.*  
(Barbara)

#### Seattle City Light

- *The other group we're working with is Seattle City Light. We didn't solve the lighting problem in this plan. SCL hasn't involved us in their planning. We have an action in here to try to advance lighting issues. We don't have a great and regular relationship with them. Some individuals have good relationships – it's just not as strong as other departments.* (Barbara)
- *SDOT does set lighting standards. The authority lies with city traffic engineer. But it's not straight forward in how it is implemented. It's mostly computer monitoring. The model our capital projects folks had. If you actually went and looked at the lighting it was quite different from the models. They need better tools.* (Barbara)
- *Street lights for the streets are very inadequate for the sidewalk. It's not just light levels. It is quality and quantity. There's a new person working on pedestrian lighting – he is really great. He's been working really hard about developing better criteria and working with the plan.*
- *There's going to be a turnover issue. LED lighting is right here. It has all sorts of efficiency improvements. The maintenance, inventory, etc is going to be a huge thing to push through.* (Mark)
- *The LED isn't here but induction is. Northgate Park will be induction. The LED is at least 5 years down the road* (T)
- *We need to make it easier for developers to do the right thing. When we have these little pots of money, we need to be smart about how we spend it. We're getting better. But we need to partner and do more.* (Barbara)

#### Seattle Police Department

- *The biggest coop of the plan -- The Seattle Police Department. We have a great relationship with the police. They've taken on the enforcement piece. They are doing stings. There's funding for traffic safety.* (Barbara)
- *What's the situation with the right turn on red?* (T)
- *The city can mark no right on red. I don't remember what we did with all way walks. Maybe a solution is to add many more of these in high priority areas.*
- *Discussion followed re: advance stop bars, problems with signage placement, and priority areas for turn restrictions.*
- *What has led to this change? Personnel?* (Ben)
- *It's the Captain and his team. If the rules are in place and there's funding and a target, it's very possible to do things. SPD makes a decision about where to deploy*

*officers every day. It's in our interest to continue this relationship. I do feel that the improvements go deeper than just the Captain. (SPD)*

### **Will citizens see tangible benefits/changes?**

- *We haven't talked about the individuals. Liz presented to us earlier in the week and we talked about the situation for citizens needing to get a permit to fix their sidewalk. Will the plan make things easier for citizens and individuals? (Mark)*
- *We did work on this a lot. We might provide something like Seattle shim day where we might provide grant money and list of contractors. (Barbara)*
- *I don't think we need to charge people for the permits. It's more that we want to be able to provide guidance about how best to do things. (Mark)*
- *I don't know that there will be enormous changes with regard to permitting. (Barbara)*
- *We talked about having a list of approved contractors. (Celeste)*
- *We'll continue to work with Liz and streets on that. (Barbara)*

### **Place Making**

- *I think the projects like Taylor and Bell are critical. What I've seen in the plan is very important – sidewalks and intersections. But I think creating destinations and places to be is even more critical. We need to create places where people want to be outside. It will balance our spaces. People in cars will pay more attention. What's being done across agencies to create more of these kinds of spaces? (T)*
- *This is the meat behind the whole vibrancy plan. We need to work with more than just the metropolitan advisory group. They've been very involved and push on news boxes, reduction of clutter, making downtown more walkable. We also need to work better with the Office of Economic Development. Street vending on streets makes sense. We need excitement, fun and activation. (Barbara)*
- *SPAB members discussed improving the vitality of downtown.*

### **How will progress be reported?**

- *We've brought some examples of the performance measures and targets. (Barbara)*
- *Are you doing pedestrian counts related to this plan? It would be a great way to demonstrate success. (T)*
- *We're doing some research into advanced counters so we can count pedestrians more efficiently. (Jennifer)*
- *We'd come to SPAB annually – about what's happened and next year's projects. We'd explain where we are on the matrix and priorities. The BTG oversight committee wants to see some overall reporting on what bike and pedestrian plan have accomplished. We have accountability agreements with Grace and the Mayor to keep the pressure on. We'd report quarterly. As far as Council, I don't know how often they'll want to hear from us. They may roll it into bridging the gap funding. (Barbara)*

- *The value of the matrix is that it helps us see what we've accomplished and what needs to be done. We'd love it if you all would go through the matrix and let us know what you think about the priorities. (Jennifer)*
- *There needs to be some discussion at all of our meetings, though not necessarily Barbara coming to every meeting. (Celeste)*
- Numerous board members recommended more frequent reporting to SPAB – reporting in addition to annual report.

### 3. SPAB Comments and Questions re: Seattle Pedestrian Master Plan

#### General Comments/ Scope/ Ambition

- *I thought it would be series of routine activities either within current budget or slightly at margins and relatively self-serving. I've come to think that it's much more and better. It's quite ambitious. It contributes to system-building, sustainability, etc. (Paul)*
- *I'm still struggling to get my head around it. It may be more powerful that we had hoped at the beginning of the process. The way the plan has been data driven and the way it integrates valuing pedestrian activity into SDOT processes is powerful. When I hear about what they're already doing - the relationships and internal agency workings – that's where things get done. In that alone, I think the process is successful. I now want to go through to see if there are tweaks that we can do to make it that much better. I think the package is good and we're making progress. This is not a plan that gets put on a shelf to gather dust. It's delightful to be heard! (Celeste)*
- *There's a huge burden on SPAB, now and for future. SPAB has to consider key people working for city as staff of itself. Not just the ¼ of a person assigned to SPAB. And the Board needs to stay on top of everything in this matrix. There needs to be a big shift in Board behavior and how it sees itself. At the same time, the Board also has radical potential... if we stay with it. (Paul)*
- *I spent a fair amount of time looking at this. In general, as a statement of intent and a statement of vision, I have to give it a really high grade. I think it balances the idealistic with the realistic. I think it is revolutionary – but within the realm of achievable. That said, there are a lot of unanswered questions about how this will play out because there are so many individuals and actions required to make this happen. I was glad to hear Barbara hear about this -- people like the DSA, which I'm also a member of. There are challenges and opportunities. I think if we can work with public and private sector there's a chance to really make this happen. We're not going to turn into Copenhagen over night. I do have some concerns about individual pieces. (Tom)*
- *I think the point about it not being a network plan is important. This makes it a challenging thing to implement. What Celeste said about the data-driven aspect is important – to think about all of the factors related to options. I think it's great that they used data to drive their decision making. Also, about it being an online plan, I appreciate that you can go into different parts of it. But I did find that it was hard to get a sense of what it is really all about. I found that it was a challenging plan to get a sense of online. I think it's to their credit that they didn't make it a network plan. I think 2 years ago we*

*Italicized comments are paraphrased versions of actual discussion. When known, comments have been attributed to specific individuals.*

*had a retreat and we put together a list of the pedestrian experience that this should address. I think that they held to that. (Kristen)*

- *I haven't looked through the whole plan. I had a truncated session and went to the pieces that piqued my interest. I don't know that I have a lot to add. I think it's a good plan and it lays out markers for where we want to be headed. I sent it to a colleague in Montreal from grad school and he was very impressed with it. It seemed to have policies and funding behind it to make it happen. And wouldn't gather dust. I was pleased, in particular, to see that it addressed street lighting to a degree – a tricky area. (Jon)*
- *For me, I've been watching the process from behind the scenes. It's been impressive to see the discourse behind the scenes. I heard the networks piece come and go. I am happy it is looking at the pedestrian experience. I'm a little wary of it being housed at the Department of Transportation – because it's so much more. I wonder about the coordination beyond the Department of Transportation. How will they advance this as something that improves city life? It seems like there aren't any real policies attached to this. (Seth)*
- *I think these would require legislative actions – levies, etc. (Tom)*
- *Making sure that the policies happen is important. (Seth)*
- *Council has a work plan – these things need to be moved to it. (Mark)*
- *When we talk about our comment letter and our approach we need to address these things. (Tom)*

#### Content

- *I still think it's too focused on intersections and getting sidewalks – not vibrancy or creating good experiences for people and place-making. It is safety oriented. (T)*
- *There are still too many disincentives for developers.*
- *I think it's in design guidelines. I think the plan is in phase 1. It needs a phase 2 – a strong collaboration with DPD.*
- *Because this is an SDOT plan, it's focused on rights of way.*
- *When you think about the development near Sheraton – you are walking on a legally compliant sidewalk. But the experience is undesirable. (Ben)*
- *There's an urban design toolkit that is missing from this plan. It needs to lay out what the city and public expects and provides incentives to developers. (T)*
- *Isn't there a right of way toolkit being revised? (Kristen)*
- *What are the chances to inform that process? (T)*
  - *When we do our comment letter, let's raise this issue. T, could you write up your comments? (Tom)*
- *I continue to see the standard mixed use development is first floor retail. How do we get first floor residential in some of these neighborhoods. It ends up; being first floor parking, not front doors. I put this in my comments on the plan. I want people to own their 20 feet of sidewalks and their front yard. It changes sense of pride and adds level of variability and fun. (Mark)*

- *Also – ground floor retail – hasn't been that useful. These new developments often displace existing businesses.*
- *Look at the Taylor project as a model – Taylor and Denny between 5th and 6th. They created a plaza street, anchored at Denny by retail. Then it goes to townhomes at the north end. The biggest problem is retail. There's no one interested. The Gates Foundation is going to open shortly. It makes no sense. We can't get café's or anything to come in. The streetscape won't make it until the residential and retail comes in.*
- *I had expected a linear plan, a hierarchical plan, with budgets to match – then as it went along, it seemed more like it was an instigative plan, a generous, open-ended plan. A flower, rather than a stick. As such it left open many possibilities and doesn't lock into a present situation. (Paul)*
- *How were percentages for priorities determined? (Christina)*
- *Some science and some judgment... (Seth)*
- *There's no gap identified. There's the have and the have nots. Don't feel like it's obvious how this should be used. People aren't going to get why these are high priority areas and how they were selected. I don't think this document will help get people to buy in. (Mark)*
- Discussion followed re: interpretation of maps. The group agreed that if SPAB had trouble understanding and interpreting the material, it would probably be even more challenging for the general public.

#### Format/ Presentation

- *I wonder how we present this to community groups in a way that is meaningful. If you're in an area without a sidewalk – this doesn't tell you how things are going to help. (Seth)*
- *The online document has been a real benefit. There's been a lot of buzz. I wonder if there's an opportunity to be a living document. The thing I was disappointed in is the toolbox. I feel like the toolbox wasn't paid attention to. I kept finding myself on the wrong page. I think part of it was the lack of attention. There are so many tools out there. People from different points of view – developers, activities – to be able to find what they need and get out. To have this be a living document that can be constantly updated. I hope it's not static. (Christina)*
- *That's why I questioned the annual report to the board. I think it should be living and consistent coordination. (T)*
- *There needs to be a fact sheet, a Frequently Asked Questions document, a blog, a video introduction on the webpage. I understand SDOT and the city may have limitations about what they can do, but perhaps we could look to partners for assistance. (Vanessa)*
- *You could use Seattle channel and do a piece about pedestrians – and having materials that can be broken up and put on the page. The most powerful thing about the plan is the pictures and the map. (Ben)*
- *We started talking about these things at the last SPAB meeting. This might be a good topic for their next meeting. (Celeste)*

- *When I previewed the plan... someone pointed this out -- it's great for people like us, it's wonky, etc. For the average person and not a pedestrian advocate – how do they see it and what does it do for them? I do think this is an issue. (Jon)*
- *The policy and political changes are the things that we need to be involved in. We need to sell the plan to the public and to advocate and mobilize the community to support these changes.*
- *I'm not a policy wonk. I don't speak the language, but I slowly understand it. I had a lot of input from a younger person's perspective and a non-wonk. If it's going to be online, I think there are certain expectations about how it will exist and how to navigate. The site was linear and didn't let me move around the way I wanted to. I like that they kept it relatively simple. It didn't have a strong "what you can do" component. The toolbox was lacking. It isn't set up for an average citizen. The toolbox says that it can be used by staff, developers and the public. But the resources that should be given to these groups should be very different. (Leanne)*

#### Management/ Responsibilities

- SPAB members discussed the actual implementation process and need for stronger tactics and policy action plan. There was an overall sense that the plan requires considerable action by DPD which might suggest housing it at DPD. On the other hand, funding for the plan is more likely to be via SDOT. One member commented that if nothing else, there needs to be a very strong partnership and shared responsibility for the plan.
- *I'm ok with SDOT holding this. But there needs to be a literal bridge between this and DPD. The design guidelines should have these objectives. (Christina)*
- *I question SDOT's rules superseding others. I feel strongly that it should be managed by DPD. (T)*
- *Do we want to make a recommendation about the ownership of the plan? (Tom)*
- *We're not going to make a real change about who owns it. (Mark)*
- *But we can influence the partnership. If you can focus on policy and focus more on private developer in city. Maybe the funding should be focused on neighborhoods... where it would be harder to implement. (T)*
- *I've been thinking about pea patches and neighborhoods. It seems like a skill to be able to get people to get involved and grasp a hold. It seems strange that we don't give the neighborhoods the ability to do some of the labor themselves. Is there some way that we can give neighborhoods the ability to do more on their own. (Seth)*
- *I don't see the city letting people do this because of liability. (T)*
- *Look at traffic circles... do something similar with pathway improvements, etc. (Mark)*
- Discussion followed re: to what degree can/should citizens be involved in sidewalk improvements. Neighborhood groups – can play a role. But the process needs to be clearer.

### Budget and Funding

- *How can budget be more transparent to the community? How can the city be held accountable for funding?*
- *Could we find out more about the financing and budget? I think this is incredibly important and it would be helpful to understand the bigger picture of funding opportunities as well as more specific city budget issues. (Vanessa)*
- *Dwight Dively might be a good presenter. I can ask. (Tom)*
- *Federally, the transportation bill will be written in the fall. The re-write could dramatically change the situation. (Seth)*
- The board discussed anecdotal information about what might happen with the federal legislation.

### Communications Strategy

- *We have been talking about how to improve and maintain partnerships and reach out to decision makers. We would like better connections with electeds, particularly the mayor. We need to think about how to reach out to people – including a new transportation committee. (Tom)*
- Tom asked Vanessa to help with the communications strategy.

### Stewardship

Tom asked for input regarding stewardship. What is it? What does it mean for SPAB to steward this plan?

#### Draw from SBAB experience

- *We're experiencing this with the Bicycle Advisory Board. The challenge is that there are so many different places where the actions are coming from. It's about building trust that the criteria is being applied. (Ben)*

#### Foster accountability/ establishing reporting standards

- *To hold feet to the fire. To ensure that policies and plans are implemented. Can't just leave it in staff's hands. It's up to us to check in...*
- *At a minimum, there need to be quarterly meetings. There has to be consistency. (T)*
- *We had this discussion on BTG committee. They hadn't specified how often we should meet... I think there are roughly as many people on this committee – more wide ranging group. (Tom)*
- *Annually for reporting, but all of our monthly meetings should deal with the plan. (Celeste)*
- *I think it would be a good exercise if we came up with our own reporting matrix. And have them do that quarterly... Then they can give us the glossy annual report... (Tom)*
- *Could have this as a standing agenda item... (Ben)*

- *Can we, as homework, identify some of the metrics that we would look to include? (Vanessa)*
- *Sounds like we're moving to accountability, which is important. I think, as stewards – we look at what the city can't do and try to identify where we can play the most important role. (Jon)*

#### Advocate

- *I think our role isn't just direction, but also advocacy. I think anyone who feels that way should express themselves here. I do question taking an advocacy tone in our comments letter. I think the points you mentioned – that this is just the beginning, is an advocates statement. (Tom)*
- *We need to address the challenge of advocating, but still remaining impartial (Mark)*

#### Support/enhance public outreach

- *Public outreach – although, some of this is a staff role.*
- *To some degree, the public should have a place to go so they can ask.*
- *How do we play a role on the citizen engagement role. How would we steward that?(Mark)*
- *A locus between city staff and citizens.*
- *I really think we need to all get out to the presentations. Maybe we can all sign up? (Tom)*
- *I look at us as one notch above grass roots level. We have some familiarity with SDOT and some knowledge of what works. (Jon)*
- *People will open up to and share information with us, rather than an SDOT employee. It's going to be 2-12 months when SDOT gets into the meat of it. I wonder if Brian will be able to get us enough information. I think we're going to have to facilitate our own contacts outside of that. We probably need to revisit meetings with department heads and elected officials... not immediately, though. (Ben)*

#### 4. Next Steps

Tom reminded the group that Council will weigh SPAB's letter heavily. Paul asked the group if everyone is excited to steward the plan and urged the group to consider the importance of enthusiasm toward the plan. Ben and Celeste added that SPAB's comments should include mention of the board's support and excitement, but note that some items should be improved upon – either in the document or through the ongoing implementation process. Celeste also noted that we should describe the plan as a "living document".

#### ACTION ITEMS:

- Tom and Vanessa agreed to work on the letter. Tom noted that the public comment period for the plan ends on June 15.

- All SPAB members should review the plan and send comments to the listserv. Please note whether your comments are meant to be included in the letter. (Some specific, technical comments may be more appropriate for SDOT.) Comments and specific suggestions for the letter to Council are needed no later than **May 27<sup>th</sup>**.
- Vanessa and Tom will draft a response by **May 30<sup>th</sup>** and share with the group for review.

#### **4. Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM. The next SPAB meeting will be on June 10<sup>th</sup>.

*Minutes submitted by: Vanessa Lund  
revised June 5, 2009*