

Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting Minutes

Date/Time: Thursday, June 21, 2018 / 5:30 – 7:30 PM

Co-chairs: Betty Spieth-Croll, Alex Krieg

Location: City Hall, Room 370

Members Present: Joe Laubach, Brian Estes, Blake Trask, Alex Krieg, David Seater, Emily Paine, Betty Spieth-Croll, Nick Paranjpye, Councilmember Mike O'Brien, Ron Posthuma

Members Absent: Dustin Lambro, Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Pat Cohn, Saroja Reddy (for Ben Noble),

Guests: Sue Byers, Matthew Donahue, Elliot Helmbrecht, Mafara Hobson, Jeff Lundstrom, Rodney Maxie, Lorelei Williams, Ben Hansen, Nick Makhani (all SDOT),

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:30 PM

Public Comment (2 min. per person)

Ray Krueger: I am from West Seattle. I've been reading the notes from the last few meetings and I'm concerned about the descoping that I see going on within the sub-programs. What I don't see is actual revenue numbers for the levy. Whatever the variance is, it could be applied to some sub-programs and you may have to go to Council for excess allocation. It's going to be interesting to watch your process.

Betty: Normally, we don't respond to the public but there is a quick response to this – I think the revenue does not change.

Nick: We work very closely with CBO to monitor actual revenue inflows and update our outyear revenue projections for Move Seattle property funds. At this time, those are still \$930M. Granted, some of the years have changed slightly but we are still working with \$930M.

Betty: I think it's a really fair comment. It feels like in this process that revenues have gone down and that is why we can't afford the commitment. It is actually the costs that have increased.

Approve Previous Meeting Minutes

Betty: May 24 meeting minutes approved.

Elliot: You have the June 7 meeting minutes printed for you to approve next time. If you have questions about anything on the tracker, please feel free to let us know.

July 19 Boards and Commissions Appreciation Event Update

Elliot: Every year, the city does a Boards and Commissions Appreciation Event. We would love to have you join us on July 19 from 5:30 – 7:30 PM to recognize all the work you do.

Levy to Move Seattle Sub-Program Data Review

- **Arterial Major Maintenance (AMM)**

Elliot: This is largely a continuation of the meeting we had last time. You were tasked with developing recommendations on three of the eight sub-programs requiring further review and adjustment. Since last month, your co-chairs have provided some great feedback on suggested recommendations. I'll pass it off to them and we'll begin with Arterial Major Maintenance.

Alex: To recap, we are now at the time where we need to start summarizing what we know and making recommendations on what we know. As a reminder, there are eight sub-programs that have issues. Five sub-programs are being handled by the relevant modal boards and three are being handled by the committee. I'm hoping that the model that is presented for our sub-programs can be used for the modal board recommendations as well. The purpose is to more plainly say what happened and establish some recommendations that will require SDOT to say that they are able to meet those recommendations or explain why they will not be able to meet them. The findings for the Arterial Major Maintenance sub-program are that SDOT cannot meet the original levy commitment because funds from this sub-program are being used to build curb bulbs as part of the consent decree, which the original funding plan did not assume, and that construction costs are rising due to local market conditions.

Elliot: Slight clarification that we updated curb bulbs to curb ramps in a newer version of this finding.

Alex: These findings are based on information we were given, and this is our attempt to simplify the language from what we had seen in earlier iterations from SDOT. We developed the recommendations from this sub-program based on our June 7 conversation. Our recommendation is to establish a new estimate for how many lane miles of arterial streets can be delivered given available funds, including annual benchmark goals, by August 2018. Our second recommendation is to count the number of curb ramps delivered using this sub-program. I think we can all agree that building curb ramps is a good thing that we should document.

Betty: I want to expand a little bit on what Alex is saying. As we begin to draft our response, it will be in a couple of different parts. One will be a response to these sub-program areas but know also that there will also be another part of our response that is beyond the sub-programs and speaks more broadly to how we got here and what needs to change to move us forward to where we should be. If you are not seeing that included in these sub-program recommendations, know that we have started some preliminary drafting on that and will speak to it later in the meeting. First, we want to walk through how we are going to respond to the three sub-programs and we have asked Elliot to encourage the modal boards to use a similar template. When it comes to the AMM sub-program, this is brief. We are implying that SDOT should not change the original goals and targets but instead acknowledge that SDOT cannot meet those targets.

Brian: I wanted to clarify the funding - \$2M was transferred from AAC to AMM. What is the shortfall? Is it more than \$4M or is it \$6M?

Nick: Two years ago, \$2M was transferred from the AAC to AMM because there were very specific maintenance needs that needed to be addressed. You'll see that the original levy funding plan was \$15M and now the current levy funding plan is \$17M (\$15M + \$2M that was transferred).

Ron: I like the relative simplicity of the findings and recommendations. I also like the fact that we are highlighting that we are building more curb ramps. I think under the second bullet in the findings, it would be stronger if we referenced rising costs of construction materials. At our June 7 meeting, we learned

that the work is being done by city crews so the increase in material cost is the largest increase in cost for this sub-program. It would also be great to add numbers for how much material costs have risen compared to revenue.

Rodney: It is supply and demand. With all the work going on in the city, price of concrete has risen. To contrast, delivering Bridging the Gap (BTG) took place during a recession where prices had decreased.

Alex: It would be helpful, to the extent it is possible, to get data on how the construction costs have increased. Being able to speak specifically, for example, about how much the cost of concrete has increased since the beginning of the levy would be useful.

Nick: We should also get some assumptions of how we are counting the number of curb ramps and what escalation factors are being used so we do not have the same discussion four years from now. What changed needs to be defined and how are we going to take that knowledge into account moving forward.

Alex: Would that edit be to “establish a new estimate, including escalation factors.”

Nick: Or assumptions to establish the new estimate so we know that for 2020 onwards, we are assuming a certain percentage of escalation or basing it on a level of CPI. If we include that in the assumptions, then we can compare our assumptions to the reality in the future.

Rodney: Right now, the program is projected to not meet these goals. The first year of the program, we paved 10 miles, the second year we paved 6 miles and this year we plan to pave 7 miles. Right now, the program is on pace to meet the 70 lane-mile commitment except for the fact that we are projecting that the leveraging money will not cover the rising costs of the ADA ramps. One thing to note is that when the ADA consent decree went into effect, these ramps were engineered as if you were living in Los Angeles or Arizona, meaning that they assumed a flat and dry terrain. Our cost for ADA ramps fluctuate due to the terrain and grade.

Betty: The word that kept jumping into my mind as we were developing these findings and recommendations is that we want prudent estimates. It’s not our job to say how that should happen but I think that there is a level of prudence that did not happen when the levy was put together. We are looking for a level of prudence without suggesting that the brakes be put on so hard and that we overcorrect so much that we stall out. When it comes to adding anything about estimating, I would add the word “prudent.”

Brian: Were some of these factors related to cost estimating not known in 2015 or were not fully built into the estimates? I’m just trying to understand what the disconnect is here.

Rodney: We settled the lawsuit after the levy passed on ADA ramps. Because we agreed we could redesign curbs to the maximum extent feasible, we had to develop designs for each ramp. Another example would be AAC on Green Lake. On Green Lake, we anticipated 250 ramps but then it was determined that there would be additional corresponding ramps even though there is not a corresponding sidewalk. We did not realize we would need to put ADA ramps where there was not a sidewalk and so the number of ramps increased to 400 ramps.

Alex: Coming back to the finding – funds are being used to build curb ramps as part of the consent decree which the original funding plan did not assume. That is a correct, factual statement.

Rodney: No, all our paving programs included curb ramps, but we did not know what the definition of the ADA lawsuit would be and what additional work would be required. We had a different standard before we settled the lawsuit.

Councilmember O'Brien: To clarify, there are now more curb ramps than were assumed before the lawsuit.

Alex: I want to make sure we are getting this factually correct – I thought what I heard last time was that we did not adequately price curb ramps in this sub-program and therefore, because of the consent decree, we are doing more.

Lorelei: I'll try to clarify. We assumed curb ramps but now out of continued clarification of expectations, there are more curb ramps than we expected and need to build, as well as rising material costs that make everything more expensive.

Alex: So, to clarify, "funds from this sub-program are being used to build more curb ramps."

Lorelei: Yes.

Nick: Conforming to new regulations. The consent decree did not change our standards. There are clarifications of how we can build more accessible ramps and we sometimes must do more.

Ben: The cost has risen in materials but also in design and construction related to building a tighter tolerance.

Lorelei: We also need to be clear about our assumptions. We'll do our best to make assumptions and share them with you so if they change, we'll at least know where we started.

Nick: Exactly, that information should be documented so we can refer to it in the future.

Alex: I recognize that as staff, there is a feeling of defensiveness as some of these findings are not great and this exercise is not a pleasant one. I just want to ensure what we are saying is correct so I'm going to reread slightly revised versions of these based on committee feedback and what I heard from staff, "Funds from this sub-program are being used to build more curb ramps, as part of the consent decree, which the original funding plan did not assume." Is that a correct statement?

Lorelei: "More curb ramps than the original funding plans assumed."

Brian: I would suggest we have a separate bullet on the consent decree explaining it in more detail than what is up there. Are these SDOT findings?

Betty: Yes, we are wordsmithing SDOT's findings into something we agree with.

Alex: The exercise here is to try to say these findings in a plain way that is true.

Brian: I think we need a little more detail on why the consent decree caused this reset.

Mafara: Maybe that could be a separate one-pager that could capture that information and we could link to in the findings.

Nick: is that something you can create?

Mafara: Yes.

Betty: The recommendations here are committee recommendations. We are recommending to SDOT that they establish new estimates and that they begin counting curb ramps.

Alex: I would just amend the recommendations to include, “establish a new estimate, including assumptions.”

David: If we aren’t providing the recommendations until August, is it a sensible timeline to ask for estimates for AMM.

Alex: Let’s look at the timeline graphic. My understanding is that we meet on August 2 where we will again review our findings and recommendations and review the modal board findings and recommendations.

Elliot: Based on my conversations with the modal boards, it’s safe to assume that they need another month to develop their findings and recommendations in July. The modal boards will then bring their recommendations to your August 2 meeting where you will hear them and approve them, as well as your three sub-programs. We would come back to you with our recommendations on August 23, incorporating your feedback and recommendations. It then goes through some public outreach in September and then we hope to wrap this up in October if things go according to plan.

Alex: Is establishing a new estimate by August 2018, is that doable?

Elliot: I believe so, we are on that trajectory.

Brian: At the end of our August 2 meeting, will we have produced our recommendations?

Betty: We need to be close because shortly after that the draft recommendations go public.

Alex: Is the release of these draft recommendations in mid to late August intended to be before our August 23 meeting?

Elliot: It would be in line with that meeting, likely the Friday before.

Alex: At our August 23 meeting, we also need to finalize this broader correspondence about how we got here and what we should do moving forward.

Brian: Will we know SDOT’s recommendations prior to finalizing our letter?

Betty: SDOT’s intention is to send it to us ahead of the August 23 meeting.

Sue: This is one of the sub-programs where we can tell you what we can tell you about 40% of what is planned for future years, but this program also handles emerging needs and may need to reprioritize quickly. We wouldn’t even say that we could plan 3 years ahead of time 100% of what we are going to do – we would probably say we can plan about 50% of what we are going to do. We do look ahead for design, but I don’t think we can program ahead for the next six years.

Rodney: That is also why we can’t decide the percentage of asphalt and concrete repairs – whatever road fails, that is the road we have to fix.

Alex: A follow-up question – is Arterial Major Maintenance more of a reactive program vs. Arterial Asphalt & Concrete which is more of a proactive program.

Ben: I think that is a good characterization. I always describe our paving as a continuum of care. The very low and basic level is a pothole repair which is completely reactive. The other end of the spectrum is AAC where you are going out to do a major planned project. AAM exists in the middle. There are some things we do where we are trying to take advantage of a preservation opportunity where we complete a mill-and-overlay. Increasingly, because we have such a backlog of streets needing repairs, we are using AMM to prioritize fixing those streets.

Nick: Can those estimated dollars be put in a different category rather than the lane-miles? For example, if you have \$1, and based on our experience we used \$0.30 to fix the potholes, can we set aside money for the pothole repairs?

Rodney: I think you can for the spot repairs, but the potholes vary – some are 4 inches and some are 10 feet which means that the costs vary significantly.

Alex: I feel like that is an important point - if we are using the wrong metric, we have a fundamentally flawed situation of how to speak to the value of the program. If we are measuring something in lane-miles that should not be measured in lane-miles, that seems like a significant issue.

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

Alex: Let's start with the findings and interrogate whether it is accurately characterized. We are not saying that we cannot meet the original commitment but are saying that there are significant risks facing SDOT's ability to deliver the original levy commitment in this sub-program because:

- SDOT anticipated delivering portions of the 180-mile original levy commitment using leveraged funds from the transit plus multimodal corridor sub-program. Because these funds are at extreme risk, it may jeopardize SDOT's ability to meet the original 180-mile commitment.
- The original AAC paving project list that SDOT published during the levy outreach period in 2015 (while not a formal Levy commitment) must be updated to reflect new conditions
- The original funding plan for this sub-program identified \$19M in leveraged funds. SDOT now anticipates only \$8M in leverage funds. Levy and local sources are also less than originally anticipated in this sub-program, resulting in an updated funding plan with \$15M less than the original funding plan across levy, local, and leverage sources.

Is this accurate?

Rodney: I think that is accurate. We thought we would have more leverage to fund paving on those multimodal transit corridors. Now what we must do to achieve those multimodal improvements is to align the paving with the multimodal projects.

Brian: All the findings are financial but in the "next steps" of the [data sheets](#) it talks about shifting more funding towards mill-and-overlay projects. Should we talk about the impact, and cost and benefits of that in the findings?

Alex: I wouldn't say that's a finding because we don't yet know what the next steps are.

Brian: It seems like an important finding if we are going to shift to prioritize lower, less-durable paving projects.

Rodney: I don't think there is an intent to do that. There is an intent to add concrete where it is needed to support the load of the road.

Ben: This is the program that I am responsible for in SDOT. The overall 180-lane mile plan that we currently have is a mix of preservation and reconstruction. It has a fairly heavy emphasis on preservation, treatments to extend the life of the existing pavement structure. For example, we'll go out on a road that is fairly good structural condition, make a few road patches, mill off the top surface and place a new surface. The roadway will get an additional 15-20 years. On a life-cycle cost basis, preservation is recognized as the most effective way to maintain your system. If you can apply a preservation treatment at the right time, there is an opportunity cost that prevents the street from deteriorating to a point that it needs to be reconstructed. Reconstruction is typically 4-7 times more expensive than preservation. It's important to note that you do not always have a preservation opportunity on a street that is structurally deficient. If we have paving needs on the transit and multimodal corridors, in most cases, because buses are the most damaging vehicle on city streets, the paving that will be required is reconstruction. In all cases, we want to apply the most appropriate treatment but the effect of that is that if we have to transfer preservation dollars into reconstruction on the multimodal corridors, we would lose lane miles.

Joe: Two of our three findings specifically call out the leveraging. I would want to understand were the original leverage estimates reasonable or did conditions change to make those leverage commitments doubtful.

Lorelei: I think both are true.

Ron: I think it would be good in this program to identify an increase in construction cost in the second bullet of findings based on the fact that we are now dealing with contracts that are being bid out and higher material costs. What I am also hearing is that the multimodal corridors cannot fund the paving on their corridors and I think we want to get to the point of recommending that this project should prioritize the necessary work on those corridors.

Ben: We are looking at those corridors where SDOT is looking to implement RapidRide. If you implement RapidRide on a street that is already deteriorated and then five years down the road, you have to disrupt the service to repave or you do not have the money to address the repave. Maybe a paving project that we are doing somewhere else isn't as important as the RapidRide corridor.

Rodney: Our goal is to move as many people down corridors as we can safely which is what we look at when we are prioritizing.

Alex: Moving onto the recommendations which say:

- Develop and publish an updated paving list with a detailed explanation of any changes, with a focus on those now being covered by AAC funds, including annual benchmark goals, by August 2018
- Identify near-term pavement repairs for corridors from the original list that are deferred given new conditions

Betty: Maybe under recommendations we recommend what to prioritize moving forward.

Brian: I wonder if we add a section in the beginning that clearly states what the levy promised.

Betty: Agreed.

Blake: Do we develop another bullet that we would recommend prioritizing the projects that rely on other sub-program buckets?

Alex: I do worry a bit about our level of sophistication because I know in this sub-program, contracts are bundled.

Betty: I am going to argue against offering recommendations against prioritization. Our sole role is to ensure the wise stewardship of the public's money. It is more the role of the modal boards and advocacy groups to advocate for specific modes. To some extent, I would argue that we should keep to strictly the stewardship of dollars.

Ron: SDOT was assuming that the transit sub-program was going to pay for arterial repaving. That money does not exist. If we do not have the reset of some of the money that is available from this program, those corridors either aren't going to happen, or they will happen on a street that has not been reconstructed. From a pavement engineering standpoint, you would want to reallocate dollars to get the most use out of that dollar.

Ben: We apply a complete-streets review and checklist to each of the paving projects so that we stay coordinated where different sub-programs are funding one project. 35th Ave NE is an example of a project where we identified a need to pave and the bicycle master plan sub-program identified the need for a protected bike lane. However, coordinating pedestrian and bicycle projects with a paving project is not always the best value.

Nick: Can we move money from one pot to another?

Elliot: Yes, under 10% requires LOC approval and over 10% requires council approval.

Alex: Does anyone have any further comments on this sub-program before we move on?

- **Bridge Replacement – Planning & Design**

Alex: The findings are that SDOT cannot meet the original levy commitment in this sub-program because:

- The original funding plan for this sub-program was \$34M. The updated funding plan is only \$15M, reflecting leverage opportunities that are no longer assumed.
- The preliminary list of bridges that SDOT published during the levy outreach period in 2015 (while not a formal levy commitment) must be updated to reflect new conditions.

To build on previous comments, we can add something about leverage here as to whether it was overly optimistic. We are recommending that SDOT:

- Develop and publish an updated list of bridges to be planned and designed with a detailed explanation for any changes by August 2018
- Allocate \$5M to complete near-term bicycle and pedestrian safety projects as highlighted in the February 2018 Bridge Safety Analysis Report (the original levy committed "up to \$10M of total funding (local, levy, leverage)" from this sub-program for these types of projects)

This one may be more straightforward than the others.

Brian: How did we get to \$5M for bicycle and pedestrian safety projects?

Matt: We received input from stakeholder and advocacy groups to look at accident data for higher-profile or more dangerous areas around bridges in the City. We looked at the places that needed improvements and have already started to make some of the improvements. \$5M was what we arrived at in combination of the \$10M that is available for bridge replacement planning.

Elliot: I also wanted to note that I sent out the bridge report to address some of the questions from the June 7 meeting and have a few hard copies for anyone who would like one.

Levy to Move Seattle Modal Board Updates

- **Bicycle Advisory Board**

Emily: We are planning to have a recommendation in July and trying to figure out exactly what that will look like. We want to make sure that we aren't revising a new baseline that will prevent us from completing the bicycle network by 2035.

- **Pedestrian Advisory Board**

David: We are also looking to develop findings and recommendations. We are all heading in the same direction about wanting to express that whatever is built to should be prioritized according to the implementation plan rather than following a new process. There was a desire from the board to keep a certain number of new blocks of sidewalk in the recommendation to set a goal to aspire towards. This would also help advocacy groups advocate for more funding to meet that goal. More broadly, we wanted to be sure that SDOT is reaching out to groups that would be impacted – Senior services and disability groups. I think we are on track to have a recommendation by the end of our July meeting.

- **Transit Advisory Board**

Ron: We are looking at recommendations and findings as well – we have already started looking at findings and recommendations. Like you, we have asked more questions about the RapidRide program. Our intention is to finalize a set of findings and recommendations next week as long as we receive data requests from SDOT.

Nick: Would the recommendations have specific info on your priorities or will they be in general terms.

Ron: I'm only one member but I would say the former.

Oversight Committee Response

Alex: The response will include two parts – the first being to name specific factors that have lead us here and the second being what do we need to do in the future to prevent us from getting here again.

Betty: I did a bit more work on this, inspired by original work by Alex. On how we got here, I had some broad categories of external factors that are beyond SDOT control - robust economy, change in administration. I would also note that while these are beyond SDOT's control, nevertheless there was a lack of being prudent about considering that these outside factors change, and you have to take into consideration being a little more conservative. I also included some themes on failures of how the levy

package was developed – a lack of being conservative in putting assumptions together and over-optimism. We'll want to ensure that the over-optimism is addressed and something about the fact that the package created little room for error and required a fully functional department to be able to deliver the levy.

The consent decree will also be important to highlight because we were told a year ago that much of that was understood before the levy package was put together and the costs were assumed. It is not clear to me how much of that is true. We may want to say that if these numbers were known, you have to take it into account. It is unclear to me the reason why those cost estimates were not fully accounted for in the levy.

We'll also want to talk about failure in how the levy funds were managed – the department was unprepared to deal with the size of the levy and hit the ground running. There was a ramp down from BTG that is necessary because you can't ramp up until you have the money in hand, but it seems like there is something missing from the ramp up conversation.

Also, highlighting questions around organization and culture. To its credit, SDOT asked for an outside audit and needs to begin to really address the findings around lack of transparency. It also needs to be addressed SDOT's failure to act when they learned this was not going to happen.

In terms of moving forward, some of my short categories were that we should not lose sight of the original levy promise targets. In other words, don't move the goal posts and change them from red to green. Maintain the original promise to the public and just explain why you can't meet them. We need to revise these workplans to reflect the reality. Consider adding new targets, such as curb ramps and recognize that we may not be counting the right things and look for opportunities to count the right things. Reset relationships with the modal boards and the oversight committee. Improve management and the culture within SDOT to make sure it's a fully functional organization that is prepared to deliver the levy. Then, speak to the role of the oversight committee and how we are going to move forward and effectively do our job.

That was my broad sweep of some of the topics. Some of you may have some additional topics that we should add. I don't want us to say things we don't know, and I don't want to make assumptions that are not grounded in fact. I think we know enough to say that there needs to be improvement

Brian: I agree with most of what you said. The way that this period of maximum of constraint was announced to this group was unacceptable and should not happen again. If they create a One Center group for citizen input, it should not be completely discarded. I also think we need a little more information on cost estimating by SDOT. How will we have confidence that they are more accurate than they were before? I would like to see some probabilistic scenarios – for example, if construction inflation is XYZ, we can do this. One final comment on this period of maximum constraint, how did this happen? Going forward, we need to have a better link between development and transportation.

Betty: I want to make sure that our comments are specific to our role as the Move Seattle Levy Oversight Committee.

Brian: People voted on safety and congestion relief as key aspects of the levy but look at how land-use has had an adverse impact on that.

Nick: I agree with your summary, Betty. We also need to say what can we do as a committee to provide oversight during the remaining years of the levy. One aspect is the estimating part of the costs and how do we monitor that the costs are what we budgeted for? On the engineering, design and construction side, how can those two teams monitor how those costs are controlled? We shouldn't be tracking that our cost estimates match to what we expect from the contractor.

Emily: Betty, I agree with all your points. I would like to see some emphasis in our recommendations around the fact that the cuts seem to be coming from the sub-programs that focus most on safety and vulnerable users. I know that SDOT does not want to move money between sub-programs but am still skeptical of whether that is the best approach. Even if they don't want to do that, I think that is something that we should potentially recommend. I am a little skeptical that all the green checkmarks have the right amount of money in them and that there is not additional money to move around, especially the programs like the ped programs where the projected shortfall for the sub-program is a mere rounding error on the other sub-programs. I would to at least see that discussed.

Ron: I think we should be talking about some of the successes of the program. I think the City did a great job pulling off the Lander project in terms of getting leverage and modifying design to get to a reasonable-cost alternative. I agree that doubling the size of the program as your ramping down is difficult. I also wanted to speak to this issue of "are your cost estimates right?" I worked in transit for a long time and if you have a multi-year program, you are throwing a dart and hoping you hit the wall. There are economic conditions that change and community expectations that change. When you go out to bid, if you get within 10% of engineer's estimate, you are considered a miracle worker. I'm more interested in seeing whether we are getting products.

Nick: It has to be both ways. It is not only the planning estimate, but you also have to make sure the 95% estimate is reasonably accurate as well. That estimate is based on current projects. You then tailor your project so that if you have to adjust expectations to meet the cost, you are ready to do that.

Alex: There is a distinction between an estimated unit cost and estimating throughout the life cycle of the project. They are both around the idea of whether we are estimating correctly.

Ron: I think SDOT was trying to accomplish something that was rather difficult with trying to build out projects in a multimodal fashion. The complexity of what was promised is relatively unique. We tend to look at it in individual pieces, but I think the multimodality was a good goal, but it was more complex. Part of the goal was to move from silos to multimodal, but I think we should highlight that it was a good goal and we would prefer them not to move back to silos.

David: I'd say largely I agree with the comments from Brian, Emily and Betty. I wanted to go back to Ron's previous comment and say that while I agree we should highlight successful programs, I would oppose listing the Lander bridge as one of those. From a pedestrian point of view, it's removing a sidewalk from one side of the street and not adding a safe crosswalk to cross five lanes of traffic.

Emily: I agree from a cyclist perspective.

Brian: I also agree with that.

Joe: I have two things. The first is that in April we were told that towards the end of the levy planning process, voters wanted more, and things slipped into the plan without a revenue source. That seems like there was a breakdown of internal control that promises got included without a funding source.

Councilmember O'Brien: I don't understand if that happened from the campaign side or the City side.

Elliot: It was an administration directive.

Alex: We also had these lists that were published during the campaign that were not a commitment, but it functioned as a promise.

Joe: My comment is that there needs to be a mechanism to prevent that from happening again.

Councilmember O'Brien: We should look closely at how that happens. There is a situation where someone stands up at a podium and promises something and it is written about in the press, and therefore it becomes a commitment. There is also a case where it was recommended to the Council and we vetted it and added it in, and we missed something. We should understand which of those it is – if it's the former, it can be tough to prevent.

Joe: My second observation and this addresses Emily's concern. I actually asked the same question last meeting about whether we should be moving some money from green to red and the answer from Goran was, "The green programs do not have surplus funding. Shifting priorities and moving money around is a policy decision that I was not comfortable with staff pursuing alone. The Oversight Committee can make the recommendation but that would be a recommendation I would take to City Council and the Mayor's Office." I think that if David and Emily come back and the modal boards cannot ensure these safety standards, then I think this group should consider moving money to the modal programs. If that means turning a few greens into oranges, then we are just kicking it to the next level for the City Council to review.

Betty: That is within our scope. I reflected on Goran's comment and I respect that he did not do that, but we can do that, so we'll have those kinds of discussions on August 2.

Blake: I still think that this is an opportunity to say something about process and am not sure about how to articulate it just yet. I think there have been frustrations over the past year about the information we have been getting and accountability to this committee. I think that this is an opportunity to tighten that up and to develop specific process improvements that enforce accountability and transparency. I don't feel that we have been able to see numbers very early on in this process and I think that the pendulum has swung from full-on reset mode crisis to now dialing in on the issues. I'm not sure if it's as much of a reset or a course direction and understanding that the environment has changed a bit. We are not changing the goal posts at this point but are asking them to develop different scenarios for us while maintaining the existing levy goals. It would have been nice to have more information earlier on and more data. It surprised me to hear Goran say that the bike program paid for the 2nd Ave improvements which included more than the bike lane. I think this is also an opportunity to discuss how SDOT conducts its multimodal accounting and what that looks like.

Councilmember O'Brien: The only thing I will add is on the draft reporting – ultimately, we need to deliver the public a variance report on what went wrong. It's tricky because the levy commitments weren't always specific, so I don't know what full transparency looks like. I do think it needs to be something that

articulates that we will build RapidRide lines with X% of travel time savings, that articulates the cost estimating issues, cost increases. It would also be great to say that 20% of the issues are attributable to X and 30% to Z. It needs to be defensible, so we can put it out to the public and that a Lindblom can dig into in the press to help us start to rebuild the trust with the public and be held accountable moving forward.

Betty: This is a broad beginning and we have a lot of continued work to do on this. It occurs to me that there is another category that we will need to address - we are also at this moment of transitioned leadership in the department as well. We had failures but now we have had several months of digging in and direction of a department to deliver these projects, be better stewards of this money, to communicate better with us, multimodal boards and the citizens. It seems like we need to say something about how new leadership should continue moving in this direction. I think it's unfortunate that we must have another change in leadership as we complete this process.

Councilmember O'Brien: I don't think we'll have another new director until the end of the year.

Brian: I think we need to seriously consider that if safety is being compromised whether we move money from some of the green programs. For example, traffic operations, what is that accomplishing?

Elliot: It is not that they are not delivering anything, but they have not been here to speak to it.

Levy Assessment Next Steps

Alex: We will need more than two hours on August 2. We'll start at 5:30 PM but don't assume that we will end at 7:30 PM. Hopefully we can start with the three we went through tonight and move through those three quickly before moving onto the modal boards.

Betty: We are open to comments, emails and suggestions.

Brian: Can you share the outline of the Oversight Committee response that you read from?

Betty: We'll share something with the committee.

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
Continue to refine Bridge Replacement, AMM and AAC recommendations	June 21	Levy co-chairs	Complete: Shared with committee on 07/27	Mid-July
Share Oversight Committee Response outline with committee	June 21	Levy co-chairs	Levy co-chairs to share outline with Elliot to share with committee	Mid-July

Action item	Meeting	Lead	Status	Deadline
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	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
As part of public outreach, SDOT should reaching out to groups that would be impacted by pedestrian sub-program changes – Senior services and disability groups.	June 21	Elliot	Complete: Incorporated into public outreach plan for September outreach	August 23
Request for AAC paving list for 2021- 2024 projects by 2019	June 7	Elliot	In progress: Tracking to ensure that committee is provided list in 2019	2019 – specific deadline TBD
Develop guiding principles for the next levy	June 7	LOC	Tracking	TBD; LOC to determine
Consider extended meetings to review priorities and draft recommendations	May 24	LOC co-chairs Elliot	In progress: Elliot to coordinate with LOC co-chairs on which meetings need to be extended	TBD
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
Provide sub-program options for LOC and modal boards to consider	May 24	SDOT	In progress: Elliot coordinating with Office of Move Seattle to develop options	SBAB - May 31 SPAB – June 1 STAB – June 1 LOC – June 1
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

Action item	Meeting	Lead	Status	Deadline
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: 7:31 PM