

Levy to Move Seattle Oversight Committee Meeting

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

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

Date/Time: Tuesday, April 4, 2023 / 5:00 – 7:00 PM

Co-chairs: Inga Manskopf, Kevin Werner

Location: Video Conference, in-person at City Hall

Members Present:, Inga Manskopf, Kevin Werner, Dennis Gathard, Jessica Nguyen, Rachel Ben-Shmuel, Lisa Bogardus, Geri Poor (Freight Board), Councilmember Alex Pedersen (City Council), Quinn Kelly (Bike Board), Natasha Riveron (Pedestrian Board), Saroja Reddy (City Budget Office)

Members Absent: Chris Miller (Transit Board)

Guests: Kit Loo, Meghan Shephard, Vanessa Bacurin, Kris Castleman, Serena Lehman, Kalen Carney, Margo Iniguez Dawes, Katie Olsen, Caryn Walline, Francisca Stefan (all SDOT), Aaron Blumenthal (City Budget Office), Riz Rizwi (Transportation Equity Workgroup), KIRO TV, Sarajane Seigfriedt, Santosh Kuruvilla, Avery, Gabriel

MEETING CALL TO ORDER: 5:02PM

Welcome and roll call

Kevin W: Conducted roll call for committee members.

Public Comment

Kevin W.: Asked if anyone wanted to give public comment.

Sarah James Seigfriedt: I am from district 5 in Lake City Area. The Move Seattle Levy was a disappointment for sidewalks. Pedestrians are the majority modality. We committed 250 sidewalks in the current Levy and that is not enough. People won't be encouraged to walk more if there is nowhere to walk. The city should Prioritize Urban Villages. Please coordinate with the 20-year comprehensive plan. Ensure all Urban Villages have sidewalks in 20 years. Developers are required to build sidewalks. We can't wait for all that development. Please prioritize sidewalks and along arterials.

Agenda item #1: Bridge Seismic

Kit L. Meghan S. and Vanessa B.: Shared on updated on the Bridge Seismic Program.

Rachel B: It is hard for a volunteer to figure out what is going on with this program. It's not so much the number of bridges but which bridges. In 2020 the Fremont and Ballard Bridges were taken off due to cost. Those are critical bridges. Doesn't matter what the commitment, focus on

the ones that are the most critical and carry the most traffic. If they cost more, talk about what it would take to bring them into compliance.

Kit L: Hard to talk about the funding. We were surprised about how expensive those bridges are. Historically, we didn't address all the issues to do a retrofit that we now do for a retrofit. In the past, SODT scaled retrofits to fit the funding. However, not doing a full retrofit could make the bridge more vulnerable. A full retrofit of the Ballard or Fremont Bridges cost over \$60M which would wipe out almost all the funding in the program.

Francisca S: In 2023, SDOT is wrapping up a Strategic Investment plan for all our investments to allow us to make smart decisions now to extend all out the assets' lifespan. We agree all the Ship Canal Bridges deserve investment and attention. We will then put together a package to ensure we are using city investment wisely. Since we could do these 16, it was good to do so and in doing so we could still meet the commitment.

Kevin W.: What is the title of the document you mentioned?

Francisca S.: Follow-up for Audit Findings: Bridge Strategic Asset Management Plan. Working at a component-level assessment to extend lifespan on inventory.

Kevin W.: When it is finished can you share?

Francisca S.: It will be finished this year. Happy to provide the presentation recently given to the Transportation and Utilities Committee to the LOC.

CM Pedersen: Thank you and Rachel for opening up for questions. When people passed the Levy in 2015, I think people were thinking of multimodal bridges. There was a memo in 2020 that showed the original list of 16 with additional cost analysis. It is unclear what SDOT did in that analysis to justify why those bridges were dropped. We want to better understand why. We shouldn't be looking to congratulate ourselves by adding these additional bridges. I don't believe the Pedestrian Bridges count towards the 16. Council authorized \$100 million in bonds and it is too bad SDOT didn't take advantage of that money

Kevin W.: Any reaction from SDOT?

Francisca S.: Understand where you are coming from. We have humility in our approach. We haven't wavered as a department to invest in bridge assets. We heard that call through the Levy as well. We felt it was good stewardship. If these bridges fell down, it would be disruptive. We are thoughtful about what we can do now. Hope you are supportive of that.

Dennis G.: Can you say more about the Strategic Asset Investment Plan?

Francisca S.: As part of Seattle Transportation Plan there is a concurrent effort to look at SDOT funding overall. This includes Sound Transit investments, streetcar network, asset management,

etc.. We are at the beginning parts of that process. These will be some of the biggest inputs into future funding package.

Dennis G.: You need cost estimates moving forward. You can't blame the codes for changing cost estimates. In '94 we set priority based on community impacts to the city. How long a bridge will last is just part of it. If you were to consider that factor, Ballard and Fremont would rate highly. Will the new Levy include money for the Strategic Asset Management Plan? Will there be prioritization based on how it impacts the community if it fails?

Kit L: Our work will continue to look into this.

Geri P: These bridges are super important. Looking at slide 11, I am tripped up on Lower Spokane St Silt removal. Can you clarify?

Kit L: Silt removal is important because with the amount of silt that comes in, it causes the bridge to displace. Removing the silt will seismically reinforce the bridge.

Rachel B.: This is hard to follow. What is important to me is that what you do is transparent so that I can feel trust and comfort in the information in what is provided to us. I am bothered by removal of bridges (I get that they are too expensive). I remember when this came up. Whatever you do, make it clear so it is easy for us to follow. We are representing voters and their trust in SDOT. Trust has been important.

Lisa: The presentation was confusing. One bridge that hasn't been mentioned is the University Bridge. How does that fit in? How are you coordinating for federal infrastructure money that will become available?

Kit L: The University Bridge is not part of this seismic program. It is part of our rehab program, and part of our planning studies. We are looking at all the deficiencies currently.

Meghan S: The information is really complicated and technical. Have several projects underway meeting multiple needs. We welcome feedback about how we can make it really digestible. Want to honor the commitment.

Geri P: Do you know the seismic stability of that University Bridge?

Kit L: It will likely be in the future list.

Kevin W: Referencing the 2018 workplan list, why was there delay to start doing reinforcement projects until 2019?

Kit L.: The dates listed there are target dates for completing construction. Work had already started prior to 2019.

Meghan S.: We also experienced delays. The Concept Design Reports (CDRs) vastly exceeded what we thought could do. There were challenges along the way with projects that are moving forward. Procurement and design is very complex.

Kevin W: What would you do in the future?

Kit L: Really getting enough information up front as we put together the funding package. When cost estimates were put together for this Levy, we didn't have enough information.

Meghan S: Looking at the programs on Slide 4, these programs could look differently in the future. Excited to explore that.

Dennis G.: Will the plan be available prior to making a recommendation?

Meghan: We will have that plan available at the end of this year. We can talk about pieces of it; we are best poised to engage in 2024.

Agenda item #2: 2022 Annual Report

Serena L. and Kalen C.: Presented the 2022 Annual Report. As a reminder there are three Levy categories: Safe Routes, Maintenance and Repair, and Congestion Relief. SDOT is focused on meeting commitments from 2015 ordinance and meeting workplan goals from 2018 workplan update. We are investing in programs at risk of not meeting goals and across the portfolio to stay on track. There are multiple highlights from each category. Spend plan and budget are separate concepts. Budget is funding available for a program for a given year (informs and puts guardrails around spend plan). Spend plan is how much of that budget/funding we expect to use in a given year. Unspent funding within budget is captured in following year as "carryforward." Actual spending can vary from spend plan – this is called "variance." We have spent \$626M of \$930M Levy funding since inception. Last year we underspent in Q1 and Q2, due primarily to concrete strike and prioritizing crews for opening the West Seattle Bridge. In Q3 and Q4, we spent very close to our spend plan (i.e., had a low variance). Reviewed spending highlights/significant projects within each category. Congestion relief has the highest spending, largely due to the ongoing Madison RapidRide construction.

Lisa B.: What were the 6 freight improvements referenced in slide 10?

Serena L.: Completed 2022 Projects:

- Installation of 80 spaces of truck parking on Harbor Island
- Installation of 11 spaces of truck parking on SW Lander St
- Installation of guide signage on SW Spokane St, east of East Marginal Way
- Installation of overhead signage on the Spokane St corridor
- Restriping of Waterfront Quiet Zone

- Restriping of Diagonal Ave S

Kevin W.: Curious about distribution of resources among 30 programs/3 categories. Was it about right? Would we recommend changes?

Francisca S.: We should probably be guided by what the need is – what is today’s challenge? What do people in this community need now? Also, some projects are way more expensive than others.

Kevin W.: I think that’s exactly right. Sure there’s a lot of experience at SDOT from this current Levy. Would be helpful to have SDOT’s insight as we make our recommendation.

Serena L.: There’s a lot of overlapping work between these buckets. Agree this is a critical question (how much we want to fund each bucket). Also think about the nuance that you’ve learned through deep dives in the past several months.

Dennis G.: In this strategic plan, are all transportation categories included? It seems that city should have all transportation investments included in a comprehensive strategic plan.

Francisca: Yes, that’s true. The Seattle Transportation Plan is a comprehensive look at all transportation modes (curbspace management to freight movement to transit and everything in between).

Dennis: And sidewalks?

Francisca: Yes, absolutely.

Dennis: When you’re selling a Levy, which I’m anticipating, to me it makes more sense to sell a Levy that fixes bridges, a Levy that fixes sidewalks (rather than all transportation investments in one).

Jessica N.: Do you have a breakdown of money spent by neighborhood?

Serena L.: We recently embarked on a Levy equity workplan – we can answer this question on an ad hoc basis now, but we are working on being able to answer this systematically.

Agenda Item #3: 2023 Delivery Plan

Serena L.: Presented [2023 Levy Delivery Plan](#). Upcoming and current work includes and is not limited to 5 safety corridors; up to 13 lane-miles of paving; completing construction on Delridge, Route 7, and others; beginning construction of the E Marginal Way north segment.

Kalen C.: Presented spend plan portion of Delivery Plan. Noted that the total spend plan is \$303M in 2023.

Serena L.: Finishing strong on the Levy is one of the most important tasks we have. We remain on track for most programs despite challenges. We will be surging on delivery in bike, bridge seismic, paving, and new sidewalks programs.

Inga: Why was SDOT not able to surge before? Also, can you talk more about the spend variances in terms of Levy and non-Levy funds?

Serena: We are surging on several programs now that we have funding as we have renewed our commitment to meet 2015 goals on these programs. We are working on finding efficiencies and improving coordination so that we can deliver this work. Now that West Seattle Bridge repairs have been completed, crew capacity is increased. This has been a challenge in the past.

Kalen C.: Madison BRT was the project we spent the most in, but that project is highly leveraged. Most funding was not Levy funds. While we have similar total spending, we have a lower percentage of Levy spending because the largest project was primarily using leverage, not Levy funds.

Inga M.: So when you talk about spending \$78M last year, you didn't have to spend more than \$100M last year because there were a plethora of other funds outside of Levy dollars you could spend.

Sam F.: If towards the end of 2023 we are coming in under spend plan and things are better than expected, is there an opportunity to look at smaller projects like NSF that have been tabled?

Serena L.: Good question; all of us are monitoring Levy spend very closely and developing a decision matrix of what we do if we have funds that can be reprogrammed. There will be programs that overdeliver.

Geri P.: Observation, and can you comment? Looking at slides 3, 4, 5, 6, my brain wants to see the financial side of it to see how much money is being invested in each program. Can you include dollars in those program categories?

Serena L.: We would be happy to share that with you.

Kevin W.: That is it for the questions.

Agenda item #: Committee business

Kevin W.: Finalize 2022 Letter from Committee. We did this last week to meet the deadline to publish the 2022 Annual Report. Dennis, would you like to speak to what you shared?

Dennis G.: I tried hard to get information that I did not get. It was the opposite of what I shared. I think I am going to get the information I need.

Kevin W.: Modal board report-outs are next

Quinn K.: No report from SBAB.

Natasha R.: We are making some recommendations around frequency and treatments to get funding into the curb ramps program in the future.

Geri P.: Was out of town but was greeted by Director Spotts and Vision Zero.

Kevin W.: TAB not present.

Katie O.: Happy to resend out meeting minutes if people need them at this time.

Kevin W.: Next month there will be three meetings with minutes to approve.

Rachel B.: Should we try to get more people in person? Looking ahead as a committee it might be good to have an in-person meeting.

Kevin W.: Presentation Q&A format lends itself fine to hybrid.

Inga M.: Kick-off for recommendation in July & August.

Natasha: Might be unique for representing modal boards; it can be a little tough to come in person since it could mean potentially going downtown twice a week. Appreciate the hybrid model.

Kevin W.: All in-person or all remote is easier but this worked okay.

Sam F.: If you are facilitating in person, you need a laptop to be able to manage what is going on.

Jessica: As long as COVID is around, it is nice to have a remote option.

Dennis: Concur.

Adjourn: 6:50PM

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
-------------	---------	------	--------	----------

Kevin: Requested presentation of bridge strategic asset management plan to be sent to LOC	April 4, 2023	Katie	Presentation sent to LOC on April 5, 2023	May LOC meeting
Geri: Add/provide dollar amounts to each program/deliverable in the delivery plan (a new column)	April 4, 2023	Katie, Kalen, Serena	Response sent to Geri on April 5, 2023.	May LOC meeting