

## **Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee III**

### **July 6, 2011 Meeting Notes**

July 11, 2011

#### **Public Comment**

- Carrie Larsen, Seattle Children's. Encourage committee to dedicate 25 percent of their funding recommendation to Neighborhood Greenways. Referenced NY Times article: [Across Europe, Irking Drivers is Urban Policy](#).
- Cathy Tuttle, Spokespeople. Encourage committee to fund 20 miles of Greenways a year and provide funding for updating Bike Master Plan. Not about being anti-car, but about equity and safety.
- Dylan Heron, Beacon Bikes!. More bike infrastructure for kids and older riders is needed. It is fairly easy to commute to work, but not local destinations within a neighborhood. Recommend setting a quota for miles of Greenways to be implemented.
- Craig Benjamin, Streets for All. Use new funding to implement pedestrian, bicycle and transit master plans. Bridging the Gap should be used to meet maintenance funding needs.
- Jamie Cheney, Commute Seattle. Consider Transportation Demand Management (education and encouragement programs). They are low cost, effective ways to help users understand their travel options and how to access existing transportation infrastructure.
- Lisa Quinn, Feet First. Take a balanced approach. Sidewalks are good and needed, but Greenways could be as good if walkable zones are created. Use the Pedestrian Master Plan as a basis to make decisions.
- Jennifer Litowski. Put more funding into creating Greenways and safe arterial crossings.
- Alex, Transportation for Washington. Agree with statements made today and encourage projects that make it easy for people to get out of their cars.

Several emails received from the public were distributed to the committee for consideration as well. They included one from King County Metro on Route 42 ridership, Route 8 ridership and Link Light Rail; five in favor of funding Neighborhood Greenways; and one asking that we not earmark more funding for bicycle facilities, but rather street maintenance.

#### **Committee Discussion**

The co-chairs used the committee's previous work to come up with a draft proposal of how to allocate \$80 in vehicle license fees (VLF). The proposal was distributed for members to react to.

#### \$20 VLF

- Can you clarify how we are treating the \$20 VLF?
- After 2013, assume the \$20 will be wrapped into the \$80 allocation should it pass on a ballot measure.

- If this is this is the case, some members said they would have to re-think the current allocation recommendation.
- It could go to the Bridging the Gap (BTG) Oversight Committee and they could recommend how it was allocated.
- The Oversight Committee might not have the right players on it to determine future allocations.
- The Council has already asked once how the \$20 VLF should be allocated, it is not unreasonable to think they would like input two years from now.
- The \$80 allocation recommendation has to stand on its own with voters, without the reference to the \$20.
- Council could decide to allocate the \$20 differently than the committee's recommendation.
- Need to consider what voters support. The EMC survey has somewhat different conclusions than the PRR survey. The EMC survey would indicate that 33 percent for Preservation and Safety is too much.
- The PRR survey indicates people would like more of a balance between maintenance and new projects.
- Went back to original \$20 VLF letter language which recommends that the \$20 VLF recommendation be reassessed as part of the 2014 budget process in consideration of changing funding needs and any relevant additional transportation funding

### Proposed \$80 Allocation

#### **System Preservation and Safety**

- Can you explain how the descriptions were created? Sometimes they are very specific and other times general.
- The descriptions are meant to be criteria that guides implementation.
- Add the text, 'such as' to create a more balanced approach that does not presume projects listed are mandatory.
- The PRR survey indicated that within neighborhoods people were concerned with the surface repair of their streets. Can we address this?
- This would help differentiate this recommendation from BTG (which only addresses paving needs on arterial streets) and goes together well with creating Neighborhood Greenways.
- We received an email from one committee member suggesting we use funding to restore maintenance to 2006 levels.
- The 33 percent shown on the spreadsheet helps to restore cuts made during the recent recession, but probably does not bring the department up to 2006 levels.
- If 25 percent were placed in pedestrian and bicycle improvements that would replace funding lost with the removal of the 'employee hours tax.'
- Technically, funding was not lost since more was being brought in than expected through the Commercial Parking Tax.
- The City Council promised to look for another sustainable funding option specific to pedestrian improvements. This package could be the way to meet that promise.

- If the Transportation Benefit District (TBD) can look for alternative funding sources why not use a portion of the revenues collected through violations captured by traffic cameras and allocate it to traffic safety projects and programs.
- Need to make streets safer for everyone. We heard that is a priority for residents.
- The language we use in this document is important. Need to indicate that some of the funding is going to maintain new projects built through BTG.

### **Transit**

- Does \$4.7M build a piece of the streetcar?
- Yes, through bonding.
- There is a danger of promising too much.
- Perhaps the transit descriptions should not include specific projects.
- We could say it funds High Capacity Transit recommendations in the Transit Master Plan.
- Be careful not to over generalize. Have to have enough specificity for the public to understand what they are getting.
- The different 'buckets' are ok:
  - First one is about connecting people with more information and by mode into the transit system
  - Second one is about our vision and creating the transit system Seattle needs
  - Third one is about making the system work the way Seattle wants it to and in the way we want (i.e. electric trolley), which also has political support
- The projects built should come out of the Transit Master Plan process.
- We don't know what State and other initiatives might bring to the table.
- It doesn't matter because the need is so large
- Does our recommendation address the loss of Route 42?
- We could revisit our decision to not purchase service hours with this funding.
- Under 'Neighborhood Transit Connections' we have recommended supporting non-profits that can assist with accessibility, which could help fill the gap left by removal of Route 42.

### **Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements**

- When the Neighborhood Opportunity Fund was first discussed its intent was to support projects that promoted active transportation, for shorter trips that helped the city meet its climate objectives.
- If the Neighborhood Opportunity Fund is anything like BTG's Neighborhood Large Projects Street Fund, most requests will be for sidewalks. It is often used for connecting local destinations and improving safety.
- People will want to know how much the funding in this bucket actually buys them (i.e. how many miles of Greenways, etc.)
- This bucket supports the fact that streets are for everybody.
- More money is needed for education.

- Some people were interested in seeing a higher percentage of funding go to pedestrian infrastructure than bicycling because there is a higher number of people who walk.
- Seattle Public Utilities should be brought into the discussion to brainstorm about alternatives to building expensive sidewalks and how to fund them.

### **Narrative**

- Make sure to mention environmental stewardship, deference to modal master plans and accountability.
- Mention connecting neighborhoods to local destinations like parks, schools and trails.
- Include Transportation Demand Management and the movement to give people options to driving.
- Reference maintenance. The funding should include maintenance to upkeep any new projects as well as those built through BTG

### **Next Steps**

- Next CTAC III meeting, Wednesday, July 13 from 3:30 to 5:30PM at the Seattle Municipal Tower, Conference Room 3832
- \$20 VLF presentation to City Council Transportation Committee, Tuesday, July 12 at 9:30AM in City Council Chambers at City Hall