

VandenBerghe, Alissa (Consultant)

From: Bennett Brooks [bennett@concurinc.net]
Sent: Friday, November 21, 2008 1:59 PM
To: Powers, Bob; Ron.Posthuma@kingcounty.gov; Dye, Dave; Paananen, Ron; Harold.Taniguchi@kingcounty.gov; Grace.Crunican@Seattle.Gov
Cc: Parsons, Jim; Grotefendt, Amy (Consultant); scott@concurinc.net
Subject: Schedule Recommendation and Meeting Observations

All,

Last night's meeting was extremely productive. The presentations were right on-point, the clarifying comments from technical staff were solid and built credibility for the analysis, and SAC members seemed to get the overarching message. Grace also did a great job of managing the meeting with a nice mix of discipline and humor.

I also continue to be impressed by many SAC members' patience with the process, interest in finding a thoughtful and analytically supported approach forward, and willingness to hang in there as we grind through the dense and technically complex analyses. That said, I feel this process is at a critical juncture. My thinking is driven by the following key reflections based on last night's (and recent) SAC comments.

- o ***SAC members are swimming (as in up-to-their-eyeballs) in the analysis.*** SAC members are needing and asking for time to understand the analysis and its implications. Their requests are consistent with the promises made to them at the start of this process. If they feel too harried, I strongly suspect many will be reluctant to rally behind the Tri-Agency's recommendations. Moreover, SAC members and others so inclined could use what they see as an excessively rushed pace to try and discredit the process.

- o ***SAC members are concerned that the schedule will not permit their informed input into Tri-Agency deliberations.*** The message from several speakers last night was crystal clear: "We've given significant time to this endeavor. Please make sure we have sufficient time to work with you on the hybrids and Tri-Agency recommendation." In these comments, I don't believe the SAC is trying to push beyond their advisory role. Rather, I think they are simply trying to assure they can fulfill their advisory role in a way that is meaningful and credible to their various constituencies.

Given this, I would like to propose that Tri-Agency consider seriously the following recommendation at its meeting next week: Add one or two SAC meetings - AND NO MORE - to the current schedule. This extra time will afford us several advantages:

- o It will give Tri-Agency a chance to share with the SAC our big-picture learnings from the stack of performance measures rolled out over the last few months. These learnings would center around a handful of cross-cutting categories - for example, distinguishing v. non-distinguishing measures, key tradeoffs and critical unknowns - and provide a solid foundation for the hybrids to follow. (In other words, we need to take at least a little time to agree on what we learned before turning to what we do with this learning.) It is also a prerequisite, I

believe, if we are to have any hope of building broad support for the hybrids and any eventual recommendation forwarded to the Executives.

- o It will give time for Grace, Dave and Harold to engage in off-line conversations with SAC members and other opinion leaders to gauge where they're at and communicate clearly Tri-Agency's main learnings and emerging path forward. The current schedule currently affords little opportunity for this type of quieter fact-finding - input that will likely be essential in (1) crafting the hybrids to most successfully balance among the Guiding Principles; and (2) helping us to frame stakeholder perspectives for consideration by the Executives.

- o It will give Jim and his team time to engage in any additional analyses needed to make the case for the hybrids and the eventual recommendation forwarded to the Executives.

Again, I would like to propose that Tri-Agency focus on this issue at its meeting this Tuesday. We (blessedly) do not have to crank out a presentation next week, so we have a small window to step back and thoughtfully assess where we're at and agree on the wisest course forward. Moreover, it seems vital to me that we tackle this topic BEFORE the briefings with the executives in early December so any conclusions reached can be folded into recommendations developed for their consideration.

I look forward to speaking with you all next week.

Bennett

P.S. - Below are a handful of other observations based on the meeting.

- o ***Economic impact presentation.*** We need to work closely with Terry Moore to do whatever we can to ensure his analysis and presentation is a mix of high-level and neighborhood findings. Steve's presentation on parking is, I think, a good model, with big-picture findings presented first followed by more specific neighborhood impacts. I understand the data may limit the extent to which Terry can pursue such a strategy, but - wherever possible - we need to encourage such an approach.

- o ***Opening reflections by SAC members.*** I think we would do well to add a 15- to 20-minute section at the start of the December 4 meeting to afford SAC members a brief opportunity to reflect on their most learnings and the workshops. I think the brief conversation we had at the start of yesterday's meeting was extremely productive and helped deal with some of the members' frustrations.

- o ***Freight interests.*** It seems like Tri-Agency would benefit from a focused sidebar conversation with the freight community. The comments from freight interests last night seemed to suggest that they believe that most of the scenarios will leave them unacceptably worse off. Moreover, the comments seemed to suggest to me that they have the impression that Tri-Agency is not concerned with the potential impacts. A focused conversation seems like a timely step - both to understand their concerns and more clearly articulate how Tri-Agency sees freight's interests being satisfied.

- o ***Bored tunnel.*** This may be an issue that needs to be revisited, as some SAC members seemed unconvinced that the timeline and pricetag for the bored tunnel were realistic (too long and too high). Perhaps this can be handled satisfactorily through the follow-on workshops, but we should keep an eye on this.

- o ***Parking data.*** We need to consider the potential to address concerns raised by SAC members about the

utility of average versus peak parking data. This seems like an issue that will linger if not satisfactorily addressed.
