

City of Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board Meeting Minutes

April 12, 2017

Board members attending: Beau Morton, Angela Davis, Gordon Padelford, Paul Muldoon, Janine Blaeloch, Carly Nations, Howard Wu (City of Seattle Staff)

February and March meeting minutes approved

Public Comments:

- Douglas B. MacDonald commented on Pedestrian Master Plan.
- Troy Heerwagen: Prepared draft letter addressed to Kubly that he'd like us to consider.
- Nancy Halborsen: Freight person who says that there should be no pedestrian areas at all re: interstate commerce to Alaska and elsewhere. City clerk's office indexes project map as "whole area", but that may not be the boundaries. If only clerk's office would mark them as "project maps", not real maps? All areas should have legal plats. Duwamish Industrial Corridor, 42% public land.
- Robert Geitch: Beacon Hill Safe Streets co-chair: Rainier Valley Greenways and BHSS about crossing at-grade Link light rail crossing, met with Sound Transit, who was responsive. Three-month timeline to look at signal timing and modeling. Asked us to keep an eye on it, and more of an effort to get funding for capital improvements. 15th and Columbian NSF project. Great opportunity to improve crossing for pedestrians and school children.

Notes:

PMP Update (Ian Macek – SDOT, Jonathan Lewis)

- Jonathan.lewis@seattle.gov Transportation Planning Manager
- Angela: Question re: school district not overlooking something that's crucial in SDOT's decisions making, how do you know that the data that's captured is truly helping. Says that some things were overlooked re: data collection on our side. SRTS is working in collaboration with school district on best ways to collect data. Kids and parents walk in the street where there is no sidewalk, Jonathan will pass it on to SRTS program.
- Christina: One good source to check in on are youth development programs, YMCA, etc. Kids might report something different in an after-school program than on the way to or from school.
- Next steps: Ian wants Paul and Gordon to sit in on presentation.
- Has worked on SPAB's role, and will speak to SPAB in May
- Joanne: At January meeting, Angela request a heat map that would overlay where older adults live in subsidized housing, and how the PIN takes care of that, or now. Does the PIN match or not match with older adults and subsidized housing? 95% of point locations (addresses) them were located in the PIN. Point locations rather than heat map.
- Gordon: Paul and Gordon met with David Tragresser about the implementation plan, and hope to narrow down implementation plan by focusing in on this point location data.

NE 65th St Vision Zero (Jason Fialkoff, Brian Macik – SDOT)

- Jason Fialkoff (SDOT, in Project Development Division)
- How many parking spaces are expected to be built along with the new 2,000 units/commercial spaces.
- Gordon: To what extent is the city actively working with the city to make this as walkable as possible and which streets are P-Zones, (ped zones). Board wants to know more about Planning and Development department is
- Street use division has certain frontage improvement requirements,
- Howard: Put us in touch with Emily and Sarah from SDOT.
- Frank: City is only talking about frontage, but gap analysis is not taken into account. Paul: board's goal is to meet with SDOT to discuss that issue. Gap analysis and collaboration with Sound Transit is what the city is focusing on.
- Janine: Where is the plastic curb located? At the line, in the intersection. Jason: because Roosevelt's one-way, people cut when turning, and there's not much yielding to people walking.
- Jason: Three different alternatives to see how they impact transit and vehicle network.
- Gordon: How do you want the ped board to help provide input? Are there trade-offs in these three alternatives? Jason: they intend to show where they can improve crossing across 65th if the Board has any specific suggestions for crossings, please let them know.
- Paul: Presenting results on the 18th, and they are hoping to have implementation next year, may have some tactical improvements this year, but
- Paul: Talked about having discussion with development folks, does it make sense to have Jason come back once further down the road?
- (Next steps) Jason: it would be best for them to come back in June or July, once final alignment is determined,
- Paul: Give Howard an update about where they are at that point.
- (Next steps) Jason: Once they have their next meeting, the next survey will go up online.

Board Business:

- Janine: Wants five minutes to talk about project in Lake City. Sidewalk on 30th Ave NE, high-speed arterial and equity issue. It has no sidewalks from 130-137th. SDOT has proposed putting in a sidewalk with natural drainage. Even after that, there will be no sidewalks for two blocks, which will lead to an area with no sidewalks, area was passed over by levy oversight committee. Didn't find out about extent of project until it was at 60% design, it's not at 90% design, and they just found out about it two weeks ago. Will need to be a political solution. Board needs to think about when and where equity comes into play.
- (Next steps) have someone from SDOT come in and talk about how and when equity is incorporated into the planning process.
- Paul: Equity issue is worth a larger discussion beyond particular projects, especially because we'll be talking about the PMP.
- Janine: SDOT doesn't have enough money to cover those two blocks, and soils there are not conducive to natural drainage. People will be walking up the mud to get to 30th, and will see a beautiful project in their neighborhood. If equity is something that the City truly values, maybe shift budget.

- Gordon: Other side of discussion is geographic balancing, which is sort of the opposite of an equitable investment scheme.
- Janine: equity vs equality.
- Gordon: geography goes for equality.
- Janine: Everyone focuses on collision data, and issues that have come up with traffic calming is that there are huge areas of known hazard where collision are not reported, due to language barrier, hesitant to call the police, various reasons. There may be numerous collision, but the data simply is not reported.

2017 Work Plan

- Paul: Goals for 2017, wants to have a conversation about whether these are the goals we want to adopt. Let's have a discussion today and see if these are the goals that we'd like to pursue, and Paul would like to make these the goals for the next two years. We can hand out additional copies and put the goals up on the board. We can make it available online. (Marci)
- Janine: Wants to clarify that we are advocating the PMP that's going to be adopted, endorsing the PMP, or advocate for bettering the PMP. Board has never taken a position on the plan. Are we endorsing, or not?
- Angela: We need to advocate for the everyday person, and does the PMP do that?
- Paul: That's the intent, but a good point: we have not taken a position on the plan.
- Gordon: Important point.
- Janine: We should have a special meeting to talk about the plan, and endorse.
- Joanne: We did send a letter with very specific points. She has not checked to see whether all of them have been responded to. She'll be willing to check to see what was added to the plan.
- Gordon: Most of our comments were incorporated, but nothing drastic is different between the two plans. Implementation Flow Chart on page 51 is still up in the air, it's something that we got added to the plan. We'll hear about it next month, after its already been added to the plan.
- Paul has also looked at the draft didn't walk away with any major issues, though there are areas
- Janine: Issue is that PMP is programmatic plan, and implementation plan is where things actually happen, and we need to understand the implementation plan before we can determine if the plan actually works.
- Paul: We've given a lot of feedback to staff, and do we endorse what we have now, as there is no implementation yet.
- Joanne: Advocacy will ensure that the implantation will unfold, doesn't see any words in the plan that will keep us from doing the advocacy There's nothing particular in the plan that will prevent us from advocating for pedestrians.
- Paul: Agree with Janine, that board needs to take formal action before we can go before Council and say that we can endorse it
- Janine: It would be a shame for our endorsement to be taken as full-throated support, when we can do a general endorsement depending on implementation.
- Gordon: We generally support the PMP, but the devil in the details is in the implementation.
- Janine: Not yet substantive enough to sat that the Board should fully endorse it.

- Paul: It's a plan of goals and objectives, not projects. With the next phase we'll see the projects and plans that will come from the stage of the Plan. How the plan will proceed is already built into what we have. Real issue is: do we endorse what the staff work has been up until this point.
- Gordon: Some concern about the flow chart, and approving that e
- Frank: Suggest a middle course, that the plan be submitted and tabled waiting for the condition assessment. It's a huge equity, and some better explanation from SDOT about how **maintenance will be taken care of. Plan be used as a pro forma implementation framework for now. Board lets run with it and see how we do, and backfill as necessary. We don't need to** look at it as either/or support the process, then next year when some of this can be filled in, then we can stamp it. Credit the plan for what it is, and point out the deficiencies that are in it.
- Angela: There are a lot of things that she was not aware of, but know now, and can better communicate, but it will still take a long time to totally read and understand the plan. Being able to take the time to clearly understand the plan will be beneficial.
- Paul: Have Ian come up and answer one or two questions:
 - 1) This plan is going to the Council, give us the timing:
 - Ian: Tuesday, April 18th is when SDOT will be presenting to TREE, and which point they will
 - 2) Concerns with the plan and how to apply those:
 - Gordon: a number of concerns about how the Implementation
 - Paul: How does PMP define projects?
 - Ian: Equity analysis etc., and other overlaid analyses.
 - Paul: Plan only talks at a very high level about those quantitative aspects and how they're applied. Understands what he staff needs is a document that has been adopted by Council, so they can then bring forth capital funding for projects.
 - Ian: With each multi-modal plan, there is a section that says SDOT will go forth and do implementation plan end of December, based on 8 months out from anticipated adoption.
 - Paul: What I assumed is that SPAB has the ability to provide input on how the criteria are applied, and we can provide input if we don't think the criteria are accurately representing what most benefits pedestrians.
 - Ian: Main point of IP is that we have a better sense of funding stream is for next five years, and can then identify programs.
 - Janine: Except for sidewalk assessment and curb ramps assessment plans.
 - Ian: This assessment will help us allocate the limited funding that we have.
 - Gordon: Explain again how this plan is forward-compatible with the transition plan, and does that plan pull funding from this plan?
 - Janine: What's the transition plan?
 - Gordon: The City's being sued by Disability Rights Settlement is imminent on how the City is going to make everything accessible.
 - Frank: PMP says it is not constrained or relevant to the PIN. The plan does say that the PIN Analysis safety location trumps all else. You can't put project anywhere outside of the PIN area.
 - Overlay of safety and cost analysis.

- Paul: Advocate that we do have someone at the committee meeting with our position. The plan as it's laid out is really a preliminary goals and objective plan, and we will then have input on what's actually implemented. Are we comfortable.
- Gordon: Valuable to have the ability to make comments about what we're really concerned about, and lay out the totality of our thoughts.
- Janine could go along with it if we point out very valid concerns, particularly around very unpredictable concerns, like that funding, and how the goals in the plan may need to change. We have to have those provisos.
- Paul: It's a living document, and we need to be able to make changes.
- Janine: It's a policy issues that those two major issues are not being taken in to count.
- Ian (SDOT): There are certain areas in the plan that are relevant elements. For funding, it's really going to be the Council and Mayors office that will make those decisions. Council will be making that ultimate decisions, and that we know that these things may change, but we hope that they don't.
- Joanne: This approach raises some of the legitimate concerns. We can't keep delaying the passage of the plan. It's a tool we can work with, and SDOT has proven that they're willing to listen to us.
- Paul: (Future steps): Can someone draft up talking points and can someone be there Tuesday at 2:00 to give public comment. (Gordon and Angela will go)
- Angela: (Future steps) Angela will draft something and send it to us to look at, paragraph, bullet point list, etc.
- Gordon: These are concerns, thoughts of the Board, and it will be a collection of our thoughts. Though, we should vote to, moves to support plan in its current draft form, with the questions and concerns that Angela is going collate.
- Joanne: Wouldn't we want to nail those down in the remaining time, they've already been broached.
- Paul: Let's re-state the 2-3 points that we've talked about:
 - 1) Janine: Unresolved issues associated with Disability Rights
 - Washington pending settlement, and unknown funding impacts.
 - 2) Still-pending sidewalk condition assessment, and unknown funding impacts.
 - 3) SPAB endorses the PMP with the recognition that there are outstanding issues that include:
 - Issues are that it will skew the way priorities are addresses.
 - Gordon: We really want SDOT to do a deep dive on the unfunded needs. "Hey Council, your work isn't done yet". We have a desire for flexibility, and hope that that flexibility carries through to the plan, contra to the issues that the Bike Master Plan has had. How do you weigh different directives? Maybe that should be an additional consideration, and the balancing of the various qualitative parts of the plan is yet to be determined.'

- Ian: SDOT hopes to have that flexibility, for good or bad, lean times or extra funding sources.
- Gordon: Ensure and look into funding for the unfunded needs.
- Angela: That we are made aware that projects are presented to us early enough the we can affect the outcome of the projects, not 60%, etc.
- Gordon: Hope to hear next month more about the Strategies section.
- Paul: A re-motion to support the plan
- Gordon: Board can approve the intent of the plan, then wordsmith later.
- Paul: Does the Board vote to support, yes, it's unanimous, motion carries.
- Paul: (Next Steps: Set the goals aside for next month
- Paul: Aske to endorse two projects, and if we support them Paul will draft two letters in support. Send letters to
- Paul: Motion to endorse to send letter for these two projects. BRT and Fautleroy.
- Paul: One moment to thank Joanne.
- Public comment about the beg buttons, its already one of the strategies the City is looking that, Gordon will bring it up when talks to City, and here's an example of something we are excited to hear about.