**Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes**

**Date/Time:** Thursday, February 22, 2018 / 5:30 – 7:30 PM **Co-chairs:** Betty Spieth-Croll and Alex Krieg **Recorder:** Elliot Helmbrecht **Location:** City Hall, L280

**Members Present:** Joe Laubach, Blake Trask, Brian Estes, Alex Krieg, Betty Spieth-Croll, Saroja Reddy (for Ben Noble), David Seater, Emily Paine, Ron Posthuma, Hal Cooper (for Pat Cohn), Nick Paranjpye, Rachel Ben-Shmuel

**Members Absent:** Councilmember Mike O’Brien, Laurie Torres,

**Guests:** Genesee Adkins, Mike Terrell, Karen Melanson, Brian Sperry, Darby Watson, Jeff Lundstrom, Nick Makhani (all SDOT)

**MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:30 pm**

* **Public comment** (2 min. per person)

Kathy Dunn – Here to speak about the Fauntleroy project. She bikes around Seattle and has been waiting for eight years to get bike safety improvements. The sidewalks are used for biking and these are getting crowded, new businesses coming in all the time. She feels they can’t bike on the street because of current conditions. She went on two walking tours of the boulevard, the community has waited eight years, city needs to make getting through this neighborhood on bike/ped safe.

Ray Kruger –If the Fauntleroy project is delayed further, he would like to see the 35th Ave SW improvements prioritized in West Seattle. He would like this rebuilt as a portion of the Fauntleroy project that was delayed. He also requested a copy of the financial reports tonight with YTD revenue and expenditures listed (a copy was given to him).

Doug MacDonald – You can’t have meaningful public input if there is no information before the meetings (referring to the meeting materials). These need to be posted online well in advance of the meetings for these to be analyzed, none of the correspondence is available, needs to be a disciplined process. Transparency and accountability is what this is all about and more is needed.

* **January 2018 meeting minutes**

January meeting minutes were approved by the committee.

Co-chair report

* Fauntleroy project update

Alex reads text from the Fauntleroy project webpage:

*“We’re putting construction of the Fauntleroy Boulevard Project on hold.*

*Thanks for your continued interest in the Fauntleroy Way SW Boulevard Project. Based on community input and continued coordination with Sound Transit, we are putting construction of the Fauntleroy Boulevard Project on hold. This decision responds to community concerns about prolonged construction and effective use of taxpayer dollars.*

*Sound Transit’s current proposed route for the voter-approved light rail extension to West Seattle includes an elevated rail line on Fauntleroy Way. If built after the Fauntleroy Boulevard Project, there is the possibility that Fauntleroy improvements would need to be removed and potentially rebuilt.*

*During our recent design outreach, we heard community concerns about dealing with major construction twice in such a short amount of time. The community also asked whether constructing the Fauntleroy Boulevard Project now, and potentially having elements of the project removed later, would be an effective use of public dollars. Our decision to put construction on hold will help to ensure that SDOT’s and Sound Transit’s plans for this stretch of Fauntleroy Way don’t conflict. We recognize West Seattle has multiple paving and transit priorities, and we will reallocate Fauntleroy Boulevard Project funds to address the community’s needs, based on community input.*

*Sound Transit is still in the early stages of their design for light rail to West Seattle, and they anticipate choosing a preferred alignment by mid-2019. Last month, the City announced plans to work closely with Sound Transit over the next 18 months to identify a preferred route for the light rail tracks and stations to the West Seattle Junction.”*

Lorelei – Reiterates messages above to the group: the decision to put this project on hold was largely the result of Sound Transit’s future plans for light rail to West Seattle. When SDOT revived this project after the passage of Move Seattle, we weren’t sure what the results would be for ST3. After ST3 passed, we continued with design still not sure where the alignment options would go. However, once it was clear that one of the options Sound Transit was considering was an elevated project along this same corridor, we made the decision to put the project on hold while a preferred alignment is decided.

Hal – Elevated or surface?

Lorelei – they are looking at elevated as one option.

Nick – What is the timeline for that project?

Lorelei – Spring of 2019 will have preferred alignment decision from ST, in construction in approx. 10 years.

Brain Estes – No preferred alternative for a number of years from now? What’s the impact on the community of not doing anything? What is the mitigation plan?

Lorelei – Since the decision was just recently made to put the project on hold, we do not have near-term plans for this community yet but we are starting to formulate near-term and long-term plans and can report back on these as they are developed.

Joe – Some people think it is still a good use of money. If ST tears things up they will replace what they tear up. These enhancements included a lot of improvements. It took eight years to get to this point. There is a sense of frustration with putting a project at 100% design on hold. It’s also frustrating to hear that the community will have to wait ten more years potentially. If we have substantial benefit in near term, there is a benefit to not wait so long.

Lorelei – We hear you. Construction fatigue in the neighborhood was a concern that we heard from a lot of community members, as well.

Hal – Is it possible to do sidewalks and bicycle lanes apart from ST project?

Lorelei – ST would need to acquire property and expand the ROW to fit and elevated project in the middle of Fauntleroy because the median is not wide enough. New sidewalks and bicycle lanes would have to be re-constructed potentially. Our paving timeline is 20 years and we want our investments to last that long.

Blake – What is the process for this committee when it comes to major decisions like this one? This project was touted as a selling point for the levy and a key levy deliverable. There is a lot of shifting going on and I would like to discuss the committee’s role more.

Betty – It is my hope that this is a unique situation with ST plans overlapping with levy projects. But I agree, this committee has two items in front of it right now. One: what is our role in general, and in specific with this one? And two: Short of us providing input, who gets to decide?

Mike Terrell – As we get more information from ST and do our own near-term, long-term planning we will look to the Mayor’s office and City Council for input on future decisions.

Brian – Safety was a major factor in this levy. If ST rips it out, then they pay to replace it. Upset with the judgment on this decision.

Blake – There are a lot of policy decisions going on here that need to be addressed.

Ron – There has also been a lot spent on design. (Note: $2.6M has been spent on planning and design out of a $16M project budget.)

Genesee Adkins (SDOT Chief of Staff) – In a statement given at and sent to the committee after the meeting:

*“I wanted to follow up with the oversight committee about some of the questions that were raised last week about the role of the committee, which came up in the context of the Fauntleroy Project. The oversight committee is a deliberative body that we’re very interested in hearing recommendations from, and we take their feedback seriously.*

*Specific to the Fauntleroy Project, SDOT will know more about Sound Transit’s plans for this corridor in about a year, when Sound Transit identifies a preferred alternative for their route to West Seattle. Since there are a wide range of possibilities for the potential impact of light rail construction, we want to proceed carefully with Fauntleroy Project improvements.*

*Our staff and the community have put a lot of time and energy into this project, which is now at final design, and the design work that went into getting it to the level it is at now is still valuable. Elements of the design can be incorporated into Sound Transit’s plans or SDOT work, when it makes sense to do so.*

*We are also looking at several options that could happen in the near-term, and the decision to put the original project on hold does not preclude any short-term investments. But if we were to move forward with construction of the original full design and Sound Transit ultimately decided to go with its currently proposed aerial alignment, our investment – and the public’s levy dollars – would be jeopardized or lost to some degree because of how the pillars of the rail could potentially shift out the entire footprint of the road, and by extension any bicycle and pedestrian facilities. This a tough call, and something we take very much to heart, which is why we made the choice to hold.*

*The decision to put the project on hold while Sound Transit chooses a preferred alternative helps to avoid prolonged construction for residents and businesses in this neighborhood and responds to concerns about effective use of Move Seattle levy dollars.”*

 Brian would like to get Genesee’s statement in writing from SDOT (see note above).

Alex – This could have been mentioned at our meeting four weeks ago. I encourage SDOT to think about the lines of communication. Doesn’t feel like the right way for this thing to be communicated to the committee.

Alex also discloses that he is now working at ST.

Betty – Requested Elliot to work with SDOT staff to get a look ahead with appropriate times to for the committee to weigh in on this and other important decisions?

* **Annual committee report**

Betty – passes out draft letter to committee. In order to get this into SDOTs annual report. It will need to be approved in April.

If you have comments, please send to co-chairs and/or Elliot in the next two weeks.

* **Modal Board Representative Updates**

Skipped in the interest of time and also because we recently met four weeks ago.

* **Director’s Message**

Deputy Director Mike Terrell - filling in for Interim Director Sparrman - today.

As Interim Director Goran Sparrman mentioned at the January 2018 Levy Oversight meeting, SDOT is currently undergoing a comprehensive Levy to Move Seattle portfolio review and assessment. SDOT, and more specifically, the Office of Move Seattle (OMS) is evaluating the entire Levy portfolio, not just individual projects or sub-programs, to determine how best to meet the Levy deliverable commitments. OMS will present their findings to the Mayor, City Council, and Levy Oversight Committee over the next few months.

In the meantime, we wanted to provide an update on the process of this ongoing work. Due to the significant levels of leverage (grants and partnerships) required on many of the large levy capital projects, and uncertainty in the feasibility of receiving these funds due to the federal administration change in 2016, planning and design work has been complex with many additional project scope analyses and scenarios currently being performed as a part of the assessment.

The plan around that April meeting would be to come back and talk to you all about that when he is back in the office on the 5th.

* **2017 Q4 Update**

From the distributed materials:

$30M of grants accepted in 2017 for levy projects

* $15M for Lander from various state and federal grants (in addition to the $45M from the Feds)
* $4M for an ITS project in the SR 520/UW area

Life to date for levy grants (not including partnerships) is just over $200M

47 Safe Routes to School projects have been completed in first two years (7 of the 12 Move Seattle priority schools)

51.3 lane-miles of major paving projects (Levy = 180 lane-miles goal)

Over 59 new blocks of sidewalk have been installed (low-cost & traditional)

Construction on S Lander St Bridge starting early this year

Deliverable targets missed in 2017 included: protected bike lanes, neighborhood greenways, AAC paving program lane-miles, AMM paving program spot improvements, traffic signals installed, bike parking and new sidewalks.

Alex – There is still confusion around the way we display accomplishments and spending.

Blake – Based on 2017 deliverables, it’s unclear how this relates to 2016. How do we understand the long term impacts on the levy if deliverables are missed in a given year? His suggestion was to figure some sort out a carry-forward metric for deliverables, not just finances. Deliverable carry-forward number?

Blake – Curious about the inclusion of in-lane bike lanes in the deliverable counts since it wasn’t a specified levy deliverable.

Elliot - You’re correct. It’s not a specified levy deliverable but we’ve included it here because we thought committee members would be interested in knowing this number. It can be removed from the spreadsheet in the future if the committee doesn’t want it listed.

The committee would also like more information about how arterial lane line paving is completed by SDOT crews.

David – I am discouraged that we missed the bike parking deliverable considering some parking was added under the battery street tunnel.

Elliot: This deliverable was missed because SDOT ran out of racks to install at the end of the year and we only place bulk order a few times per year. We still doing very well towards our 9-year, 1,500 goal.

Brian – Please add a cumulative deliverable count column to the table in the future and add it to the annual report.

Ron – I know the multimodal corridor program is short on money. Why is this program not being made up with the Fauntleroy money? The multimodal corridor program are on a timeline to make funding decisions because of the Council SLI.

Elliot – We have not made any decisions about the Fauntleroy funding and if the committee would like to recommend this option, it would require a larger discussion.

Joe – (Speaking about Fauntleroy) If the City has decided on use of money, it should go to next highest citywide (or MSL) priority.

Brian – Requested the Attachment A level of detail to be included in the SDOT annual report.

Ron – It is concerning that “maintenance and repair” is underspending for a program that should be an SDOT staple. Would like to know more about this.

Elliot – The “maintenance and repair” category includes the AAC paving program funding, which we mentioned had projects delayed in 2017 and missed its deliverable target. Because of the size of that program, this leads to significant underspending when rolled up with other programs.

Alex – Why was Accessible Mt Baker project only 6% spent in 2017?

Darby - We did not have a consultant or a PM during that timeframe, but we have one now. We can update the committee on this project if you all want one.

Alex – Will this work be coordinated with RapidRide Rainier project?

Darby – It will be coordinated but not packaged together, we want to keep them separate.

Alex – We have a finance subcommittee to bring these things to our attention that has been going well. If you are interested in the very fine details, I encourage you to also attend those meetings.

Brian – Requests this information sooner.

* **CDM Smith Report Responses**

SDOT passes out CDM Smith responses.

Brian Sperry – Discusses four of the SDOT responses to the CDM report findings:

Finding #20 – Baseline Scope & Budget Validation

Office of Move Seattle (OMS) Response: SDOT is currently undergoing a comprehensive Levy to Move Seattle portfolio review and assessment. It has become apparent that a portion of the assumed leverage funds (grants) are unlikely to become available, yet SDOT is determined to scale the scope of projects to meet the goals stated in the Levy.

OMS is evaluating the entire Levy portfolio, not just individual projects or sub-programs, to determine how best to meet the Levy deliverable commitments. OMS will present their findings to the Mayor, City Council, and Levy Oversight Committee over the next few months.

Finding #11 – Risk Management Approach

OMS Response: In August 2017, the Office of Move Seattle created a new Risk Register that all project managers now use that includes information about the probability of risk, dollars and/or working days of impact, proactive risk management strategies, and summation of total risk exposure in dollars and working days.

To ensure that risks requiring escalation are elevated to executive staff in a timely manner, OMS leads monthly project delivery meetings with executives to review project status, schedule, budget, and key risks that could affect delivery.

Finding #4 – Handoffs between Divisions

OMS Response: Last August, SDOT began reinforcing the formal process of handoff from the Project Development (PD) division to the Capital Projects (CPRS) division. This process requires each capital project to go through the Project Definition Steering Committee1 and verify that all project handoff requirements have been met. This handoff requires executive level signatures to proceed. OMS is now responsible for monitoring the follow-through of this process by both divisions.

Additionally, all projects have a CPRS project manager assigned at the 0% project milestone. The CPRS project manager is now responsible for the project through all phases of design and construction. This eliminates a step in the process and avoids potential conflicts, resulting in fewer variances to schedules and costs.

Finding #22 – Office of Move Seattle staffing

OMS Response: In September 2017, OMS began utilizing consultants to assist in managing OMS duties and a further assessment of OMS staffing needs will be performed in late 2018 to determine whether additional staff need to be added to the OMS team. This staffing assessment is scheduled to be available by the end of 2018.

Brian Estes - What are Darby’s thoughts?

Darby Watson – This is consistent with when we started thinking that there was a better way to deliver projects. The old system wasn’t working as well as it could have been. Our project managers were trying hard within that system to make things work but there were some challenges. When we sat down with OMS to talk about 10% handoff, we knew that handoff wasn’t working. The teams came up with this decision to remove the handoff.

Betty: We have spent a lot of time now responding to this report and I have three points. 1. Hopefully the resources put in to revamping the system pays off soon. 2. Are we doing all of that from our own internal systems or did the consultant provide ideas for better ways? 3. How is this so different from BTG? Why was this a whole different set of approaching projects that didn’t work?

Darby – Our processes worked for BTG but this levy is on a much bigger scale. It was before my division (Project Development) existed, so we are learning and adjusting as we go, as well.

Mike Terrell: Our processes worked throughout BTG but it wasn’t ideal. And the department benefited from the economic downtown and we are working in a different economic climate that we were during that levy that has introduced some added challenges.

Brian Sperry - We are seeing some improvements already and mentioned the streamlining of processes. CDM Smith is doing a check-in in April 2018. We are bringing in consultants to help with some of the other recommendations.

Betty - Is Move Seattle levy money paying for consultants?

Mike Terrell - Yes.

Committee - Are the finding they address resulting in the underspending?

Mike – Underspending has been the result of the ramp up.

Nick: Did they have recommendations on dealing with personnel issues?

Brian Sperry: Yes, finding #6 is related to staff morale and trust.

Alex: I think it’s important going forward that we document economic climate and document the challenges so these lessons don’t have to be re-learned at the start of the next levy.

Blake: I would like more information about this report and when we can expect a follow-up.

Betty - This is clearly an ongoing body of work and we expect to hear back.

*(There was considerable frustration amongst the committee that they received these materials the day of the meeting, many of them not seeing them until the were passed out. SDOT will continue to improve our processes to ensure the committee members receive all materials in advance of the meetings so there is ample time for review.)*

* **Committee Survey Results**

The committee quickly reviewed the results of a recent survey they all completed.

In response to “SDOT has clear measures in place to help Committee members track Levy to Move Seattle progress.”

Brian Estes – I think there is an opportunity in SDOT’s annual report to improve upon the measurements on the dashboard. I’d like to discuss this more at a future meeting.

Alex – This brings us back to outputs vs outcomes. What are the departments greater mode split goals. There is not a clear articulation in the departments vision that are beyond the levy regarding progress.

* **New business**

No new business was discussed.

**Action items**Action items below capture action items from previous meetings, beginning with the February 2018 meeting. Complete items will remain on action item tracker for one additional meeting minutes to capture “complete” status and then be removed.

| **Action item** | **Meeting** | **Lead** | **Status** | **Deadline** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Send April meeting date to committee members | Feb. 22 | Elliot | **Complete:** Elliot sent date to committee members | March 2 |
| Sent Fauntleroy statement from Genesee Adkins to committee members | Feb. 22 | Elliot | **Complete:** Elliot sent statement and included in summary online | March 2 |
| Review final version of annual letter for approval at April meeting | Feb. 22 | LOC co-chairsElliot | **Complete:** Letter approved | April 24 |
| Create timeline for appropriate opportunities for the LOC to receive updates and feedback re: Fauntleroy | Feb. 22 | Elliot | **Complete:** Reflected in May Fauntleroy action item above | April 24 |
| Data on how SDOT tracks cumulative progress or delay for projects | Feb. 22 | Elliot | Elliot to work with team to send data to LOC | June 7 |
| Data with breakdown of striping and how SDOT determines whether to stripe or restripe a road | Feb. 22 | SDOT | Elliot to provide data via email | June 1 |
| Further discussion about SDOT responses to the CDM Smith Report and follow-up in 2018 and when the committee can expect an update | Feb. 22 | SDOT | Updates included as part of assessment work | Ongoing |
| Add cumulative deliverable count to SDOT annual report | Feb. 22 | SDOT | Elliot to track and add | TBD |
| Add discussion to future agenda regarding performance measures on the levy dashboard | Feb. 22 | SDOT | Elliot to add to future agenda | TBD |
| Send materials earlier to committee | Feb. 22 | SDOT | **Complete:** Since April, SDOT has been sending materials earlier to LOC members | April 20 |
| Review policy regarding posting meeting materials online | Feb. 22 | LOC co-chairsElliot | Elliot to add to future agenda | TBD |

**MEETING ADJOURNMENT: 7:30 PM**