

Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting

Date/Time: Tuesday, August 3, 2021 / 5:00 – 7:00 PM

Co-chairs: Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Samuel Ferrara

Location: Video Conference

Members present on the phone: Sam F, Dennis Gathard, Inga Manskopf, Hester, Vicky Clark Ron Posthuma, Kevin, Patrick, Emily, Kristin Simpson, Chris Gregorich, Katie Olsen, Dawn Schellenberg, Chris Z, Tyler V, Francisca, Stefan, Kris Castleman, Simon Blenski, Monica Dewald, Christiana Farr, Ching Chan, Jennifer Lehman,

Members Absent: Ben Noble (City Budget Office), Lisa Bogardus, Joseph L, Alex Pedersen (council)

Guests:

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:04 PM

Public Comment

Rachel B: Asked if anyone wanted to give public comment – no one participated

Agenda Item #1: Presentation on Neighborhood Street Fund

Simon B – Walked the LOC through the current cycle showing which projects will be built by the end of this year. Talked about the improvements that were made in the cycle two (2019-21). Highlighted the increased level of outreach by partnering with the Department of Neighborhoods trying to meet people where they already are. The cycle received over 300 proposals with a spike from the areas of which outreach efforts were concentrated. That list of projects was brought to LOC who picked 15 projects in council districts 1, 3, and 5. Additionally, SDOT moved \$2,000,000 forward from the cycle 3 funding to cycle 2 funding. Introduced a modified project selection process that leverages the outreach that occurred during cycle two outreach. Proposed that SDOT/LOC would not replicate the cycle two outreach efforts but rather use projects from cycle two to fund with cycle three funding. Proposed that SDOT would focus on geographic equity areas primarily in council district 1, 2 and 5. Would review projects not selected in cycle two that fall within the geographic equity areas to judge feasibility of moving the projects forward. Benefits to the approach were outlined including leveraging previous detailed outreach efforts – which would be difficult to do during COVID. This wouldn't require individual/groups to resubmit their projects. Allows funds to go directly to building projects which may also allow design stage of projects to kick off early and potentially be built/completed earlier. If supported by the LOC the NSF group would come back with a list of projects for the LOC to consider. Will still build in outreach to let individuals throughout the community know that we are pursuing a modified approach and why it is being taken.

Hester – believes that this a thoughtful approach that doesn't make people re-apply. Has there been any indication from the public that safety needs have changed post COVID

Simon B. – SDOT/NSF team needs to talk to the applicants prior to selecting projects to understand if there has been any evolution in need/is still relevant

Jennifer L (Seattle Pd Board) – How much money is represented in Cycle 3 that would go toward additional projects?

Simon B. – About \$8M per cycle, however, \$2M was advanced from 2024 to 2019, leaving about \$6M. Additionally, some funding was shifted to the vision zero program leaving \$5 to \$5.5M for the cycle projects.

Ron P. – Likes this proposal from the staff saving cost and for the fact that there is not that much money available. Helps to level expectations with the community. Two issues 1) The relative quality of the proposals in the pool from cycle two – are we sure there is a rich enough pool of projects 2) We want to hear from BIPOC voices, concerned how we can still honor that effort on the selection process

Simon B. – There are about 60 projects from the pool that SDOT would be starting with. Would start with the projects that were most popular projects. These projects are those in the equity areas. If we need to go past those 60 projects, SDOT would have to check back in with the LOC. The outreach that occurred in 2019 really focused on BIPOC communities during the selection process which yielded a higher number of projects from these communities

Christiana F – A lot of the outreach that occurred happened at churches, grocery stores, community centers anywhere where SDOT could hear from a diverse group of people about concerns in their community. SDOT believes that building on these existing relationships is most advantageous.

Ron P – Accepts the fact that initial outreach effort was well done, however, a lot of time has passed since then and believes that there needs to be some sort of connection with BIPOC communities.

Emily WP – When we went to the voters and told them that there would be three cycles to be heard, but now we only use two and combined with the fact that communities have become more transitory, maybe asking people to resubmit as renters might have moved out or new renters have moved in and we will not hear from them.

Simon B. – This is why SDOT is not looking only at the ranking of the project and will conduct outreach with the applicant to understand the continued relevancy of the submitted project.

Sam F. – Projects vary in cost; it might be worthwhile to see the list of projects funded with the \$5,000,000 – there might be an opportunity to do more projects by not selecting very expensive projects that comprise a large portion of the available funding.

Simon B. – Similar to 2019, SDOT would come back to the LOC with a list of projects that represents more projects than what we have available funding with cost estimates. Would present the LOC with the opportunities to pursue whatever method they desire.

Kevin W. – Generally supportive of approach – would encourage rewriting the NSF website to reflect the change in process. Concerning equity, there are gradations of equity that the map (slide 7) does not consider. Encourages SDOT to be thoughtful on the equity location of the proposed project.

Simon B. – Could compile information on a multitude of factors to get around a binary approach to decision making based on equity.

Patrick – Generally supportive but curious about the cost of the outreach process – what is the price tag of going through the process and just using the cycle two project list.

Simon B. - The cost of outreach is roughly \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000 or the equivalent of three or more projects not being built.

Emily L. – Responding to the cost of the outreach effort – would like to see a FAQ with the community that emphasizes that we are prioritizing getting projects in the ground

Rachel B. – Really likes this approach to try to save money on the third cycle outreach since a more extensive process was done in cycle two than what we could do now because of COVID. SDOT needs to let people know that new projects will not be collected and for those projects that SDOT will be considering, is that project still relevant? Would rather see the \$1,000,000 outreach cost go to projects. In terms of involving the LOC it is important not to overwhelm the committee with more projects than they are able to review/visit. SDOT should keep in mind the limitations of the committee as volunteers.

Vicky C. – Believes that the comments from the LOC have been solid and emphasized communicating with the public and communicating with the project sponsors.

Simon – Concluded by expressing his appreciation for the feedback from the LOC.

Jennifer – There was a public comment from the LOC meeting in June about a NSF project in Mt. Baker, has there been follow up?

Sam F. – Received the letter and reviewed the changes. The evolution of the project kept the spirit of traffic calming but via different built infrastructure than what was originally proposed.

Agenda Item #2: Presentation on and discussion of SDOT's efforts to advance racial and equity and Seattle's Race and Social Justice Initiative

Ching C. – Began presentation with history of how RSJ began at the City of Seattle and how the city continues to emphasize RSJI as a core value. SDOT's approach to tackling equity including racial equity analyses (RETs), Public Engagement, Women and Minority Own Businesses in SDOT contracting. Walked the LOC through the process of how SDOT uses/considers both quantitative/qualitative data in its use of the Racial Equity Toolkits. Have applied this framework from our multimodal improvement programs and SDOT's 2020 COVID Assessment Impact report. SDOT has been working to alter the RET process such that more qualitative data could be collected. SDOT has also rolled out a RET-lite to encourage this framework be applied to smaller, not just large, projects. SDOT is working to establish a RET library that would be accessible through the web to increase transparency. SDOT ran the 2020 COVID Impact Assessment to evaluate the projects that were paused/canceled due to COVID 19. Share examples of where SDOT and the Levy used RETs to make transportation infrastructure more equitable; scooter share, seamless Seattle pedestrian Wayfinding program; Delridge RapidRide H to provide reliable transit corridors to job centers

Dawn S. – (continuation of presentation) Highlight on equitable distribution of Urban Forestry and tree planting throughout Seattle. Used data from Department of Neighborhoods and internal tree inventory to inform where 2,300 trees planted from the levy, 65% of trees have been guided toward disadvantaged communities. At the end of the levy will replicate this process and build it into the next levy or funding package. For the Delridge RapidRide H program less than 10 trees were removed, however, 5 times that number of trees were planted in the project area.

Ching C – Speaking on SDOT public outreach process. Translates materials and uses community reviews who read/speak/write the language to ensure accuracy of terminology and text. Works specifically to

familiarize SDOT and Levy branding with community. SDOT also partners with Department of Neighborhoods and the City's Community Liaisons (CL) to help penetrate outreach into the community. SDOT is currently exploring how community engagement can be compensated. SDOT attempts to meet people 'where they are' by setting up tables at shopping centers, community centers, community planned events such that they are not reliant on coming to the municipal tower or log on to public meetings

Dawn S – Stay Healthy Streets Little Brook Project – Worked with community liaison to establish a pilot stay health street and work with grassroots organizations to reach out to the community to understand how SDOT could improve the street to meet the community's need. SDOT serves as an administrative partner. SDOT is trying to increase the different entry points where community members can communicate their ideas and concerns.

Ching C. – WMBE (Women and Minority Owned Business). Happy to report that we are above the 23% goal of contracting with WMBE firms across the region. SDOT wants partner with WMBE businesses for 38% for contracts and 19% for purchasing. SDOT hosts *Working with SDOT* events to allow community to understand their opportunities to contract with SDOT for public infrastructure projects. SDOT attends public events to promote WMBE contracting opportunities. Moves on to discussion/questions from LOC.

Rachel B. – The numbers presented on the tree map (slide 10) , is that the number of trees that were planted? What could help for clarity is to make the year shading on the map clearer. Appreciative that SDOT led with tree planting in equity areas.

Dawn S. – The yellow dots are those that were planted in 2016, the dots do not represent an exact number but rather where we have been and where we have planted trees. The numbers overlaid on the map are how many trees we planted. Showed how we started the levy focusing on the underserved areas and then branch out into other neighborhoods throughout Seattle.

Jennifer – Appreciates seeing SDOT's continued engagement/commitment to RSJI. Particularly appreciated meeting people where they are out given that it is not always easy to engage with government.

Kevin W. – Exciting to see dialogue and commitment to progress equity. On slide 6, the link to the template. Curious how much use the template has provided and what the plan is to aggregate the use of the template to start understanding equity across the city.

Ching C. – The RET template that we use is very extensive. SDOT has began holding RET trainings to help SDOT staff understand how to fill them out and emphasize the importance of each individual RET. Not every project/program has traditionally gone through RET processes, however, SDOT is trying to change that. SDOT has provided an abbreviated RET template so that it is more accessible and consistently applied to every project.

Agenda Item #3 Levy Highlight from Q2

Katie Olsen (presenter) – new dashboard displaying deliverable and financial data, financial summary in progress, Quarter 2 highlights. SDOT completed the 12th Ave S Vision Zero project incorporating rechannelization, protected bike lanes, and sidewalk repair. Complete two safe routes to school projects in Westside School and Arbor heights school zones. In the Bike program SDOT complete 4.2 miles of bike

facilities and 68 new bike parking spaces as part of the Columbia City bike parking plan. The Delridge RapidRide H program is over halfway complete. SDOT have completed over half of the ADA curb ramps and new transit foundations, new signals, and upgraded water/storm/electrical utilities. SDOT completed design of Route 7, In Green Lake SDOT complete 500 new/improved curb ramps, enhanced crossings, sidewalk spot improvements, transit spot adjustments, and 13 miles of repaved arterial streets. Concerning bridges, installed Northgate Bridge spans over I-5, pushed toward the opening of Fairview Bridge. SDOT also repainted 2,060 crosswalks, began construction of NSF projects, 60 new trees planted in 2021. We will share the physical report with the committee in the coming week.

Ron P. – How did the bid come in on the Madison Street BRT project?

Inga M. – Will we get the Q2 report within the week and why was it delayed? Will this be covered in September meeting?

Katie O. – We are currently going through a review process with the City Budget Office

Rachel B. – Expects to see reports a week prior to LOC meeting.

Sam F. – The report will be on the September agenda.

Committee Business

Pedestrian Ped Board – Jennifer L. August meeting has invited an unhoused resident of the city to explore the intersection of pedestrian issues with community members experiencing homelessness. There were two pedestrian fatalities at the Columbia City light rail station – the ped board has reached out to ST to understand what improvements will be made to light rail stations to promote safety of pedestrians.

Transit Board – Emily. Took a July recess. In June heard from Metro on fare enforcement. KC Metro is trying to reimagine what fare enforcement of the future will look like. Board was presented with good plans on how they are approach community on fare enforcement. Expects follow up on this effort at the end of the year

Bike Board – Patrick. In June meeting received an update on progress for the Georgetown-South Park trail that is slated for construction in 2022. Board was briefed on integrated modal plan. Bike board continues to have concerns on this framework and the implications on the Bike Master Plan. Believes that the LOC should be briefed on this effort. Currently trying to recruit a new representative of the Bike Board to the LOC.

Finance Committee – Kevin W/Ron P Have not met

Project Implementation Committee – Rachel B. Have heard from Kristin Simpson (SDOT) Elliot H (MO) on the equity report that was received ahead of the LOC meeting to provide feedback.

Freight Board – Sam F has reached out to the freight board to secure a member on the LOC

Meeting minutes for approval (April 2, 2021 and June 1) – Rachel Ben- Shmuel, Sam Ferrara

Rachel B: call for corrections of June meeting minutes, has been seconded, and was unanimously passed.

Rachel B: There is an action list at the end of the minutes that would like to be used more actively than it has been in the past.

Rachel B Adjourned meeting at 6:57pm.

Action Items:

Action item	Meeting	Lead	Status	Deadline
Modal Integration Presentation	August 3, 2021			