

# Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

[Levy Oversight Committee bylaws – adopted April 2017](#)

[Move Seattle Levy legislation, approved June 29, 2015](#)

**Date/Time:** Tuesday August 6, 2019 / 5:30 – 7:30 PM

**Co-chairs:** Betty Spieth-Croll, Ron Posthuma

**Location:** Seattle City Hall, Room 370

**Members Present:** David Seater, Betty Spieth-Croll, Sam Ferrara, Inga Manskopf, Patrick Taylor, Lisa Bogardus, Vicky Clarke, Todd Biesold, Alex Rouse, Nick Paranjpye, Rachel Be-Shmuel, Joseph Laubach

**Members Absent:** Ron Posthuma, Hester Serebrin, Mike O'Brien, Ben Noble

**Guests:** Lorelei Williams, Nick Makhani, Jeff Lundstrom, Monica Dewald, Chris Svolopoulos (all SDOT), and Kristian Alcaide (Dept. of Neighborhoods)

**MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:31pm**

## Introductions

Introduction of new member, Sam Ferrara, who is half-way through the approval process, but cannot officially vote until fully approved.

## Public Comment:

Ellen Philips – Support for project #D2-128.

Marjorie Lamarre – Support for project #D2-128.

Midori Sumida – Support for project #D2-160 (Kubota Garden flyer and support letters handed out).

Ray Krugger – Would like to see the Revenue of Accounts for the Levy.

- Nick Makhani and Lorelei Williams said that additional info is already planned to be shared at the next Levy Oversight Committee meeting (and posted online) and the November 2018 Workplan report (online) has most of the info.

John Lisko – Support for a project that did not make the short list in District 1, Longfellow Creek - Thistle to Cloverdale St.

Jesse Moore – Support for project #D2-13.

Ryan Packer – Q2 Levy Update for the New Sidewalks Program, did not like the low-cost sidewalk option of placing concrete curb stops along the shoulder, he felt this is not what the public had in mind when they voted for the Levy. He handed out copies of a photo at 46<sup>th</sup> Ave S at Cloverdale St.

Karen Jones – Support for project #D2-160.

John Pearson – Support for project #D7-95.

## Approval of Meeting Minutes:

Edits to Minutes: None

Inga moves to approve, Alex second. Motion passes unanimously.

### **Agenda Items:**

#### 1. 2019 Q2 Report (5:58pm)

Lorelei Williams and Nick Makhani present “2019 Q2 Levy Report” PowerPoint and “Levy to Move Seattle Quarterly Report” handout. Finance Subcommittee meeting held with Ron & Nick P. on July 25<sup>th</sup>.

- Betty: Any member can attend Finance Subcommittee meeting.
- Nick P.: Charts are very helpful, thank you to staff for these.
- Lorelei: SDOT currently on target for spend, but Q3/Q4 have challenges, namely Burke Gilman Trail Extension has a legal challenge delaying construction. We will keep you up to date.

#### 2. NSF Cycle 2 Project Evaluations and Vote (6:03pm)

Monica DeWald, Chris Svolopoulos, Kristian Alcaide: thank you for all your hard work. Extensive outreach resulted in 300 applications (more than double Cycle 1), 224 projects met the minimum qualifications to move forward, we did a new process where we had community members and neighborhoods prioritize the projects in their district, resulted in 104 projects moving forward, then we had community voting (online voting city-wide and paper voting in under-served/represented neighborhoods in Districts 1, 2, and 5), 750 paper ballots and approx. 7,000 online votes, resulted in 39 projects moving forward to the Levy Oversight Committee for final selection.

SDOT selected the top 5 overall projects in each district based on the community votes, then did an equity adjustment by looking at paper ballots in the under-served/represented neighborhoods and looked at those top 3 projects (noted with an asterisk) and if these were not in the top 5 overall list then these were added to the list for the Levy Oversight Committee’s consideration.

NSF Cycle 2 has approximately \$6+ million, it was \$8M but Cycle 1 had cost overruns that reduced funds from Cycle 2. NSF Cycle 3 (2002 – 2024) has approximately \$8 million. LOC has the option to advance some of Cycle 3 funds to this Cycle 2; SDOT Finance and Office of Move Seattle will need to concur, but mostly a formality.

- Vicky: What is meant by “Cycle?”
  - Monica: Cycle 1 was 2016 – 2018, Cycle 2 is 2019 – 2021, and Cycle 3 will be 2022 - 2024.
- Lisa: What is meant by the asterisks in Districts 3, 4, 6, and 7 if outreach was only in Districts 1, 2, and 5?
  - Chris: Asterisks were for anything that was in the top 5 of the equity list for all districts, but there was a lot of overlap between the two lists, so equity (asterisk) projects appear in all district lists. District 1, 2, and 5 had additional outreach targeting those specific equity projects. SDOT did not limit people from voting except to ask that they only vote for projects in the district in which they live; thus, attending an equity outreach event in District 1 even though the person lives in District 4 meant that they could vote for projects in District 4. The Racial Equity Tool Kit analysis did not produce the asterisked projects, only the targeted outreach did, although there is overlap.
- Lisa: What is meant by “Health Risk”?

- Chris: Things like prevalence of diabetes, arthritis, and things which limit opportunities for advancement.
- Betty: The process committee members will go through: each group will present their top 3 projects and why you chose them, then a brief few minutes for everyone to jot down questions. After all the 7 presentations then there will be Q & A for all projects. We could use all \$6M or go over or go under (having contingencies is okay). We're talking about the top 3 projects in each district, but the others are not off the table and could be brought back.
- Rachel B: This NSF Cycle 2 was way better organized this year than 3 years ago. Way easier to approach the materials and not overwhelming.
- David: What about these projects getting matching funds or grants, for instance the projects near the Capital Hill transit station receiving Sound Transit funds?
  - Monica: SDOT did a quick check for overlap with other SDOT projects.
  - Chris: SDOT has checked into the possibility of receiving other grants and those sources have indicated that there is a possibility but will not entertain consideration until the projects are "real" and moving forward. It is a possibility of receiving additional grant funds and SDOT will definitely pursue these options as soon as the project list is finalized.
- Betty: The committee should only consider the funds that SDOT has at this time. We are not here to value-engineer these projects.
  - Monica: These are early cost estimates; more detailed cost estimates will be developed at 30% design.
- Patrick: All projects were great and worthy, appreciate all the hard work put in by all SDOT staff.
- Alex: Shared her personal calculation of equity, collision history, and community support, and then ranked them. This may be helpful to all committee members as another resource.
- Nick: Are all the Cycle 1 projects complete and within budget?
  - Monica: No, a few projects are not quite complete. The total Cycle 1 package went over budget, which is why there is only approximately \$6M for this cycle.
- Sam F: Who put together the project cost estimates?
  - Betty: SDOT staff.
- Patrick: District 1: selected #138 & #236, they are cost effective, safety, service under-served neighborhoods, fast-moving traffic, urban villages, transit connections. #153/148, crucial connection from W Seattle Bridge to Delridge, could serve larger community. #236 has had a recent fatality. Underserved communities played a big part in the selection. Close to a school.
- Lisa: District 2: selected #281, was originally recommended to be a roundabout but project idea applicant has agreed that a signal is okay. High equity opportunity score of 99.3, highest safety score also, but unfortunately is most expensive, at \$1,397,000. #13 is connecting communities of Georgetown to South Park, and also weird tunnel under road. Data didn't tell whole story – a field visit really showed the true project value. #108 traffic calming in front of Beacon Hill transit station – difficult to know where pedestrians should cross street, high on economic benefit. Also considered fourth and fifth projects #160 and #128 as very worthy projects.
- Betty: For the benefit of the public audience: committee members were assigned to review projects that were specifically not in the neighborhoods that they live in.
- Alex: District 3: selected #26 adjacent to light rail station, help 1,000's people daily, equity is average, high support from community. Concern why SDOT isn't doing this through CIP Program? #24 to add crosswalks: two healthcare facilities, low income & senior housing, library, transit

route, bike lanes, significant equity, community-centered project. Concern of design element: bike lane through intersection going uphill with lots of turning vehicles could create blind spot collisions. #29 confusing set of intersections, lacking crosswalks and curb ramps, equity above average. Significant project so why SDOT isn't doing this through CIP Program?

- Lorelei: Reason some of these projects are not part of SDOT's Capital Investment Projects list is because SDOT has far more needs than funding, so while some of these projects may seem, in isolation, like they should be high on SDOT's priority, there are many other projects that have much higher priority.
- David: Regarding Sound Transit funds: pointing out a potential conflict of interest, the group I co-lead happened to submit all three of these projects, although I was not involved with the submittals. There are Sound Transit funds available for projects near the Capital Hill transit station, but have not been requested; if this project is selected will this spur SDOT to apply for the funds?
  - Chris: SDOT has talked to Metro and Sound Transit and they are non-committal until there is a real project to talk about. Don't know if the money is still available or not, but SDOT will pursue if available.
- Alex: District 4: selected #88: crosswalks, Roosevelt Way to 28<sup>th</sup>, arterial, commercial properties, light rail coming soon, high school, high community support. Not sure if crosswalks needed at every intersection. #96 sidewalks and bikes at N 55<sup>th</sup> St, above average support. #146, elementary school, support higher, residential neighborhood. Did not recommend top-rated project #92 because it didn't appear to address the problem of connection to Burke-Gilman trail.
  - Monica: We really should not consider changing the scope of these projects without discussing it with the applicant. For today we should consider the projects as proposed. We can make a recommendation if the project moves forward. The NSF fund is for what the community asks for.
- Betty: Projects near Roosevelt would they be available to receive Sound Transit funds?
  - Lorelei: We can check.
- Nick P: Are there developer funds available to help with these projects?
  - Monica: Developer approval process starts several years earlier than construction, so the timing does not line up.
- Vicky: District 5: selected #171 to add crosswalks; arterial, high positive effect for community, library. #51 artistic crosswalks for schools. #73 build sidewalks, at corner of Lake City Way at 145<sup>th</sup> both large arterial streets, walking & biking, apartment buildings, high equity ratings, better access to transit.
- Joe: District 6: selected #215 crosswalk & signal: major arterial, natural connection, existing island. #212 safer railroad crossing, better signing and experience, high use. #183 crosswalk, lots of residences one side and new business district on other side of 9<sup>th</sup>.
- Rachel B: Is #212 a repeat of a project submitted in Cycle 1 that didn't get funded?
  - Chris: Yes.
- David: District 7: selected #210, significant equity score, sidewalk built over areaway. #64 is an unpleasant intersection and won for "Seattle's Worst Intersection" again, high collisions and injuries, concern why crossing of Stewart not included. #246 which has unprotected bike lanes shared with (blocked by) parking/loading, helps connect bike network.
- Betty: #210 is high equity but did not have an asterisk, why?

- Kristian: We targeted Districts 1, 2, and 5 but they could vote for projects in their home district, so even though this project did not receive many personal votes, it is still highly equitable.
- Lisa: #246 is already a bike lane, this would just make it a “protected” bike lane for \$2.1M.
- Inga: #246 would it change parking?
  - David: Yes, it would reduce the number of parking spaces.
- Betty: Consider one option: all districts select #1 projects = \$4.3M, add #2 projects = \$6.8M.
- Alex: I’m concerned about equity.
- David: I agree and wonder if we should select more from Districts 1, 2, and 5.
  - Monica: What about adding the #3 projects from Districts 1, 2, and 5? Cost = \$8.8M.
- David: That’s where we could consider removing the #2 projects from Districts 3, 4, 6, and 7.
  - Lorelei: This could work if we take \$2.8M from Cycle 3, leaving about \$5M for Cycle 3, if you want to consider that. There was a lot of effort put into this.
- Betty: There seems to be support for considering spending some of Cycle 3 funds in Cycle 2.
  - Monica: You can consider a contingency list, since some projects may have overage/underage, or grant funds become available.
- Nick P: #281 seems to be very high cost for a roundabout (which is actually a signal now, approved by the applicant).
  - Chris: We are using current bid prices and consultant’s analysis, so these cost estimates are semi-accurate, especially given the early design level.
- Betty: Consider top #1 from all seven districts and the #2 and #3 from Districts 1, 2, and 5. Cost = \$7.3M.
- Vicky: Goals of NSF and borrowing from Cycle 3? Is it about addressing safety and needs as soon as possible or making the community feel a part of the process?
- Betty: They are not mutually exclusive.
- Joe: Concerned of borrowing from Cycle 3 since this would leave less funds for Cycle 3 which would build less with inflation, which is what?
  - Lorelei: 5% inflation for this year, and then slight decrease to 4.5% for next year.
- Rachel B: The effort for equity outreach was great and we should consider approving the #1, #2, and #3 projects from Districts 1, 2, and 5. I support shifting funds from Cycle 3.
- Patrick: I’m not sure we have enough time for this. #281 is \$1.4M which could be swapped for several other projects, even though this is in District 2.
- Alex: What about not selecting #108 and instead select the #4 and #5 from District 2 (i.e. projects #160 and #128)?
- Lisa: I agree, although #128 has an updated cost estimate of \$650,000, instead of \$187,000, because the original cost estimate was for low-cost sidewalk, but the applicant later contacted SDOT and requested the design instead include full concrete curb and sidewalk.
- Rachel B: SDOT overspent in Cycle 1, could that happen again?
  - Lorelei: Yes, but SDOT is conducting business much better now and would engage the committee early if there are concerns of overspending, so decisions can be made to reign in the matter.
  - Monica: Also, overhead costs of administration staffing and outreach is a lot, so if we can deliver more earlier in the Levy we save more that way.
- Betty: Would someone make a recommend for a motion, include reasons why.

- Rachel B: I move to approve projects #1, #2, and #3 from Districts 1 and 5, #1, #2, #4, and #5 from District 2, plus #1 from Districts 3, 4, 6, and 7. In consideration of SDOT and DON reaching out to communities that haven't been reached and NSF better serve underserved communities. Cost = \$7.679M.
- Joe: The cheapest 18 projects would be less than \$8M.
- Alex: In consideration of Rachel's proposal, I am concerned about District 6 and the #212 project, I wish we could fund it.
- Joe: If we take out #73 that would free up \$1.1M to fund some other projects.
- Vicky: Depends on what we would be swapping it for.
- Inga: I know there are certain areas of District 5 that are higher inequity than other areas, do we know this?
  - Kristian: #73 and #308 are where I worked a lot with "One City Collective", a non-profit that works with immigrants and refugees, and they heavily advocated for these specific projects. There are low income housing and schools.
- Vicky: I would like to keep project #73. The City over the years has gotten better at listening to historically marginalized communities and I think the projects in District 5 speak to that intent, and this last minute discussion of we could get more bang for the buck with some other project perpetuates that mindset of historic disadvantages that that part of the city has experienced.
- Audience comment: District 7 is a big district yet is only receiving \$110,000 by this option.
- Betty: Is there a way to see the costs by district?
  - Chris: Totals for each district: District 1 = \$1.0M, District 2 = \$2.624M, District 3 = \$0.945M, District 4 = \$0.85M, District 5 = \$1.7M, District 6 = \$0.45M, District 7 = \$0.11M.
- Betty: District 7's \$110,000 is a little out of alignment. We could add in project #64 and still be under \$8M total.
- Rachel B: I will amend my motion to add #64.
- Joe: I second this motion.
- Lisa: I'm concerned about not including #108.
- Nick P: We are exceeding \$8M which will leave less than \$6M for Cycle 3. What about having an approved list of projects plus some contingency list of projects in case costs/funding situation improves? Maybe consider the third-ranked approved projects in Districts 1, 2, and 5 as the contingency list.
  - Monica: This would mean in District 2 the most important project, #108, to the immigrant community would not be approved.
- Alex: Now that I know #128 cost has increased substantially, and the fact that #108 is a highly equitable project, I would like to switch these around to fund #108 instead of #128.
- Vicky: I agree with Alex.
- Joe: Instead of a contingency list to spend more now, reserve any cost savings for Cycle 3.
- All: Agreed, no contingency list.
- Rachel B: Amended motion is: #138, #126, #153/148, #281, #13, #108, #160, #26, #88, #171, #51, #73, #215, #210, and #64 = \$7.759 million.
- Betty: All in favor say aye.
- All, except Patrick: Aye.
- Betty: Opposed? (none). Patrick is abstaining.

- Monica: We will confirm all this and send to Rachel McCaffery, and she will send it out to all members.
- Patrick: I don't think we gave ourselves enough time to discuss in detail and it is frustrating and leaves me feeling bad.
- Betty: I respect your feelings. I will defend the process saying that there was discussion of the projects within the smaller teams that went out to site visits and they are representing those projects here tonight.
- Rachel B: Thank you to staff for making this process great, rewarding, transparent, easier, more representative, and organized. Great job.

\*\*\*For a final project list with cost estimates see Attachment A\*\*\*

### 3. Retreat subcommittee report (7:46pm)

- Betty: We will send info out to all about the retreat.
- Rachel B: Purpose of retreat is to get to know our fellow members and to understand our role on this committee. There is an ice breaker, legislation, who are the folks at SDOT who present to us, the SDOT organization, how are the meetings going, is the setup working for us.
- Betty: The issue of a secretary will be discussed, but I am pushing back. I think a committee responsible for \$1.7 billion taxpayer funds should have a professional note taker, not a mishmash of note taking. This retreat takes the place of the September committee meeting.

### Meeting adjourned 7:50pm

#### Action items

Action items below capture tasks from previous meetings. Completed items will remain on action item tracker for one additional set of meeting minutes to capture "complete" status and will then be removed.

Action item	Meeting	Lead	Status	Deadline
Identify topics and questions for follow-up Vision Zero presentation	May 7, 2019	LOC		Tracking
Provide more detailed update on Burke-Gilman Trail	March 5, 2019	SDOT	In progress	Tracking
Consider briefing on congestion pricing	March 5, 2019	Rachel	Re-address for month with extra time on the agenda	Tracking
Develop guiding principles for the next levy	June 7, 2018	LOC		TBD; LOC to determine
Keep committee informed on Fautleroy progress	May 24, 2018	SDOT	Rachel to keep the committee updated as the Mayor and CM Herbold continue community process to identify near-term safety improvements	Tracking

# Attachment A: 2019-2021 Neighborhood Street Fund (NSF) Program Final Project List

Approved by Move Seattle Levy Oversight Committee on August 6, 2019

Yes: 10

No: 0

Abstain: 1

Absent: 4

## District 1: \$1,000,000

Delridge Neighborhood Greenway Safe Connections (application 2019-153)	\$387,000
South Delridge Pedestrian Safety Enhancements (application 2019-138)	\$160,000
SW Barton St Pedestrian Safety Enhancements	\$453,000

## District 2: \$2,454,000

South Park and Georgetown Safe Connections (application 2019-13)	\$399,000
Andover and Dakota Pedestrian Safety Enhancements (application 2019-160)	\$178,000
Beacon Ave S Safety Enhancements (application 2019-108)	\$480,000
51st Ave S and Renton Ave S Traffic Safety Enhancements (application 2019-281)	\$1,397,000

## District 3: \$945,000

Broadway and John Street Signal (application 2019-26)	\$945,000
-------------------------------------------------------	-----------

## District 4: \$850,000

NE 65th Street Pedestrian Safety Enhancements (application 2019-88)	\$850,000
---------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

## District 5: \$1,700,000

Little Brook Pedestrian Safety Enhancements (application 2019-73)	\$1,100,000
NE 125th Street Pedestrian Safety Enhancements (application 2019-171)	\$400,000
North Seattle School Crossing Safety Enhancements (application 2019-51)	\$200,000

## District 6: \$450,000

15th Ave NW and NW 83rd St Pedestrian Safety Enhancements (application 2019-215)	\$450,000
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

## District 7: \$360,000

Denny-Stewart-Yale Safety Enhancements (application 2019-64)	\$250,000
Yesler Way and 3rd Ave Sidewalk Repairs (application 2019-210)	\$110,000

Total: \$7,759,000