Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

Levy Oversight Committee bylaws – adopted April 2017

Date/Time: Tuesday May 7, 2019 / 5:30 – 7:30 PM
Co-chairs: Betty Spieth-Croll, Ron Posthuma

Location: Seattle Municipal Tower, Room 370

Members Present: Alex Rouse; Ron Posthuma; Betty Spieth-Croll; Patrick Taylor; David Seater; Joseph Laubach; Lisa Bogardus; Brian Estes; Nick Paranjpye; Inga Manskopf; Councilmember Mike O’Brien

Members Absent: Rachel Ben-Shmuel; Ben Noble; Hester Serebrin, Todd Biesold

Guests: Sam Zimbabwe; Lorelei Williams; Rachel McCaffrey; Dave Conway; Megan Hoyt; Jim Curtin; Brad Topol; Nick Makhani (all SDOT).

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:30pm

Introduction and Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Edits to Minutes: Alex was not attendance on April 2, Lucas Simons attended on her behalf.
Minutes approved unanimously.

Public Comment: None

Q1 Report Presentation

Rachel McCaffrey provided overview of how Move Seattle reporting documents work together. Winter weather means Q1 is traditionally slow, sidewalks that were added were mostly from 2018 carryforward, projects are not counted until totally “done”, more of progress can be seen by looking at spending. Bridge projects have hit major milestones.

Nick Makhani stated that Q1 spending of $28.8MM is highest of any year of Levy. Some of the key projects in future quarters of 2019, will be Lander Bridge, ITS improvements near UW and on Denny Way, and construction of Northgate bridge. Lorelei Williams mentioned that Q1 hit spend plan perfectly because of process, Betty asked if that will always be case, Lorelei says currently that is how creation of spend plan works.

Nick P. asked if Q4 lower than Q3, Nick M. responds that typically Q4 is highest not Q3.

Question asked: Is Northgate on time? Lorelei: Lighting fixtures on handrailing were specific, restrictions meant that only one bidder would be eligible, budgeted initially for 1 million and the cost came through at upwards of 6 million.

Question from Betty: Were lessons learned with Northgate project? Was project too specific? Lorelei: Architect plans led them into one supplier accidentally, we have made more of a performance spec with less specificity now that should allow costs to come in line with what was expected, so this caused rebid.
Nick M. mentions that major spenders are shown but the projects are not yet completed. 25th cost close to 700k, for future projects design costs come earlier than completion. O&M costs include signal maintenance, urban forestry, over 400 trees planted at a cost of close to 1 million.

Previously LOC had finance subcommittee, Nick asks if there is interest in restarting subcommittee? General response is yes. Alex asks: Why was this subcommittee valuable? Nick said it was helpful for his team to make sure that visualizations and information was at the desired level, allows finance to provide greater detail than is needed for full meeting presentation. Brian mentions there used to be a performance subcommittee too. Alex and Nick volunteered to form a finance subcommittee.

Dave Conway presents on spend plan. He supports PMs, schedule development, wanted to talk about how spend plans are developed. Plans are to give accurate picture of what is projected to be spent. Spending plan is meld of cost estimate and work schedule. Different types of teams and crews deliver projects. Typically, one- or two-month delay for when costs hit the books.

Question from Nick P.: Do you do in-house estimates to project costs? Lorelei: Yes, both, engineers and standardized and historical information guide costs, and consultant can guide construction cost estimate. Engineering services group keeps unit price basis up to date. Take information from WSDOT and other sources into account.

Question about what is contractor versus loaded labor? Dave: Loaded labor is SDOT time that will be used on the project. Contractor labor is in contractor costs not loaded labor.

Betty states that previous years spend plan were not accurate, what about future spend plans are they going to be updated? Lorelei: Workplan reset tackled this for the most part. Still working with same plan, we have had a good stretch of engineers estimate coming in the middle of what contractors are bidding, for the moment things have stabilized and our predictions are doing well.

Lorelei mentions that Lander is projected to significantly underspend, $20M of change for 2019 spend plan is due to lander, think it will come in at 100 million or possibly lower.

Betty asks what do we do with those savings? Lorelei states that good chunk of money is with grants so it’s not all ours. Idea would be that we come to LOC about what to do with Levy money. Typically wait until about 90% before money will be reallocated to other projects. Some small claims still in the mix with contractors.

Question asked: Are there any projects that will need more funds? Sam Zimbabwe states that Fairview and Northgate both need increase, Lorelei mentions that permit issues raised price, culvert issues have increased project cost.

Lorelei states that while the spend plan is $218M, SDOT will consider a range of $190M-$218M acceptable for year-end actuals due to the remaining unknown and potential risks. This is further explained by spend plan risk. Some seismic projects are dependent on FEMA grants. Northgate project has caused rebid which caused future bids to come in higher.

Question asked: Should we be worried that we are pushing to the end of the Levy? Lorelei: We share this concern that this is not ideal, but this is a valid concern that we all need to watch. Sam states that using years of spending may not be the best way to visualize, the years are not the actual delivery times.
East Marginal Way

Megan Hoyt states that from beginning project was funded with 5 mil and additional 40 mil in partner funds were needed.

Mostly freight focused project, but there is a lot of walking and biking, main project goals were to separate modes, this is expensive project due to major roadway upgrades. SPU will also be replacing watermain as road will be torn up. Road was previously brick, want this road to last for 50 years, 15 inches of pavement will be laid down in expectation of heavy trucks. Adaptive signals will be in north section. Project includes bike separation for north section. Full concrete barrier as big safety improvement and will add to predictability for trucks driving on roadway. Central segment is very industrial, most truck traffic will take flyover, bike improvements mainly. South segment levy goal was to make this a connection to Michigan street. This would require taking lane of traffic from 99. There are currently spaces where there are no sidewalks on the street. 50 million costs for just north section, this is more than expected. Money from grants is very specific, comes with spending requirements. Port funding is pending but not the same as grant source. Phasing 2020/2021 grants require that phase one will be built first. Bike facility will be built first due to grant restrictions. Phase one will fund 60% design of phase two. Proposal will take rest of levy funds all towards phase one. Other programs deliverables will also get credit from this project. Future grants will need regional support, will not apply for 2019 grants. To apply for federal grant must be able to show the match.

Question of what is the delta need for phase two? Lorelei states about 22-27ish million short on phase two. Question of what about south section, many people are riding in mud path? There is big need for facilities down there. Megan: We applied for design funds for south section down to diagonal street and hope to include sidewalk and upgrades to benefit bikes in this phase. Schedule is to hopefully break ground in 2020, outreach will be in summer with more details on project.

Megan asks when would you want to hear about this project again? Betty would be interested in update once we have updates from big funding sources.

Question about how to get 20 million still needed? Hoping to get that all in federal grant? Megan states that Fed grants run roughly 6 months, expect another one in Jan, some are more competitive than others. Follow up question: Look for rest of money where? Sam mentions that Lander savings could come into play here. Lorelei mentions that this gets certainty in Levy timeframe, which is why we went forward. Megan states that we went after small grants that will help to land bigger federal grants, but smaller grants have shorter timeline.

What bike connections will exist from phase 1? Megan replies that north section has great connection to current facilities. To the south, connections do not exist, some improvements could be made at very south end hopefully.

Vision Zero Presentation

Jim Curtin introduces himself, filling Darby Watson’s role as interim Project Development Division Director and introduces Brad Topol, filling Jim’s old role as Vision Zero Coordinator. Vision Zero started in Sweden. Near 2000 state of Washington launched target zero, learned a lot from them. 2015 Seattle codified that zero traffic deaths is the goal, in 2016 lowered speed limits across city council. Map presented of fatal
and serious injury over last 3 years. Majority of serious crashed occur on arterials. Vision zero team focuses on arterials because of this.

Brian asked: Does this data include only police data, as this under reports data? Jim mentions that this does include EMS data.

Jim agrees that official crash statistics are generally underreported. States we are one of the safest cities for peds in United States being rivaled only by DC and SF, cities that have embraced VZ too. 2018 was decent year in city of Seattle if you look at pure fatal crash number, 14 total deaths, 170 serious injuries, and many serious injuries are fine line from death.

Question asking what is definition of serious injury? What about those who did not call police or EMS? Jim replies that this is broad range, broken bone counts as serious injury, but we are relying on the police to determine what is serious injury. This includes deaths that occur 6 months after incident. Last year in 2017 we had 11 ped deaths, last year we had 8.

Question asked: Typically, are pedestrians hit most at intersections? Jim states that majority do occur at intersections, but more serious crashes on midblock.

Comment made that there was same number of deaths in 2017 as 2009, the data seems so noisy and trendline seems flat while understanding that population has gone up thus overall rate has gone down. Is absolute number of people dying changing? Jim mentions that yes, some good and bad years, getting some interesting scenarios causing death more recently. If we design our streets for peds we are designing for all modes

Alex asks: Is there data of how many people feel safe? On Rainer Ave I look both ways when crossing crosswalks, are we investing in infrastructure that people do not even want to use? Jim says every two years we do customer satisfaction survey, and we have seen increases in people feeling safe in walking to school but mixed results overall.

Due to reduction of speeds across the city the speed limit downtown had led to 9% drop in injuries. Focus on program is now on urban villages. Where 80% of crashes occur. Speeds have decreased across the board. Total crashes on 85th are down significantly. Looking to talk a lot more about signals this year, leading pedestrian intervals, thanks to Brad, 82% of signals will be considered moving forward. NYC is only city with ped fatality going down. We are hoping to do 50ish a year.

Seattle Safest Driver: Do not need to drive. Few things that change behavior, this is one. Question asked what is Seattle Safest Driver app? Jim says it is app that tracks how you drive. Measures speed and other habits. PEMCO insurance gives 5 thousand to winner. Question asked where does the data go? Data is all anonymized. SDOT get aggregated data. Only thing needed to sign up is email and zip code.

SPD will begin sending plain clothes cop who crosses the street to test who fails to yield to peds starting in late summer. Failure to yield is a top cause of injury that is why they are ramping up enforcement efforts. Betty asks if Jim can come back as we are interested in all sorts of different things.

Board Business

NSF evaluation process will happen June through August and Joe reviewed the SDOT and community vote process. Once feasibility study is done, LOC will be given top 21 projects. LOC will look at projects in
teams of 2 to 3. LOC will be given project concept designs. During July, LOC will evaluate projects. By August 6 meeting, LOC to have reviewed and recommended projects in each district according to evaluation criteria. LOC will present and decide on projects on August 6. Brian asks if safety and RSJI map will be included? Rachel mentions that NSF team will brief LOC next month, that will be time to clarify criteria.

Co-Chair report

Draft letter feedback

Alex: Be more specific in second paragraph. Talk specifically about number of lane miles that have been fallen short. Relative to what? Lot of other subprograms that are not meeting commitments.

Brian: Not granular enough. Voters approved by levy, get that to the front.

Joe: Kept this high level. Bike board can get into the weeds.

Brian: It will lack credibility if we do not get more specific.

Joe: Current plan will deliver 60% of the mileage, not sure about breakdown. Either way too inadequate.

Ron: Not just mileage, put in something about 60% or 40%.

Alex: Is it worth mentioning that we support SBAB letter?

Ron: SBAB will be more detailed and specific about reprioritization of levy funds.

Betty: Council or mayor will do whatever they want. Moving funds will come out of someone else’s pot of money. I think it is worrisome to encourage moving money without the specifics. Just keep in mind that money is coming from someone else.

Sam: Makes it sound as if money has been moved away from the bike program, sends mistaken message, money has not been diverted away.

Patrick: Well things like 35th and more projects have been not delivered due to rising costs.

Brian: I think ITS money should be moved to bike projects.

Alex moves to approve letter with edits

Motion to approve letter with edits as discussed approved unanimously.

Brian: Have some performance metrics been removed from the levy dashboard? Due to meeting time, Betty asked this question to be addressed as an action item for response in meeting minutes.

New Business

Matt Donahue, Roadway Structures Manager, raised one new business item for Committee. He shared context about one of the bridges that is part of Levy program #14. Bridge was recently inspected and closed due to a deteriorating structure and life safety concerns. Matt supplied Committee with a memo requesting their approval to use Levy funds to make robust, near-term fix to the bridge to reopen it, instead of the Levy program commitment of designing a full bridge replacement by 2024 (no
construction). Request to do 15-year fix in the near term, rather than 50-year fix and by association SDOT would not produce a replacement design in 2024 with the other bridges listed in program #14.

**Action items**

Action items below capture tasks from previous meetings. Completed items will remain on action item tracker for one additional set of meeting minutes to capture “complete” status and will then be removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action item</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edit April LOC meeting minutes to remove Alex Rouse, replace with Lucas Simons</td>
<td>May 7, 2019</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify topics and questions for follow-up Vision Zero presentation</td>
<td>May 7, 2019</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMP Implementation Plan response subcommittee</td>
<td>May 7, 2019</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Ron to finalize letter according to edits discussed.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Levy Performance Dashboard metrics changed recently?</td>
<td>May 7, 2019</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>The performance dashboard was updated to match Quarterly/Annual Levy report data in late 2018. At April 2 LOC, SDOT presented and discussed additional performance measurements (levy outputs, levy outcomes, and system outcomes), taking feedback, and agreed to return to the committee with a proposal in fall 2019.</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more detailed update on Burke-Gilman Trail</td>
<td>March 5, 2019</td>
<td>SDOT</td>
<td>In progress</td>
<td>Sept. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider briefing on congestion pricing</td>
<td>March 5, 2019</td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Re-address for month with extra time on the agenda</td>
<td>Tracking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop guiding principles for the next levy</td>
<td>June 7, 2018</td>
<td>LOC</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD; LOC to determine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep committee informed on Fauntleroy progress</td>
<td>May 24, 2018</td>
<td>SDOT</td>
<td>Rachel to keep the committee updated as the Mayor and Councilmember Herbold continue community process to identify near-term safety improvements</td>
<td>Tracking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>