

Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

Date/Time: Thursday, August 23, 2018 / 5:30 – 8:30 PM

Co-chairs: Betty Spieth-Croll, Alex Krieg

Location: City Hall, Room L280

Members Present: Rachel Ben-Shmuel; Don Brubeck (substitute for Emily Paine); Betty Spieth-Croll; Brian Estes; Alex Krieg; Joe Laubauch; Nick Paranjpye; David Seater; Erin Tighe (substitute for Ron Posthuma); Blake Trask

Members Absent: Pat Cohn, Ben Noble, Councilmember Mike O'Brien, Ron Posthuma, Emily Paine,

Guests: , Jim Curtain, Summer Dawson, Monica DeWald, Matt Donahue, Brian Dougherty, Ben Hansen, Elliot Helmbrecht, Mafara Hobson, Maria Koengeter, Serena Lehman, Jeff Lundstrom, Nick Makhani, Rodney Maxie, Goran Sparrman, Brian Sperry, Cristina Van Valkenburgh, Darby Watson, Lorelei Williams, CJ Jackson (all SDOT)

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:30 PM

Public Comment (2 min. per person)

Jules James: My name is Jules James. I am an Eastlake resident. I ask that the Roosevelt RapidRide be removed from this levy. Please give the Northgate light rail and the 1st avenue streetcar time to become operational. If the Central Connector succeeds three years from now, it is a fair bet that the streetcar system will extend up Eastlake, eliminating and removing the bike lanes that Roosevelt RapidRide would have just put on Eastlake. If the Central Connector fails, this project would spend \$10 million, shortening an already-doomed South Lake Union Streetcar. This project wastefully spends transit dollars with both outcomes. Move Seattle could build two useful RapidRide lines for the cost of this project. This project proposes zero load zones south of Lynn Street. Lyft, Uber and private shuttles will have no place for picking up riders for a mile along Eastlake. Paratransit ADA access to neighborhood storefronts will become alley entrance only. Take-out drivers will be staging from the center-turn lane, dashing across traffic lanes with their food. SDOT is creating a menace out there. This project will reduce peak-hour lanes on an arterial from two to one – one block, 32 times/hour by a stopped bus loading. This is self-induced gridlock. This project proposes 34% of the roadway for bike lanes while eliminating 50% of peak-hour traffic capacity, 75% of load zones in Eastlake and 100% of the neighborhood's arterial-parking capacity for the exclusive use of less than 1% of the roadway's overall users. The Roosevelt RapidRide is premature for the transit grid and dangerously designed for my Eastlake neighborhood. Let a better plan arise later and thank you very much for letting me speak.

Kate Duleuba: My name is Kate and I live in Eastlake. I have some stuff to hand out to you all. First off, there is a letter handed out by SDOT in March of 2016 to all small businesses in Eastlake. It did not include bikes, no mention of parking loss or anything like that. They received 41 responses to their survey, 31 were in Eastlake and 10 were technically outside of Eastlake. In response, when I got wind of this project, we did our own survey and received 58 responses. None of them were aware of the Roosevelt RapidRide Project, multiple minority-owned businesses, multiple concerns for paraplegic and quadriplegic patients being dropped off. Second piece is the [mailer that went out in December of 2017](#) to some, but

not all, Eastlake residents. Again, it does not show bikes anywhere on the map or anywhere in the text. I also wanted to hand out, from the scoping meeting in December, all the public comments received about the project. They received 135 total negative comments against the project as it stands right now, 66% of the total comments received. I just want you to be aware that if Roosevelt RapidRide comes to Eastlake under the current plan, expect a fight. And really quick, there was a comment made at the last meeting about Save 35th and Save our Eastlake and how we are anti-bike. We are not, we are pro-small business. I hope we can work together to find a compromise to make everyone in our communities happy, healthy and safe.

Eric Fisk: Cycling advocates, residents and small businesses all agree that SDOT is messing up on Green Lake Way where they are putting the transition from the two-way cycle track to the one-way cycle track at N 52nd St. SDOT is calling it a compromise. We see it as trying to declare metrics on their sheet. There is no one that we have talked to, either at SDOT or outside of SDOT, who supports the design as it exists today. We asked them why they are doing the transition at N 52nd St and not at the Pitch & Putt at N 55th St or at N 46th St where there is a regional greenway crossing. Their response is they are not looking at the intersection at N 50th St and Stone Way because it is out of scope. Instead, they are adding an entirely new signal at N 52nd St. They say, “We can’t look at that signal so in order to not look at that signal, we are going to put in a new signal that no one wants.” They are also going to be taking out a rapid flashing beacon that they just put in six months ago. So, it is a project that is happening without support from anyone. We have not been able to have a good meeting with SDOT about it. We worked very well with Brian Dougherty before, and had a great relationship with him, to come up with designs. At this point, there is no one at SDOT who is working with the Wallingford Community Council or the Green Lake Community Council or anyone in the neighborhood to come up with designs that work for everybody. Our ask is that you ask SDOT to look at these designs seriously – to look at changes to the N 50th St and Stone Way intersection and say look, if we are going to pave the whole area, let’s do it right. Why not add the regional greenway crossing at N 46th St, save parking along a seven-block stretch, have a two-way cycle track with fewer crossings across busy arterials that will be better for cyclists? It’s win-win-win for everybody.

Alex: Elliot received an email from Myrna Basich, similar to the comments we just heard but specific to the 35th Ave NE project.

From: Myrna Basich
Sent: Thursday, August 23, 2018 12:06 PM
To: Helmbrecht, Elliot
Subject: Communication to MSOC for August 23, 2018 special meeting

Elliot, please provide this email to the MSOC membership prior to or at their meeting tonight.

Many thanks.

Dear members of the Move Seattle Oversight Committee,

Having attended several of your meetings, members of the Save 35th NE coalition appreciate your hard work to develop a package of recommendations to the Mayor for “resetting” the Move

Seattle levy. Our coalition is prepared to engage now and during the upcoming public comment period to make our concerns known to the Oversight Committee and the Mayor.

Our group is NOT anti-safety, we are not anti-bike lane, and ours is not a NIMBY action – our opposition to the dedicated bike lane component of the 35th Avenue NE project is based on the LACK of pedestrian and bicycle safety inherent in the current design. To that end, we have been actively promoting that the city instead enhance our existing 39th NE greenway and/or establish a second greenway in one of a variety of possible locations within our neighborhood at far lower cost than the proposed designated bike lanes. Alternatively, the portion of funding in the project budget for implementing designated bikelanes could be diverted to other BMP priorities across the city.

We understand, based on your recent discussions, that the MSOC is concerned about lost or impaired pedestrian access, lost or ineffective Metro service, “level of traffic stress”, and about making significant improvements to the bicycle network. In particular, you have signaled priorities of completing the Downtown network and making network connections to the city’s designated Urban Villages. These priorities make good sense, particularly in an environment of rising construction costs and diminished revenues. Since downtown bike facilities, where the greatest number of bicycle trips are actually occurring, are more costly to construct, SDOT will need to consider those higher costs when updating the Move Seattle implementation plan this fall. But for the record, **our neighborhood has not been designated as an Urban Village by the city, and the bicycle facilities planned for 35th NE do not safely or seamlessly connect to significant elements of the city’s bicycle network.** *(please see the details of our neighborhood’s concerns that follow)*

We understand that the Move Seattle Oversight Committee will be making broad, programmatic recommendations to the Mayor and will not likely address individual, discrete projects, but hope that the Committee will recognize the example that the 35th Avenue NE project provides for rescoping and reprioritizing current as well as future projects during the “reset”. Some SDOT staff have stated that the ultimate decision on proceeding with the 35th dedicated bike lanes can occur at the completion of construction when the striping design is finalized, so the scope of this project is not totally “cast in concrete” at this time.

Sincerely,

Myrna Basich
Save 35th Avenue NE

Details of our neighborhood’s concerns:

It has been widely published that riding bicycles on busy arterials, particularly those carrying regular transit service, is less safe than riding on neighborhood streets. We are also seriously concerned about the well-being of our neighboring businesses and community services, like the library and houses of worship, should they lose 60% of the on-street parking, on which they have historically relied, as is proposed.

We are concerned that, as designed, the 35th Avenue NE “repaving” project will NOT address the MSOC’s stated concerns about lost or impaired pedestrian access, lost or ineffective Metro

service, “level of traffic stress”, and about making significant improvements to the bicycle network. Instead, we fully anticipate actual harm to our community. Over 4,000 community members who have signed our petition, and over 50 small businesses in our business district believe that:

- Pedestrian safety will be greatly impaired. With parking restricted to one side of the street, many more children, adults, seniors, and disabled persons will have to cross this busy street. Based on the city’s own parking numbers, we will be losing almost 300 on-street parking spots between NE 60th and NE 85th, where our primary business district and community gathering spaces are located.
- Bus service timing and reliability will be harmed, with buses caught up in traffic in the one remaining congested through lane each direction and, as noted above, with far more frequent pedestrian crossings at signalized, flashing, or unsignalized intersections. In addition, due to the removal of the bus stop pairing at NE 68th, access to the city’s most frequently used branch library (over 800 visits per day) together with a church, synagogue, and multi-family housing will be lost at this community gathering corner.
- Already significant congestion on 35th NE will increase further as anticipated redevelopment, particularly more multi-family housing, occurs, and result in increased cut-through traffic on neighborhood streets. Ironically, the city’s traffic modeling for this project does NOT include the anticipated 850 additional residential units and 102,000 to 225,000 square feet of commercial/retail space contemplated in The Future of 35th Ave NE study completed by the city’s Planning Department in January 2015 OR the even greater amount of redevelopment contemplated under HALA.
- The proposed dedicated bike lanes don’t connect safely or seamlessly to other bikeways. They will connect to existing sharrows at the north end of the project, but the planned sharrows south of NE 68th do not connect to the Burke Gilman trail or other safe bike path. The closest connection point is where 35th meets NE 47th Street, known among our local biking community as “Dead Man’s Curve”, where southbound riders must cross busy 35th at a blind corner. Staff apparently are now recommending that, instead of following 35th in sharrows for its duration, which would still be striped, bikers actually deviate from 35th to drop down to the 39th Avenue NE greenway at NE 68th to make connections to Burke Gilman. This design is not very logical.

Ironically, the dedicated bike facility is intended to provide a quicker through-route for bicycle commuting and avid cyclers but, as designed, those using the bike lanes will regularly be put in conflict with Metro buses. Rob Gannon, General Manager of Metro, in an email dated May 25, 2018, responded to our coalition’s questions stating:

“Regarding the configuration of the 35th Avenue NE bike lanes, customers who are boarding or exiting the bus will do so at the curb as they do now. They will not need to cross the bike lane. Transit operators will merge in and out of the bike lane to reach the curb.... People biking when a bus is serving a stop will have the option of waiting or passing carefully.”

Buses merging in and out of the bike lanes does not promote bicycle safety. **Not only does this project not serve our business/residential community well, but it really does not do a great job of serving the avid bicycling proponents of this project, either.**

Approve Previous Meeting Minutes

Blake: Correction, I did not attend the meeting.

LOC members: Approved August 2 meeting minutes with correction.

Co-chair report

Alex: We do have a few new members who are not yet officially members but will be approved by the Seattle City Council Sustainability and Transportation Committee on September 7. Their names are Hester Serebrin and Lisa Bogardus.

Betty: Hester is taking Shefali's place in a Mayor-appointed position. Lisa is taking Dustin's Mayor-appointed position as he has moved outside the City of Seattle which is a requirement for serving on this committee. Will Lisa technically be representing labor or just an appointment?

Elliot: Just an appointment.

Brian: Wasn't there another woman – Laurie Torres – on the committee?

Alex: Laurie resigned from the committee.

Elliot: That's right which means you also have another council-appointed vacancy.

- **Director's report**

Goran: I wanted to take the opportunity to say a few words because I have one more week and then there will be a new interim director. I wish I could tell you tonight who that is going to be, but that decision is pending. I cannot help but reflect on the past six months – we began with looking at the levy program to ensure that we were meeting commitments within current fiscal resources. I basically just want to say thank you. The reality is that these things are hard work and looking back, we may have been somewhat optimistic four to five months ago when we thought we would be done by now and have a new plan to move forward and execute. The reality is that we have a little bit more work to do but I will remind you that I said back in May that it was more important to get this right than to do it fast. And to get this right, we really needed your help and our modal advisory board's deep engagement, and that has happened. I'm profoundly thankful, both to our modal advisory boards and to this committee. One more quick comment is that while this committee has been very engaged, we also have pretty strong engagement from the Mayor's Office. The Mayor is paying close attention and continues to look for opportunities to strengthen the program and look for additional budgetary resources. It's good news but does mean we need to sweat the project details a bit more which I know you are helping us to do. Tonight, in my view is largely a status report on the work in progress rather than a finished product. Again, I really appreciate the hard work, and this is the kind of work that can't happen without the deep engagement of the committee members. For me, a profound thank you to everybody and a special thanks to your two co-chairs. I really enjoyed working with you. It has been a very interesting, and one cannot deny, often a very challenging eight months but a really good effort that reflects the community values and responds to the commitments that voters made a number of years ago.

Betty: When I learned it was Goran taking this position earlier this year, I was delighted because I have had the opportunity to work with Goran previously, so I thought this was the right guy to come in and do this. I want to thank you because this has been, certainly a lot of work, but also all new stuff. You guys were making this up as you went in the best possible way. You were trying to figure out what had gone wrong and I think you outlined a good process ahead and as we all acknowledged, we didn't even really know what we were heading into as we undertook that. You did the work before we took it on to take it to the next step and provide our input. I personally want to thank you for the time you spent here. I wish it were longer and that you would take us further. We'll miss you.

- **Green Lake and Wallingford Paving & Multimodal Improvements**

Elliot: At our last meeting, we had some folks give public comment about the Green Lake and Wallingford Paving & Multimodal Improvements. I sent you all a presentation that was given at a different project meeting and a [project handout](#). Our project team also put together a response that I can hand out as well with some additional details about the project. Hearing some public comment today, I think it would be a disservice to read the letter and call it good. I would entertain a motion to pass out this letter and have the full project team come back to respond to some of the concerns we heard tonight and provide a more detailed project update.

Alex: Is this project an Arterial Asphalt and Concrete (AAC) project?

Lorelei: Yes, it began as an AAC project and had other elements added to it. We worked to rename the project to better reflect the improvements on the street.

Alex: I feel like the 35th Ave NE project is similar in that it started as a paving project and now includes other elements. I understand that the cost of multimodal facilities is lower when combined with a paving project, but it does seem like there is a breakdown in engagement with the community around what those elements need to be. I'm incredibly sympathetic to the question of why we can't touch the N 50th St and Stone Way intersection – I don't live in that neighborhood but do not like traveling through that intersection. It's also important to be clear about the sequence of decision-making, what is in the scope, what is out of scope and why we might not actually address core issues.

Elliot: Those are all valid questions and is why I think we need the full project team here to address them.

Alex: Our charge needs to be to ask SDOT to recognize these types of projects as not just paving projects. In addition, maybe the approach that is taken to engage can't just be straightforward as if the project was merely a paving project. It seems that these projects end up turning into mode wars which is not a good thing.

Lorelei: We are making changes around how we name things and how we describe them from the beginning. We take in this feedback to continually change what we're doing to make sure that communication is clear. Unfortunately, we have such limited right-of-way so when we join projects to gain efficiencies, the conversation has to be about how to prioritize the right-of-way. This conversation then becomes a conversation about what is being added that is not already there and what is being taken away. It is a challenge.

I'll also speak to a couple of things on the N 50th St intersection. That intersection does not operate at an acceptable level of service. We would love to do something different with it, but we recognize that the

“something different” is significant, and would close off lanes of the intersection and reallocate how we distribute traffic. In the context of paving funding plus supplemental sidewalk and bicycle funding, we do not have the financial ability to do what would need to be done to fully address that intersection. We recognize that we are not able to give everyone what they would like there right now. We looked at the signal at N 52nd St as a compromise because making the transition there rather than south of the Pitch & Putt allowed us to preserve the parking in that section on the east side of the street. In addition to that, it gives one more traffic-controlled spot for people to get out of the park, as well as a few other advantages. I totally understand the perspective of how it feels like we are just adding a signal and not fixing the one with the issues.

Nick: Is it a matter of communication? Are we communicating to the public why we chose the specific intersection at N 52nd St?

Lorelei: We have a communications team working with the public. We are working on coming back out to the public with the details I just shared with you. After hearing feedback, we had our own session internally to assess if the current location of the signal was the right location. The details I shared tonight was a synopsis of where we landed. The next step is to go out to the community and explain the compromise, including noting the added benefits to the signal and the challenges we face with funding.

Eric (Wallingford Community Council): It just feels like we are playing operator. I have never talked to you and I represent the transportation interests of the Wallingford Community Council. We have had lots of engagement with Krista but then we pass the message off to Krista and receive a response that is muddled. We put another response to Krista when more people are upset and then maybe in a month or two, we hear back. If we could just sit down with the people who make decisions. I don't know why there has to be layers between you [Lorelei] and me. That's the frustration. And I still disagree with your characterization of the intersection at N 50th St and Stone Way.

Elliot: I think we can work with you to schedule a larger discussion on this. Good questions are being asked but I also know we have a lot to get through.

Alex: I want to be mindful of patterns – people tend to give public comments when they are unhappy. There also seems to be a communications issue of whether people are working with the right folks rather than gate keepers who may or may not be communicating what needs to be communicated. I don't think we need to interrogate every single project but need to be mindful of the patterns happening across projects.

Don: This was presented to the Bicycle Advisory Board and it was obvious from public comments that there were several groups that have really made an effort to study this project to make it as good as it can be. I've been looking at projects in cost/mile because people keep talking about how expensive bike lanes are. This particular project is \$6M/mile so it is expensive. That signal at N 52nd St is about half a million of the \$12M total so it is a significant piece. The comments from the bike board and community representatives are that the signal at N 52nd St is not going to be a good compromise, will result in frustration for everyone and result in bike riders not following it because of the time it will take to use it. I'm happy to see that there will be response to the comments regarding the five-way intersection at Green Lake Way, but I would urge you to compromise when the compromise gives each party some of what they want but not compromise when it does not seem to have a great benefit for anyone.

Elliot: I'll work with the co-chairs to schedule an update at a future meeting.

- **Q2 2018 Financial Report**

Elliot: You'll notice that we made some updates to the report since we published our last report in Q1 2018. We are trying to reflect the feedback that you have provided over the last few months about wanting more financial and performance details. To start it off, we wanted to create a high-level summary of accomplishments. As you know, Q2 is not when most of our work gets done because it is still typically rainy and cold, so we have highlighted a few non-specific project accomplishments for Q2 as well.

In Q2, we repainted 538 crosswalks. As you know, our 2018 goal was 1500 and I can say that we have now met that goal. In Q2, we completed 4 safe routes to school projects and 11 different groundbreakings for projects. We also received \$6M in grant awards for levy projects with over \$20M still pending.

The rest of the report provides some details around the deliverable accomplishments that we track closely. As of Q2, we had 28 of 31 subprograms on track for this year. I do want to highlight that this result is subjective – I work with the program owners to determine if they are on track for the year. Like I said, a lot of projects do not complete project work in Q2, so you may notice that not a lot of trees were planted but it was still listed as on track because we plant a lot in the fall which you'll see reflected in the Q3 report. There are some listed as closely monitoring – these are the projects that need closer attention and I'm happy to talk more about these with you. You'll also see some contract award information as well. Spring is a busy time for contract awards with 8 contracts being awarded for 20 projects.

Nick (SDOT): We have been very successful with our spending so far this year. We have spent \$59.2M to date. You'll recall that we came here earlier this year with a spending plan of \$190M, \$65M of which was planned to be spent through Q2 – we have achieved 90% spending through Q2. As Elliot noted, we do expect a lot of our project spending to be in Q3 and Q4, so we are on track with our \$190M spending plan. Of that, \$37.9M was spent in Q2 alone - 64% of all spending. Do note that the "all funds" column includes Move Seattle funds and all other funds allocated towards Move Seattle projects.

Of the \$37.9M spent in Q2, two projects I want to specifically call out are the Lander Street Overpass project and the Multimodal Improvements subprogram. This past quarter, the Lander Street Overpass project has really been ramping up, spending \$4.5M in Q2. There has been a lot of design work in the Multimodal Improvements subprogram, with \$3M in spending in Q2.

Rachel: What is the distinction between the Arterial Roadway Maintenance (AAC) program and the Arterial Major Maintenance (AMM) program?

Rodney: The AAC program is for our large projects that we contract out with contractors. The AMM program is a crew-based internal SDOT program where we can do emergency paving for voids or panels that have cracked. Every year, we aim to do 7-10 lane miles of the most egregious maintenance issues through the AMM program.

Nick (SDOT): In the overall maintenance repair program, you'll see that we spent \$10M in Q2. Within the AAC subprogram, some of the big projects that were complete in Q2 were 6th Ave, 4th Ave and Michigan St. Finally, in the Safe Routes category, you'll see that we spent \$10.7M by completing some significant bike projects – 7th Ave, 2nd Ave and Rainier Valley – and our ADA curb ramp work.

Nick (LOC): How many projects are there in the ADA program?

Nick (SDOT): I'm not sure. You're asking how many curb ramps we have installed?

Nick (LOC): Yes, but more importantly I would like to know the cost per curb ramp.

Elliot: We can get you the unit cost of curb ramps.

Rachel: Is Urban Forestry the replacement of trees?

Nick (SDOT): It's both. We have maintenance of urban forestry and replacement.

Rodney: A lot of it is maintenance, pruning and keeping the trees healthy.

Alex: Can we talk for a minute about the "closely monitoring" projects – particularly the AAC projects? My understanding is that the "closely monitoring" is associated with the substantial completion date of December 2018 and the risk of that shifting to January 2019 and not being able to count the accomplishment in 2018. Is that correct?

Lorelei: Correct.

Alex: What does "finished" mean?

Lorelei: We wait until it is considered substantially complete which means it is available for use. Sometimes, we may even have temporary pavement markings because we are not able to complete final markings until the following year due to weather – in that case, it would still be considered substantially complete.

Alex: This may be an explanation for this as well – lanes of neighborhood greenways installed with an asterisk on page 8.

Elliot: I was going to call that out as well. Rainier-Valley North-South Neighborhood Greenway Phase I is 99% of the way there but we did not want to count it because users cannot yet use it. We did not count it this time, but it will be counted in Q3.

Blake: I just want to follow up and say that I really appreciate the tracking document that lives on the back of the minutes. The third to last item speaks to this and I wonder if it will be implemented retroactively, "Add cumulative deliverable count to SDOT annual report" which speaks to how we can better understand how we are doing on a deliverable level throughout the levy.

Elliot: Yes, we are working on a report spreadsheet that lists multiple years. We set annual goals for you to track but it may not be the level of oversight that is helpful for all of you as you are trying to monitor the nine-year levy. We're working to improve it.

Lorelei: Once we get beyond what we are doing now with the assessment and get into a regular cadence of reporting, we can have these conversations more regularly. I'll just note, since paving has come up, I was the one who came to talk to you all last October to let you know that we would advertise earlier so that projects could be complete within the same year. We did do that, but we are running into problems that I have never seen before in my time at the City getting our contractors started. They have all committed themselves to so much work that they drag their feet before bonding so that the contract cannot be awarded. We have had some pretty significant struggles getting our paving jobs started even

though they were advertised early. Now we are looking at adding something more specific to our specs that says you must start a project within a certain amount of time after the project is awarded. We will discuss this a bit more next month.

Brian: I had a question on the protected bike lane (PBL) status - are we going to hit our annual target? Also, what is the status of the Burke Gilman Extension? Is that still held up in administrative appeal?

Lorelei: We are still in an appeal process and are looking at opportunities to phase the work, so we could begin part of the trail while we resolve the pieces in the administrative appeal. There are also pieces to resolve with the railroad which will take some time. The design is close to being final, but we are working through some of the tough, final issues. The next milestone is a Design Advisory Meeting on September 13.

Elliot: To answer your first question – at this point, I do not think we will meet that target for PBLs. The contractor issues Lorelei was mentioning with regards to the AAC projects also impact this subprogram.

Nick (SDOT): This slide shows Q2 year-to-date spending for the last three years, differentiating all funds and Move Seattle funds.

Nick (SDOT): This next slide shows spending by quarter for each year. These are not cumulative and are static numbers. We have a spend plan of \$190M. You can see that the dark green bars are actual spending compared to the light green which shows our spend plan.

Blake: Do you have this bar chart that shows the previous years and what was expected versus what was spent?

Alex: I want to expand on this a bit more. We have the \$190M spend plan which pivots off the revised budget number of \$326M. This to me suggests that you should be spending \$326M. Something we talked about in the finance subcommittee is that there will be a reappropriation happening that gets to this difference and highlights the point that we were supposed to spend a lot more money than we did in the first three years and we are now reappropriating that delta in the next few years.

Nick (SDOT): The reappropriation is still under consideration. It has not been approved or formerly approved to council at this point. The concept there is that the \$326M are funds that we have received and banked for Move Seattle – they include Move Seattle funds, grants, bonds, etc. The reappropriation is that we would shift dollars from these \$326M into future years. For example, in Lander, we are holding \$25M of funds that we know will not use until future years. It's not a bad thing – we have accepted grants and bonds that we know we will use for this project but do not need this year because our construction schedule is not aligned with those bonds. One accounting strategy is to reappropriate them into future years so we can realign our revised budget to the spending plan.

Alex: Likely the \$112M in the first year was quite a bit higher so there is a delta and similarly the \$141M in year two had a delta. Those resources will be reappropriated to be used in later years. Part of me making that point is that at our next meeting, we'll start to hear about the budget and the Mayor's budget which precipitates a 2-month long exercise at Council where I think that \$120ish million dollars that are not planning to be spent this year will be communicated. I believe there will also be a new Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) which is six years in duration, and the remaining six years of the levy which should provide better certainty and clarity around the budgets.

Blake: That just gets back to my earlier point which is that I think it's important to have a clearer idea of what that means in terms of deliverables and what that looks like in terms of reappropriations in deliverables, so we can understand where we are at in the nine-year levy.

Alex: It seems like we are about \$120M behind in levy spending.

Blake: But we've been using the reset so much and talking about how we are behind in deliverables, not money. I don't know how to square that with what we are seeing, and it has made me uncomfortable with this process.

Alex: To square the circle with this finance stuff – more information at the October meeting on the budget, and with the status report vs. revised workplan for the assessment shows that it will have budget implications as well. The work will not be done tonight but there will be a milestone around the budget and presumably, the budget process is likely to be a vehicle for resolving some of these things.

Blake: There is the deliverable and the reappropriation of dollars, and then for me, there is still this accounting measure that is very confusing. That is my one question as we look ahead to our letter and determine whether or not we address that because the fact is that at the April or May meeting when Interim Director Sparrman said that a bike lane costed \$12-million, there was an accounting error and a misapplication of what a bike lane was, and I think that still needs to be squared. There were so many elements that were not a bike lane – the bike lane was 10% of the overall project – so how do we address this in the larger context.

Nick: I hear you, and I'll work closely with Elliot, Lorelei and the Office of Move Seattle team for the October meeting. We'll explain to you where the funds were received and what is in our CIP.

Don: Are all the carry-over funds in the calculations?

Nick (SDOT): Yes, they are all included. We strategize based on total revised budget.

Nick (LOC): Will you know in October if you have been able to reappropriate the funds?

Nick (SDOT): It has not yet been approved but ideally it would be codified when the budget is approved around Thanksgiving.

Ahmed: We do a budget process every year. There will be a reappropriation. That does not mean that next year, there will not be a reappropriation, and that does not mean that the following year, there will not be a reappropriation. It is part of our job as managing the budget to continue to stay on top of it.

Betty: We obviously continue to have a lot of questions on this, but we are now going to shift to the status update on the subprogram areas. As we move into the slides tonight, and the October and November meetings, I think these things are coming together. Keep asking questions.

Joe: If work is performed in Q1 and is paid for in Q2, does it show up as spending in Q1 or Q2?

Nick (SDOT): It will show up when the bill was paid – Q2.

- **Status update of subprogram areas**

Lorelei: One of the things we are doing tonight is to let you hear directly from the program owners – the people that run these projects day in and day out. Tonight, for our presentation, there will be a rotating cast of people coming up to speak about their programs. Since the last meeting, we obviously reviewed all the feedback from the letter we received from you. Then, Betty was kind enough to go with us to the Council meeting and present all those details. We have also been spending time behind the scenes compiling data, particularly around the transit-plus multimodal corridors to respond to your request regarding project details. We have now reviewed and pulled together a full understanding what can be delivered within available funds.

Elliot: Before we get to the program owners coming up here, I wanted to acknowledge as well that this is an ongoing work in progress. Goran mentioned this at the beginning. At the beginning of this process, we had thought we would be coming to you with a final draft of the workplan tonight but there are still some additional things that need to be done. We have incorporated your feedback and are excited to talk to you about what we are here to talk to you about tonight but there are some factors that we are going to continue to review and continue to provide you with updates on, moving forward.

Brian: Did the transportation committee resolution get approved by the full council?

Elliot: Yes, it did.

Brian: Did they make any changes?

Elliot: There were a few slight changes and I can pass those out as well.

Ahmed: I'm Ahmed Darrat, Transportation Policy Advisory in the Mayor's Office. I wanted to make a couple of comments very briefly of support from the Mayor's office in what SDOT has done. The direction that the Mayor gave Goran was a specific task to look under the hood and find out what was going on. One of Goran's commitments very early on was that part of SDOT's job was to do this analysis within the means and what we know we have as cash in the bank. What that means is that what you will see proposed here is a status update of SDOT working within the money they know they have. A lot of that is levy money and a lot of that is other funds that have already been committed to those programs through last year's budget process. What you don't see here, and why a lot of this is still in draft format, is there a lot of oversight that happens in the Mayor's Office and City Council process through the budget process and through the implementation plan processes. Through the budget process, SDOT proposes things to the Mayor's office, the Mayor's office in the last week of September will deliver our budget to the City Council. Within that, if we want to make changes to these programs outside of the levy funds – looking for ways to supplement the levy or leverage funds – we would have the opportunity to do that through the budget process. The Mayor's Office and SDOT are currently working on developing what our proposal might be. The second piece is about the implementation plan process. Most of our programs – the Pedestrian Master Plan (PMP), the Bike Master Plan (BMP) – have implementation plans that accompany them each year that SDOT and the Mayor's Office submit to City Council. This process is typically done through the advisory groups – you'll see projects up here that SDOT plans to move forward to the Mayor's Office to then be reviewed and possibly revised and submitted to City Council. The status update right now is that you get to see the transparent process and the inner-workings of city government. You are seeing the differences between SDOT – a department, – City Council and the Mayor's Office. The fact of the matter is that we want to wrap a pretty bow around this but every year, we will be back to talk about budget. By the October 4 meeting, the Mayor will have submitted the full budget to City Council

and there will be an opportunity to have discussion about that. City Council will take the budget under consideration and the week before Thanksgiving, they will vote on the final budget. There will be plenty of opportunities for this Oversight Committee and all of the other boards to comment on it through the full public process.

Alex: At the August 7 Sustainability and Transportation Committee Meeting, Councilmember Johnson took an optimistic view of what was going on and just said that we are only a couple percentage points off of the full levy.

Betty: Yes, he essentially said that he was doing math on the back of the napkin for the full assessment and that it was only a couple of percentage points and that we are really doing great.

Alex: I recognize that we have a levy. We also have another resource – local funds – which we have control over and then we have this other pot – leverage – which is our best guess at any time about what we might get from dozens of different fund sources. It seems like leverage in some subprograms – particularly the transit-plus multimodal – seems particularly vexed. In the next meeting, I would like us to be able to examine, with a little more oversight:

- Updated leverage numbers
- How the leverage numbers are different than the 2015 numbers
- The distinction of certainty vs. uncertainty within those leverage numbers

Understanding the margin of error with these numbers and the subprograms that are impacted by that uncertainty is important.

Blake: You mentioned that two implementation plans will be happening – typically they are more of an end of Q1 or early Q2 activity. Is this the same activity but was just delayed because of the reset and is happening now, or is this more of a prospective for 2019 and five years from now?

Ahmed: The challenge comes down to timing. We have two transportation committee meetings before the Council goes away for budget. We only have two opportunities to present the implementation plans. Similar to what Goran said, we would rather do it right than do it quickly and so, if we can work through that process and get them fully in on time, then we will do that but if we are unable to get them into the last two transportation committee meetings, they will have to wait until the budget is done.

Blake: But, is this the 2018 implementation plan or is this looking forward?

Ahmed: They would be 2018 implementation plans for projects taking place from 2019-2024.

Lorelei: When we have the program owners up here a bit later, they can say a bit more about timing. As the program owners come up and give details, you'll hear specifics on projects, but I wanted to make sure you also knew that we've been going through a process of updating and reviewing our cost estimated on all these subprograms. When we originally started, escalation in programs was around 2 – 2.5%. We have now increased that and are using the data that we have been able to gather on the market. It's not perfect data but it's reasonable and falls in line with what we've seen in the last couple of years. We've also hired a firm who has done a study to show us what we can expect for Seattle market conditions in the future. I just want to call attention to some cost-impact items such as steel tariffs that are difficult to pin down. You will hear about this more in the future, but we have not been able to quantify their impact.

- **Bicycle Master Plan**

Monica DeWald: I'm the out-of-class manager of the Vision Zero team. That encompasses the BMP as well as other programs. With me is Serena Lehman who has been managing the BMP and has been working on the levy reset, and Summer Dawson who is with Neighborhood Greenways. Jim Curtain is also here who is our out-of-class division director. I'm going to quickly run through our proposed scenarios and we will have time to answer questions at the end. We considered multiple scenarios for the bicycle master plan and the three most-highly, sought-after scenarios were the following three:

Given the stakeholder input we received and the Council-approved Center City Resolution, the recommendation was to move forward with recommendation two which focuses on building the Center City network and citywide network. We received a letter of support from many of the stakeholders regarding this recommendation.

So, what does this mean? I'm going to tie into a little bit of what Ahmed was talking about in regards to the Bicycle Master Plan Implementation Plan. When the BMP was adopted by Council in 2014, part of the resolution was to create an implementation plan every year. We work with the Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board to create that list which then goes through the Mayor's Office and is adopted by Council – this process is typically done in March. When we went to do the levy reset, projects in 2017 through 2019 years would be left as is, as they had already been started to some degree, whether through planning, design or the construction phase. The opportunity to change the projects are in the latter years and may change depending on what is determined through the levy reset and what is recommended by the Seattle Bicycle Advisory Board (SBAB).

One of the risks around the BMP subprogram is that cost estimating methodologies for this subprogram vary dramatically based on facility type and level of project development. I was around when our 2007 BMP was developed, and we had a lot of low-hanging fruit – opportunities to put bike lanes on wide roadways without the removal of parking or travel lanes – which resulted in limited impacts to the road corridors where bike lanes were being installed. There is not any more low-hanging fruit so one of the challenges in trying to implement BMP projects, as you just heard during public comment, is that it requires the removal of some parking and/or a general-purpose lane and/or a center-turn lane which have level of service impacts that can be quite controversial. This project list also includes projects that will be funded by other programs so there is a potential risk that if we are unable to secure funding for those programs, it could lead to delays and/or changes.

We give a monthly progress report to city council that will be submitted in September. We will work with SBAB to develop the 2019 implementation plan this fall. We typically do a five-year implementation plan but since there are six years remaining in the levy, we will work with them to create a six-year plan. We will continue to work with the Levy Oversight Committee (LOC) and the SBAB to give quarterly updates.

Blake: The Levy does not conflate the Missing Like, the Northgate Bike/Ped Bridge or South Lander Street with BMP deliverables. It sounds like you are now adding those as BMP deliverables and as mileage, even though those were separate projects in the original accounting of the levy. It sounds like you are taking numbers that were not originally assumed from the levy and adding them in to increase the BMP deliverable.

Elliot: We can pull out which ones are funded by the BMP and which ones are funded by other subprograms to report on that, so it is clearer how each project will be counted.

Blake: Are there any criteria for how you evaluated the three different scenarios? Are you trying to create a network? Are you trying to grow ridership? Are you trying to improve safety? I think that is a really important point for public outreach and on the public involvement piece.

Don: We were told at SBAB by SDOT that the Implementation Plan for 2018 – 2021 was set because there was a commitment to those projects and what was at play were the projects from 2022 – 2024. Is that correct?

Serena: To answer your question, Blake – when we looked through different scenarios, we looked at projects that had been previously discussed with SBAB, we pulled the center city priority directly from Council’s resolution, and we looked at projects that had been previously on the list in the center city. I also want to note that we knew going into this process that we would be working with SBAB on an implementation process in the fall to talk about what their priorities were for connectivity.

Don: Our priorities were clearly stated. As far as the network goes, we wanted SDOT to implement the BMP and the BMP’s priorities are to have the citywide network filled by 2030 and the full network completed with local connectors by 2035. To do that, the years of this levy have to implement a proportional share of the network otherwise the next levy will be overloaded. We can’t rear-end load the BMP implementation. If you look at 2035 as your goal, we should get to about 80% of the goal by the end of this levy. Option 2 was not our recommendation.

Monica: In order for us to do that, we would need more funding.

Don: Exactly, and that was our recommendation.

Monica: I understand that, Don. Our direction was to look at current funding and what we could do with current funding.

Don: I just want to be clear that SBAB’s recommendation is none of the above as far as those three options. Our concerns are a safe, connected, equitable network, and other programs as envisioned in the BMP.

Blake: My last challenge is that the \$35 - \$37M number has been bouncing around since April and May and I’m a little confused because I believe it will substantially change once \$16M is transferred now or next month via the community package from the Washington State Convention Center expansion. So we will now be at \$19 - \$20M. We have already met the nine-year levy leverage dollar expectations in two years from the BMP, so how does SDOT plan to seek additional funding?

Serena: The Washington Convention Center funds are earmarked for specific projects so when we were looking at how that budget number impacted different funds, it did not have a large impact.

Blake: But that number – the \$37M – I would assume it would have still addressed the earmarked projects?

Serena: Yes.

Lorelei: What the dollars get you change based on what the project is. Standard/mile cost when we built the levy are not ringing true for us which is why we have continued the cost estimating process. We do not have enough money to complete all the projects and these scenarios are just different modifications to show that. If we get more money, we can reexamine but the projects frankly are more expensive and that is something that rings true with all these subprograms, not just the BMP.

Brian: I have two questions. Particularly since we are talking through 2023, how are we going to measure city network connectivity and does this analysis assume traffic stress? Is this scenario consistent with the Council's Resolution on accelerating the bicycle network downtown?

Monica: To answer your first question, when we prioritize bike projects, we consider many quantitative factors including connectivity, equity and other factors that are put into a machine that then kicks out a prioritization. There is also a qualitative side that considers traffic stress which matches up with what is in our BMP. If we need to put in a bike lane instead of a protected bike lane, we are going to look at the speeds and volumes on that corridor – everything that contributes to the feeling of biking on that corridor – and that is then folded in our prioritization process. To address your second question – yes, the recommended number 2 scenario is in alignment with the City Council resolution

Brian: How is the level of traffic stress changing prioritization that was in previous BMPs?

Monica: it goes onto the qualitative side of the review. When we run our prioritization, we have many factors that contribute to the final prioritized list of projects. As we do a qualitative review, we are able to look at a corridor which is done frequently when Neighborhood Greenways (NGWs) are constructed.

Summer: For NGWs, part of our process is always to look at the available routes to us and making sure that we are connecting people to where they want to go, that we are using low level of stress streets. We look at the vehicle volume, and type that uses the streets – for example, we have some residential neighborhood streets with buses and neighborhood freight traffic that contribute to a level of stress that would not be on a parallel street. In certain cases, we might recommend a higher level of separation or targeted spot improvements to lower the level of stress, or we might switch to a parallel street which might be a higher cost to build because it would require a new signal or a new crossing improvement. By switching to a parallel street, we can provide a higher level of service.

Brian: Has your model been updated to incorporate parking?

Jim: Parking has not been incorporated directly but we do look at street width which does imply that there is some parking involved. The street width also contributes to whether a street is high or low traffic stress and the level of comfort that an individual might have crossing that street.

Betty: This is the direction the Department has taken given the input and the reset. What we are getting out of this is the direction you are headed which will then feed into the budget, so modal boards and the LOC can continue to comment on this, correct? This is just your direction at this time.

Alex: What are we going to see on this in October? Is there going to be a new overall mileage target set? Counting things that were not previously being counted should not be done. For example, if the Northgate bike/pedestrian bridge was not part of the original 110 miles, it should not be counted now.

Betty: One of the things we have wanted to show clearly is keeping the original commitment, so it does not change. We can recognize that it will not be met but not just moving the goal posts and changing the commitment.

Lorelei: The reasoning behind showing it is that the BMP is contributing money towards the Burke-Gilman Trail Missing Link, and even though it is not contributing all the money, should we count it? There are some details that we can share about how we struggled with this internally.

Betty: Thanks, we'll keep moving since we have a lot to cover tonight.

- **Transit-Plus Multimodal Corridors**

Maria: I am with SDOT's Transit and Mobility Division and I manage the Transit-Plus Multimodal Corridor Program. I would also like to introduce Cristina Van Valkenburgh, our interim deputy director of the Transit and Mobility Division. Tonight, I plan to cover the program-level slides, as well as provide corridor-by-corridor level information that was requested at the end of the last meeting. At a program level, as you know, one of the major findings was that the cost to deliver the level of investment that aligns with the higher mobility needs of our growing city and meets community expectations is greater than assumed in the original 2015 levy funding plan. Since then, we've been working with the Seattle Transit Advisory Board (STAB) through a number of conversations, as well as the Office of Move Seattle, to review budgets and timelines to make sure that those were evaluated and adjusted to reflect a Transit-Plus Multimodal Corridor Program grounded in secured funding and corridor-specific identified potential funding.

The feedback that we received from the STAB and the Council Resolution has directed us to continue to pursue RapidRide partnerships while also evaluating what we can deliver with our secured funds. That creates some ongoing tension for this program, in terms of continuing to talk about levels of investment in a range but that is something that we want to continue to do, especially as corridor-specific funding continues to evolve.

As you heard from Ahmed, the Mayor's office direction was to be clear about what we could do within secured funding. For a number of these corridors, we will continue to pursue additional funding and advance planning and design that would allow us to do that. Below is a revised project delivery timeline based on the levy assessment work. It takes into account the more project-specific level of funding for each of these corridors, as well as the cost estimates and delivery timelines.

Some of the big challenges with this is the ongoing process to define the program strategy. What this group and the STAB realized is that talking about this in large program generalities often misses a lot really important detail. We have committed to coming back at key milestones for each project so that we can make corridor-by-corridor decisions. A major risk for this program is that more than 60% of potentially identified funding is unsecured and there are a lot of factors outside of SDOT's control that impact the timing on when that funding could be available. And finally, many decision points are required as projects are developed which will require continued monitoring and adjustment of scope, schedule and budget. The one thing I can guarantee is that these things will continue to change.

Alex: How many of these programs were initially assumed to be FTA Small Starts and how many are today?

Maria: We had originally identified four corridors that would be competitive in the Small Starts process – Madison, Roosevelt, Rainier, and Fremont. We are no longer planning to pursue Rainier and Fremont. Throughout this levy assessment process through conversations here and with the STAB, we have not heard any objections to that because the likelihood of that funding being available in the levy timeframe seems very unlikely.

Alex: In the 2015 funding plan, I would assume that Rainier and Fremont were assumed to be Small Starts which was then included in the overall leverage assumptions. I'm trying to better understand how much options need to be adjusted given that leverage assumptions have changed.

Maria: At a program level, in terms of the information published back in May in the data sheet, the program had assumed a \$254M total program budget with \$63M being from secured levy funds. It is the most-highly leveraged program in the levy.

I want to revisit very briefly the level of investment that can be done on each corridor. With secured funds, we feel confident that we can deliver the type of transit, speed and reliability that we have delivered on Route 44 with bus lanes in spot locations, transit signal priority, in-lane bus stops and pedestrian crossing improvements. The other end of the bookend would be a robust and full RapidRide and Multimodal Corridor project which would be similar to what is planned for RapidRide Roosevelt with full RapidRide treatment, extensive transit priority lanes, investment in trolley wires, protected bike lanes, signal improvements, and pedestrian access improvements. This would be a really complete investment.

Now I want to move into the corridor specifics – we provided this level of detail to the STAB in June. Most of this information is consistent but has been updated with additional secured funding and this additional assessment timeline. I would note that for all of these, particularly those that continue as RapidRide, we will have to sync up their delivery very closely with King County Metro.

Madison

We are continuing to pursue this as a RapidRide and multimodal project. This project will require the partnership with King County Metro. Small Starts is taking longer than anticipated so the schedule you see reflects a more conservative Small Starts process based on what the FTA is telling us. We are also assessing our fleet options due to trolley fleet availability. We have been working with King County Metro for the last couple of years to procure 60-foot electric trolley buses with five doors. We signed an agreement with King County to procure these buses since they will be owning and operating this fleet and they have been working with their vendor to advance design. Late last year, the vendor notified SDOT and King County that they would not be able to deliver that fleet in the project timeline or within the anticipated cost because of much more significant engineering costs and impacts to their product and production line. This comes at a time when the industry as a whole is shifting towards zero-emission, battery-operated technology, and also coincides with King County moving forward with their commitment to a zero-emissions fleet. Since then, SDOT and King County have been working to assess options that can be delivered by a 2021 opening. This is critical to the success of the project and the FTA grant. King County has led an assessment of battery options and is also reviewing the options of diesel-hybrid. We expect to have a full report in the fall to be able to determine the final fleet. We are both committed to having the fleet available by 2021. Meanwhile, we have continued to advance design on this project and worked with FTA on that.

Nick (LOC): How much of the total project budget will we have spent by 2019 before construction begins?

Maria: We can get back to you with that information.

Lorelei: This is a corridor that is tough to scale and so we decided to fully deliver the corridor. You are right, that we are facing some costs by spending money now to pursue an FTA Small Starts grant. It's a risk, and a real risk we acknowledged. This is also why we plan to come back at project milestones to discuss progress.

Maria: We had a lot of discussion with the STAB about the merits of staying in FTA Small Starts, both for Madison and Roosevelt. This is a project where we have invested quite a bit and the project is rated high. The Small Starts program is funded, and we see a worthwhile cost-benefit to stay in a little longer and keep pursuing a grant. We are trying to be clear that it is not an indefinite process which is why we have the milestone in 2019, both in Madison and on Roosevelt, to give a status assessment to this group and the STAB.

Erin: Would a switch from a trolley bus to diesel-electric bus impact the federal grant process?

Maria: It does not affect the rating, but we would need to do a reevaluation of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents.

Delridge

We are continuing to work with Metro to advance as a RapidRide and multimodal corridor. Some of the risks are that we know the paving needs are beyond the scope and budget, however, based on direction from STAB and this committee, the opportunity to align those subprograms will help to resolve that issues. The other major risk is that our current schedule is aggressive with showing 30% design where we would baseline the cost and schedule at the end of this year. is at the end of this year. At that time, we would revise the program budget based on the project cost estimate.

Roosevelt

We also plan to advance Roosevelt with RapidRide and multimodal improvements with a Metro partnership, but the FTA Small Starts grant process is adding some uncertainty and time to schedule. We have identified Q2 of next year for a status update check-in on Small Starts funding and provide options for what we could deliver with secured funding.

Rainier

Rainier corridor is currently being described as a safety-and-reliability corridor with access and safety improvements and is based on secured funds (levy and grants). If King County comes out with a budget that enables us to partner with them to expand this corridor to a RapidRide corridor, we would revisit this plan with STAB. Some of the complexity of this corridor is that there are other levy deliverables along the corridor There are a lot of other levy deliverables. The secured grants are regional FTA grants which require their review of our environmental documents. This does limit some of our control over the project schedule. Due to the community outreach on this corridor in advance of the levy assessment, community expectations may be higher than the revised program budget.

Market

This corridor would be a safety-and-reliability corridor with access and safety improvements and is based on secured funds. The major risks on this, as well as the major risks for Fremont and 23rd Avenue BRT, are that limited planning and design work have been completed and that the potential scope of projects adds schedule risk.

Fremont

Similar message on Fremont in that the grant funds identified are regional FTA grants.

23rd Ave BRT

23rd Ave BRT is a bit of a nuance in that there are multiple levy projects on this corridor, including 23rd Ave Phase I, II and III and the Route 48 electrification project. There were no levy funds specifically assigned to 23rd Ave BRT but may be able to move around some levy funds as a local match. This is something we will want to assess later once we do some initial planning in 2019.

Erin: These are newer numbers than I've seen.

Maria: They are – since early June, we've secured some additional grants.

Brian: Does this align with the LOC recommendation? I thought we were prioritizing four routes – Madison, Delridge Roosevelt and Rainier.

Alex: We made a recommendation. It is then entirely up to SDOT, the Mayor and the Council to take or leave.

Erin: I can speak to that as well. I understand that this group recommended a specific priority order – the STAB purposefully did not for a few reasons. One is that we did not think we would be able to agree on a list of the four corridors and two, especially with regards to Rainier, you'll note that it is a RapidRide question mark. King County Metro is the factor in what these corridors are going to be because we do not know what they are going to invest in until they come out with their Capital Budget. We did not want to release priorities before King County released their investments. I know that SDOT has been taking the STAB, LOC and Council's input to form a single recommendation for moving forward.

Betty: When we get to our cover letter, we've added some new language that adds some context around this.

David: For the non-RapidRide corridors, you added the phrase "access and safety improvements, as funding allows." Can you describe what that will mean?

Maria: I would refer to the example project – the Route 44 Speed and Reliability Project – which included pedestrian crossing improvements, as well as sidewalk connections. The levy language clearly supported access to transit as part of these corridors. The treatments will be different depending on each corridor.

David: Has there been any thinking around what "as funding allows" will mean in terms of the transit improvements versus the access and the safety improvements? I don't like seeing the phrase "safety, as funding allows."

Maria: That's a good point. That was language that was my attempt of taking the discussion I heard here to recognize the importance of transit improvements while meeting the multimodal improvements.

Safety is important across all programs. We are just trying to be clear that the funding is uncertain with some secured and some that is not secured.

David: Some of the later projects have a light green bar that says, “pause for grant funding.” Why do some projects have it and some don’t?

Maria: 23rd BRT has that bar and it is one where we need to do a bit of planning to determine what the investments could be and seek the grants. The grant opportunities have specific timelines for when you apply and when that money becomes available. The light green bar is just showing that sequence of timing.

Joe: I have a logistics question – the Madison corridor is the highest budget and has the largest ratio of unsecured funds. How are we so far into the design process when 70% of the funds are unsecured? If those unsecured funds aren’t obtained, would the full project be pulled?

Maria: Of the \$88M that is not secured, \$60M is part of the FTA Small Starts application with the other \$28M from ST3 which is tied to a high-capacity transit corridor. When we do the status check next spring on Small Starts progress, part of what we said we would do is to come back with what we could do with secured funds.

That’s part of the reason we made the recommendation for Madison and Roosevelt to continue pursuing federal grants because it is an investment to pursue those grants and we hope it will pay dividends.

Alex: If the Small Starts funding comes in, how locked in are you to project scope elements that may make neighbors of that project unhappy?

Maria: Part of the reason that the FTA requires you to go through your NEPA process is so that you can have that thorough evaluation of impacts with the community to discuss tradeoffs and mitigation. You are hopefully able to make more progress with the community on loading and access as the environmental document discloses those impacts.

Alex: Has the environmental document for Roosevelt RapidRide been released for public comment?

Maria: No, so we started the NEPA scoping process this past year and intended to go out this spring. Frankly, because of this assessment and wanting to have more of a programmatic conversation, we hit pause on that and are now planning to go out this fall with more details about the project scope and the alternatives analysis that led to that project scope. We will also be bringing more details about the parking and how it is being utilized and bring more data so we can discuss mitigation strategies with the neighborhood.

- **Arterial Asphalt & Concrete (AAC)**

Rodney: My name is Rodney Maxie and I am the relatively new interim Deputy Director of Operations and Maintenance for SDOT which covers our street maintenance and paving programs, our urban forestry programs, and our signs and markings programs. I have our two program engineers for AAC and AMM – Ben Hansen and CJ Jackson.

Ben: I wanted to first start out by highlighting the difference between these two programs. The lowest level of basic day-to-day repair we have is filling potholes. At the highest level is the AAC program with

corridor paving – we send it out to design, put it out to bid and a large contractor builds the project. Somewhere in the middle of those two is AMM – projects typically one to three blocks in length, typically designed to address a specific issue at a location where we can't respond quickly and efficiently with a contract, but a pothole repair is not enough to address the issue.

I'll start with AAC and CJ will talk about AMM. In revising our AAC plan as part of the levy reset, we had to adjust costs upward to reflect the bids and what we are seeing in terms of current projects. We are getting higher bids in a hot construction market and we are hearing from contractors that certain things about city contracting requirements make our work less attractive to bid. As more construction and traffic has picked up around the city, we are trying to limit our community impacts. We do this in two ways – the first thing we do is a lot more outreach on the project ahead of time through the project development and design process to do our best to tailor the projects to address community concerns; the second thing is that we limit the amount of space the contractor can occupy in the street to keep traffic moving and keep businesses open. This unfortunately may make them less efficient and drive up costs – for example, when we are working on a major arterial, working hours are 9 AM – 3 PM so they are not able to get a full day of work.

We are also increasingly trying to fully upgrade curb ramps along the corridor when going into the corridor to meet our ADA curb ramp requirements. On the design and documentation side, there are requirements to document each ramp to ensure it is fully accessible to the maximum extent feasible. On the contract side, where we could previously have a contractor that may have been within 1% of slope, they are now required to have perfect slope. From 2014-2019, the per curb ramp cost has increased by 29%.

As we remove and replace area curb sidewalks, we are required to install new stormwater infrastructure to comply with the City's stormwater code which is a cost-driver as well. We have updated all our costs based on where we are with recent bids and then apply these new inflation factors moving forward so we are keeping pace with cost escalation. We are also updating our project list to defer N 130th St, 35th Ave SW and SW Roxbury St to add the transit corridors as we felt it would be a mistake to implement a new transit service on a corridor that would be rough and full of potholes at least until the next levy.

To quickly address some of the assumptions and risks. When we do paving projects, we have standard unit costs for certain work, but we have done a better job of factoring in the costs for planning and design. As Lorelei also mentioned earlier, we are having issues with getting our contractors going. Some of the contractors are smaller contractors who sub out most of their work and cannot move as quickly.

From 2016-2017, we have completed approximately 55 lane-miles and \$43.1M of paving. Right now, in 2018, we have under contract another 27.4 miles and \$29M in projects. We are coming up to our target of 180 lane-miles.

- **Arterial Major Maintenance (AMM)**

CJ: AMM has been mentioned before – it is our crew paving program, planned, designed and implemented in-house. There is some curb ramp design that is contracted out but we do most of the work ourselves. It generally consists of a 1-3 block mill-and-overlay per location or replacing 2-10 concrete panels per location. The key changes from this assessment process is that supplemental local funding is no longer considered in the funding plan, and rising construction and materials costs. Moving

forward, the goal is to deliver as many lane miles of arterial repaving and spot repairs as possible over the nine-year levy with funding available and recognizing that the original levy goal may not be attainable. In 2016, we had \$6M in funding and delivered 10.7 miles. In 2017, we had \$5M in funding and delivered 7.2 miles. In 2018, we have \$5.8M and plan to deliver between 7.3 – 8.3 miles. The range reflects the proportion of asphalt to concrete – concrete is about 10 times more expensive than a mill and overlay per square yard.

Rodney: To meet the 70 lane-mile commitment, we needed to average 7 lane-miles per year. We are above that for the first three years. This program is not behind but the local funds are not secured for all future years, so we will not know until the final budget is in this year whether we will be able to meet the levy commitment or not.

CJ: Some of the assumptions and risks we used as part of our assessment update included: developing project cost estimates that were developed by indexing 2017 actual crew-delivered unit prices and adjusting based on new inflation factors; the fact that AMM projects are often performed on high-volume transit arterial streets which dictates work be conducted during the weekend; and the fact that the abundance of construction-related activities in the Seattle area will necessitate overtime work on streets where work was historically performed during business hours. Next steps are to continue to report on the amount of curb ramps, annual mileage and spot improvement target, and report quarterly on progress and funding updates.

- **Bridge Replacement – Planning & Design**

Matt: Key change is that we have about half the money that we originally thought we would have. We looked at our top bridge priorities with the money we had left and putting some effort into how we would replace the bridges in our system down the road. You may notice that this list of bridges is the same as the original list with two exceptions – we are requesting that E Duwamish Waterway N Bike/Ped Bridge and the N 79th St tunnel be moved off the list and be replaced with Jackson St 4th/5th West and University Bridge North approach. The Jackson St 4th/5th West bridge was prioritized primarily due to the activity in that area and the need to maintain the bridge. The University Bridge North approach was added due to one of our regular monitoring and inspection reports that noted concrete was falling off the bridge and onto Northlake Way. We then did an inspection there and found there were more emerging issues there than we previously thought based on our routine inspections. We continually inspect our bridges as part of the federal mandate. Based on the two examples I gave, you can see that we occasionally do need to reprioritize based on emerging needs or agency partnerships.

- **New Sidewalks**

Brian: I am Brian Dougherty and am in the Project Development Division and oversee the New Sidewalks program. We will be going to City Council with an update of the Pedestrian Master Plan (PMP) implementation plan in mid-September. It is very similar to what you saw previously but with updated numbers and updated prioritization to extend out to end of the levy. We have project currently underway on 35th Ave SW – it will be open for Arbor Heights Elementary in time for the first day of school. We just started construction on Greenwood Ave N which will be a huge project for a year-and-a-half, building sidewalks on both sides of the street from 137th to 145th St and repave the street in partnership with AAC. You might also remember that the New Sidewalks subprogram is frontloaded in the levy. This was because the previous administration was very interested in sidewalk acceleration. We are moving forward with that, delivering about 40% of the 9-year goal in the first 3 years of the levy. Last year we delivered about 41 blocks of new sidewalk and this year, we plan to deliver about 47 blocks.

Alex: That explains why the 2022 – 2024 are much lower numbers.

Brian: Yes. We get our funding from many sources – the levy is a big source of funding, but school traffic safety cameras also provide a large source of funding for new sidewalks. When Council set up that program, it dedicated the money towards Safe Routes to School which helps build new sidewalks, neighborhood greenways and curb ramps in school zones. Because of the sidewalk acceleration, we'll be building fewer blocks of sidewalk as we get to later years of the levy. Also wanted to mention that originally when we started this exercise in May, we thought we were going to have to tell you that we were not going to be able to build the 250 blocks of sidewalks, and in the intervening amount of time we learned that the camera fund is generating more revenue than our revenue forecasters thought so we will be able to reach 250 blocks of new sidewalk with the help of this additional new funding.

As I mentioned earlier, in September, we'll deliver an updated PMP implementation plan to Council. Moving forward, we'll continue to update this committee and the Seattle Pedestrian Advisory Board (SPAB).

- **Sidewalk Safety Repair**

Elliot: Moving forward, we are proposing to count the number of sidewalk spot repairs which we are estimating to be about 1,000 annually.

- **Curb Ramps & Crossings**

Elliot: We are looking at ways to save costs and it's looking like we will be able to meet this commitment. In April, we were a little more worried about it than we are today. Any questions as a whole?

Alex: There was initially a commitment to engage the public, beginning today. Is that now a part of the budget process?

Elliot: There are definitely spots for the public to engage. At this point, we had thought it would be more locked in and we recognize the difficulty of doing public outreach when you have something that is still in draft form. We fully intend to open up future meetings – either here or at Council – for public comment,

and then when we have a better sense of when everything is final, that is when we would do some additional outreach.

- **Next steps**

Elliot: We have our next meeting on October 4 to update you on program management improvements and the Mayor's budget. In November, we'll be reviewing our Q3 finance report. On December 1, the Council resolution requires a final work plan from SDOT.

Alex: We can probably have a preview of that report since it's two days before you submit to Council.

Elliot: Yes. Like we've heard tonight, an ongoing commitment to continue reporting on changes to lists and any changes to subprograms.

Betty: I would like to add that the October 4 date was prompted a year ago by the feedback that we did not have an opportunity to weigh in on the budget. This will be an important opportunity and we will keep that schedule moving forward. Also, beginning in January, we'll start writing our annual letter.

- **LOC Letter**

Alex: Next up is the letter.

Betty: You all have seen it mostly but there are a couple suggested changes that we hope to adopt tonight. A couple things I want to point out on page 3 is the first bullet "overly optimistic leverage projections" – there is a sentence in here that notes the current leverage projections versus the original leverage projections.

Alex: I'll speak to this – we will not have that data tonight but was my effort to add onto a question Ron had asked earlier. My proposal would be to delete that and leave the rest of the content.

Blake: I'm ok with that as long as SDOT fixes its erroneous number around the shortfall in the BMP which is not accurate.

Betty: On page 5, the top bullet is a new bullet to address the multimodal corridor program, recognizing that it is the biggest budget shortfall and most complex of all the subprograms we looked at.

Erin: This is what I was talking about it earlier – the biggest takeaway here is that coordination with King County Metro is key before prioritizing corridors.

Alex: I think everyone – LOC, SBAB and STAB – came up with slightly different recommendations and want to acknowledge that that subprogram requires ongoing coordination with stakeholders as it is the most complex and there are a variety of perspectives to consider.

Blake: Can I just wordsmith to change "the" to "all" modal boards? Giving it to just the STAB during this process was the problem as the subprogram impacts the other modal boards as well.

Don: One of the disappointing ways with how the levy was developed is that Transit-plus multimodal doesn't make sense as transit is a part of multimodal

Betty: Now look at the page prior. At the last meeting, we decided to add three overarching recommendations for all subprogram areas which was "seek additional funding; use safety as among the

highest priorities; and look at all program areas and consider reallocation if warranted.” Joe came back to us with some additional wording for the safety that is not yet included – could you read that for us?

Joe: When I read “use safety as the highest priorities,” I certainly agree with that but it doesn’t really give a justification for why so I suggested the following wording, “program funding decisions should prioritize public safety projects and spending, prioritizing safety projects is consistent with our City’s commitment to Vision Zero and ending traffic deaths and serious injuries on our streets by 2030.” My thought was to just put the priority within the framework of Vision Zero.

Alex: I would propose just saying “safety projects” rather than “public safety” as “public safety” has a connotation of what the police do.

Joe: Agreed.

Blake: In the AAC conversation, there was a subtle but important policy shift that was discussed. Originally, there was this hidden thing that multimodal projects are paying for paving but now SDOT has decided to fund that paving through the AAC program. We also saw through BMP implementation that BMP is funding signals as opposed to signals paying for signal work on BMP projects. I’m wondering if there is something we can do about maximizing efficiency through accounting or at least make it consistent across subprograms.

Lorelei: When the bike facility necessitates the signal change, then yes, the BMP subprogram pays for the signals. Also, our signal program is meagerly funded and would not be able to pay for the signals needed.

Ahmed: Clear distinction is that what Ben said is that paving is paying for pavement maintenance. What the bike program is paying for is signal improvements. The bike program is not paying to rebuild signals in their current status but are paying for an upgrade.

Blake: So that is new signals?

Ahmed: Sometimes that is new signals and sometimes it is signal phasing that needs to change.

Rodney: SDOT did coordinate between all of those programs – AAC is done through the national standards of the paving standards of all arterials. When we originally looked at the levy, we thought that the multimodal corridors had the funding to pay for their own paving. When they did not have the funding, we looked at whether the level of service on those corridors would be reduced due to the addition of buses.

Blake: I understand that, but it seems like a big shift from the burden being on multimodal to the burden being on AAC. We can talk later. I don’t really have a good bullet here.

Betty: I think that is different from the seek additional funding bullet, but I think the whole question of how the city accounts for and manages projects is a big question that does need to be answered.

Alex: There are a couple places where the spirit of this conversation is captured. On page 3, we reference “balancing complexity and risk.” The levy aspired to be multimodal but that does create complexity. In the role of the LOC, we note that we have been thrown into understanding how these dependencies exist and to your point about accounting, we have this knowledge, but we need to continue to ask these questions about how subprograms impact each other.

Blake: That is fine, but could we add additional text after “balancing complexity and risk” by adding in parentheses “but more work remains.”

Betty: I would not put that in parentheses.

Elliot: I would encourage you to email Lorelei and myself so that we can ensure that we provide exactly what you are hoping for from this conversation in the next meetings.

Don: On the complexity part and the interwoven nature of the subprograms – I would also note that it does make it cost-effective to interweave the programs. I think that the city and SDOT staff are to be applauded for approaching it in a multimodal way.

Blake: It’s a good news story that we need to continue to tell.

Betty: As we know, SDOT used to be much more siloed so I agree that we do need to continue to tell the story.

Brian: I wanted to revisit one change I suggested that didn’t make it in. At the end of the LOC’s role, I just wanted to include this note, “especially if existing shortfalls in safety-related programs persist.” I think it’s important that when talking about reallocation, we should prioritize safety.

Betty: We do have the bullet that expands on prioritizing safety so I’m a little bit reluctant to become a board that just focuses on safety.

Alex: I certainly appreciate your point that existing issues is vague but what if existing issues in safety is not the issue. That is one of the issues but there may be others.

Blake: I still think safety really needs to be emphasized and maybe it’s covered in Joe’s comment. Last night’s public meeting on Beacon Hill showed that we are missing the point on why safety must be paramount.

Betty: I think this whole exercise this year has been good for the committee to sink our teeth into what is important to us. I think we have a good start to that in the letter but also agree that there are many parts that we need to continue to talk about.

Rachel: I think it’s a terrific letter – its direct and talks about things we’ve been thinking about.

Alex: I think I have found a middle ground here – “In the future, this may mean recommendations for reallocating funding, if existing issues, especially safety-related issues, persist.”

Brian and Blake: Yes, that’s a good change.

Betty: Call for a motion to approve the letter

Rachel: Second

LOC members: Approved, with changes discussed.

- **Final Update**

Alex: I started this cochair position, and then two weeks later, I started a job at Sound Transit. I don’t think I can count but Sound Transit has come up a few times tonight. In the spirit of being an ethical

human being, I can't work there and be a cochair of this committee because while there have not been conflicts of interest yet, there may be in the future. I am sensitive to real and apparent conflicts of interest which is not a good thing for serving in this role or being in that job. This is my last meeting. I think the reality that you will see over the next few years is how intertwined SDOT becomes with Sound Transit. I will be doing things as part of my job that the city will use levy funds to match. There can certainly be arguments that it would be fine, but I don't feel comfortable with it and a conflict of interest can just be an apparent one. I'm glad to have helped us through this exercise.

Betty: I want to take the opportunity to thank Alex for his work over these last 8 months – we could not have had a better cochair and it has been my pleasure to work with you as cochair. It also means we have a vacancy on the board and in the cochair position.

Brian: Thank you for all you did to raise important finance questions.

Alex: I want to say thank you to you all. This is public service – literally – and I want to thank staff because you put in a lot of work to support this work. Right now, it is very thankless given what we are talking about, so I will say thank you.

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
Provide a more comprehensive update on the Greenlake Paving Project from the project team	Aug. 23	Elliot	In progress: Elliot to work with co-chairs to add to agenda of future meeting	Tracking
Provide unit cost of curb ramp installation	Aug. 23	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to provide unit cost of curb ramp installation to LOC	September 14
Request to examine in further detail: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated leverage numbers How the leverage numbers are different than the 2015 numbers The distinction of certainty vs. uncertainty within those leverage numbers 	Aug. 23	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to provide info at October 4 meeting	October 4
Request for bike project list to be clear about which projects will be counted in the levy	Aug. 23	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to provide info at October 4 meeting	October 4

Action item	Meeting	Lead	Status	Deadline
BMP deliverable commitment of 110 miles vs. which projects may be in other subprograms (i.e. Northgate Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge)				
Request for the Madison project budget estimated cost through 2019 (prior to construction)	Aug. 23	Elliot	Elliot to work with Maria to provide information at October 4 meeting.	October 4
All subprograms: Note assumptions in one-pagers (for example: if we are assuming inflation at 2-3% moving forward in estimates)	Aug. 2	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to incorporate into updated workplan	Fall 2018
AMM: Establish a new estimate, including the assumptions to establish new estimates and factors for how many lane-miles of arterial streets can be delivered with available funds including benchmark goals by August 2018.	Aug. 2	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to establish a new estimate	Fall 2018
SDOT staff to give a briefing on the traffic signalization program for context	Aug. 2	Elliot	In progress: Elliot to work with co-chairs to add to agenda of future meeting	Tracking
Bike Master Plan: Document how SDOT will fully fund and complete a proportional share of the BMP network and programs each year	Aug. 2	Elliot	Elliot to work with SDOT staff to incorporate into workplan	Fall 2018
Provide data on how the construction costs have increased (example: how much the cost of concrete has increased since the beginning of the levy) to add to AMM recommendation	June 21	Elliot	In progress: Elliot to work with Office of Move Seattle to provide data	July 9
Develop a separate one-pager re: consent decree with more information to link to in the LOC AMM findings	June 21	Elliot	Elliot to work with staff to develop one-pager for committee	July 27

Action item	Meeting	Lead	Status	Deadline
Develop guiding principles for the next levy	June 7	LOC	Tracking	TBD; LOC to determine
Keep committee informed on Fautleroy progress	May 24	SDOT	In progress: Elliot to keep the committee updated as the Mayor and Councilmember Herbold continue community process to identify near-term safety improvements	Ongoing
2017 Move Seattle Report	April 24	SDOT	On hold until after the assessment	TBD
Data on how SDOT tracks cumulative progress or delay for projects	Feb. 22	Elliot	In progress: Elliot to work with team to send data to LOC	June 21
Data with breakdown of striping and how SDOT determines whether to stripe or restripe a road	Feb. 22	SDOT	In progress: Elliot provided initial data via email to Blake Trask	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
Review policy regarding posting meeting materials online	Feb. 22	LOC co-chairs Elliot	Elliot to add to future agenda	TBD

MEETING ADJOURNMENT: 8:25 PM