

Seattle Transportation Levy Oversight Committee (LOC) Meeting

Date/Time: Tuesday, August 4, 5-6pm

Location: In-person at Seattle City Hall Room 370 & Online

Members Present:

- Lisa Bogardus
- Jack Brand
- Chase Kitchen
- Lynda Firey-Oldroyd
- Kaid Ni Ray-Tipton
- Jack Whisner
- Geri Poor
- Zach Burton
- Tyler Vasquez
- Rafi Ronquillo
- Wes Mills
- Chase Kitchen
- Harrison Jerome
- Steve Pumphrey
- Lucy Sloman
- Saroja Reddy, City Budget Office Director, delegate
- **Members Absent:** Nafiso Samatar, Timothy Chang, Councilmember Rob Saka

Guests:

- **SDOT:** Serena Lehman, Meghan Shepard, Alex King, Francisca Stefan, David Burgesser, Andy Merkley
- **Members of the public:** Louis Spanias, Gary Duvall

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:00 PM

Welcome; Introductions

- Alex K.: Facilitated roll call for committee members.
- Alex K.: Introduced Louis Spanias as our newest LOC Member. He will go through the formal council appointment process this fall. Invitation to Louis to introduce himself.
- Louis S.: Work in the climate action space. I have worked with cities. Excited to learn from all of you.

Public Comment

- Tyler V.: This is a time for any members of the public to give public comments if they wish.
 - Gary Duvall: lifetime Seattle resident. Does advocacy with WA Bikes. Vision Zero isn't moving in the right direction. I know someone who was killed on their bike on Aurora 20 years ago. SDOT has done many studies and has a proposal. My idea for you to consider, when we slow Aurora we save lives. When build crossing we save

lives until we don't. If it gets too slow cars will go somewhere else. Worth considering pedestrian overpasses.

- There is another piece of public comment in the LOC members inbox

Committee Business (None)

Vision Zero Subcommittee Update and Discussion

- Tyler V.: the LOC advise and monitor the \$1.55B transportation levy. In June we formed a Vision Zero (VZ) subcommittee. Traffic deaths and fatalities are going in the wrong direction. I see many people are in the letter making comments. The purpose of the meeting today is to reconcile comments and then vote so we can send the letter to the Mayor and SDOT.
- Tyler V.: I want to have a discussion on questions and comments. The subcommittee has had the opportunity to work on the letter for the last couple of weeks. We want to transmit this letter as soon as possible. We will approach editing the letter like we did the Charter by going through comments and then going to discussion.
- Let's go through the 6 recommendations:
 1. Right size delivery timelines. We have heard from public comments and committee about how long some of these improvements take.
 2. Incorporate a safety improvement on any project on the high injury network
 3. Flexible quick build rapid response program to respond to collisions
 4. Accelerate 12 safety designs so the planning is done in the first half of the Levy
 5. Protect and grow Neighborhood Traffic Calming and Safe Streets for All
 6. Require SDOT to report annually on safety funding. Ensure the funding is going to the highest priority corridors
- Jack W.: Would like to raise some factual questions. Is #6 already moot?
- Tyler V.: Currently SDOT reports on safety funding. There are some aspects that might be outdated. There are calls from Council for an audit. We should have that information as well. Every project in the levy is supposedly a safety project.
- Steve P.: Safety should be way up there in terms of priority even above equity. Safety needs to be at the very beginning and ensure that spending is for safety
- Jack W.: SDOT management would say that that is the case. SDOT intention is strong but execution is questionable.
- Steve P.: I want to see that wrapped in 6.
- Lynda F.: I have a 7th addition. Engineering without enforcement is moot. Want to direct SPD to add enforcement. Maybe this is a separate letter. If we are only relying on engineering, we are missing something.
- Jack W.: Levy funds can't direct the actions of SPD.
- Steve P.: Want to know in what decade that would happen with SPD. I would rely on SDOT more than SPD but that direction should go somewhere else.
- Lynda F.: There needs to be a wholistic effort including engineering and enforcement.
- Jack W.: For #2, my suspicion is that this is already true. We might disagree on how but I would say they do this. I would delete number #2.

- Lucy S: For #2, is there a list of safety treatments we are asking SDOT to consider? Otherwise we are caught between these two projects. The question is are we asking them to do something beyond what they normally do. We should be clear what we are asking. What was the intent of this statement?
- Tyler V.: This was conceptual. I am not the expert. Things may change; I want SDOT to be able to adapt.
- Lucy S.: I worry that if SDOT says we already do this, this statement will won't move the needle.
- Chase K.: We want SDOT to demonstrate accountability. When levy funds are used on the high injury network, demonstrate the safety improvements done on this project.
- Tyler V.: We can ask SDOT for the right language for prioritization and mitigation techniques.
- Steve P.: How do we ascribe degrees of risk to a particular area to different modes: speeding, racing. What is the right answer if we don't know what the risk is?
- Jack B: For #2, would it make sense to incorporate a safety treatment vs a rational for not some other treatment?
- Tyler V.: We want to prioritize safety over thru-put traffic for all projects on the high injury network.
- Zach B.: I like that change
- Jack W.: For #5, how do we know that it is statistically valid to shift more money to that program. Local streets already have low speeds. SDOT has installed a lot of Toronto barriers not necessarily a safety treatment. For neighborhood traffic calming, this might not be at the top safety wise. Follow the data.
- Tyler V.: Neighborhood traffic calming program or safer streets. As a Levy oversight committee, there are a place we can see the data, injuries or deaths. If they gathered other placemaking data, when it comes to these programs they are funded for the community. When people can see it, it builds trust. Shouldn't just focus on arterials.
- Chase K.: The data might not just be about safety it might be about quality of life. I won't let my daughter play in the street because there are no sidewalks.
- Steve P.: How would we go about getting the data we would need to drive the safety projects. I agree with Jack. Are we wasting money? Like protected bike lanes as an example. I have gone to council several times about the use of technology. That is how we fill a gap with the police.
- Rafi R.: For #5, while this letter is focused on VZ, it is a worthy discussion of backing up dollars with data. These programs do change the data. Comfortable keeping it in this letter.
- Lynda F.: The mayor is against surveillance. I am a huge proponent of technology as part of the solution, but maybe we should leave out of the letter
- Kaid N R.: This goes to TEF 43.6. Replaces non policing interventions. Want to refer back to the TEF
- Saroja R.: It is fine to have the priority. What does it mean to fund something at or above that level. If you fund above it, you are taking from somewhere else. What are not funding if we do this. I don't know what the tradeoffs are? This applies for #3 and #5.
- Jack W.: I made the same general comment. What is the opportunity cost of shifting money around.

- Tyler V.: That is the reality of letters. I know the trade off of not prioritizing safety you see people dying on our streets. 2030 is just around the corner. There are aspects of accelerating this, tradeoffs. What is it? Is it the engagement timeline? Are there things in the project delivery process we could move forward? We understand that tradeoffs will be needed.
- Saroja R.: It would be great to have a little more information especially if there is a specific spending amount or timeline. For example, for #3. I don't know what that means. I need more information. Like #1 it is great goal but I don't know what that means. Can SDOT give us some examples. I would like more background information.
- Tyler V.: We Need to remove the SS4A mention. We intended that to be NISPP
- Meghan S.: SS4A is a federal grant.
- Zach B.: After talking, I don't know where to prioritize my responses. #4 is something we could really allocate funding to prioritize VZ projects. The tradeoff is saving lives. With the VZ team here. Let's just ask them direct questions. Do we want to shrink it to be more specific. Lots of good questions being asked.
- Tyler V.: It looks like we got a lot of feedback. I don't think we are in a place to have a vote.
- Zach B.: In other modal boards we have done a general vote on sentiment and goal and give permission to sub committee to finalize.
- Lynda F.: There are some things about tradeoffs we haven't nailed. Trade offs is a big exercise.
- Jack W.: Zach's question on timing. Okay, not doing it as quickly as the sub-committee wanted. The committee can work on this and come back in September.
- Alex K.: We have space on the September agenda. Happy to work with you to have that be incorporated into future meeting as you think through next steps
- Steve P.: I agree with Zach and Jack. I applaud the sub-committee who wrote the letter. It gets across idea we think are important.
- Jack B.: Agree with the process next steps. Message based on feedback. As we think about trade-offs, I don't think we should get too far in the weeds. This is the start of the conversation. Not incumbent on us to come up with the trade-offs.
- Zach B.: We are asking for city to accelerate VZ. We want to be the loudest voice in the room.
- Saroja R.: We don't need to say what the trade-offs are, but we want to acknowledge there are trade-offs
- Chase K.: There is some work to do, some deeper dives with SDOT staff.
- Tyler V.: It is so cool to see people that care. This is a body of people who care. Care about moving stuff forward. Seattle leads when it comes to safety. Thankful to all of you for the conversation. Looking forward to September.

Adjourn: 6:00 PM

Action items

Action items below capture tasks from previous meetings and status.

Action	Responsibility	Status

