

# Regional Transportation System Initiative Technical Committee Meeting #6 Summary

September 8, 2017, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Puget Sound Regional Council – 1011 Western Ave #500, Seattle

---

## Welcome and Introductions

Bob Wheeler (facilitator – Triangle Associates) called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and Regional Transportation System Initiative (RTSI) meeting participants did a round of introductions. Bob reviewed the meeting agenda, and then participants accepted the July 14 Technical Committee meeting summary.

---

## RTSI Schedule

The facilitator noted the October 6 Technical Committee Meeting will focus on completing revenue recommendations and developing a package of materials as an outcome of the RTSI Technical Committee's work. That package may include the RTSI network map, maintenance and preservation costs, capacity/congestion improvement costs, and mobility/transit/ITS costs. He also noted the Technical Committee has meeting dates set for November 3 and December 1, however it has not yet been confirmed if those meetings will take place. RTSI Technical Committee members were encouraged to keep these dates reserved at this point. Additionally, the Elected Officials Committee meeting date will be set soon; potentially taking place in November but more likely in December.

---

## RTSI Network Maintenance and Preservation Cost Estimates Process

The facilitator noted that Triangle will soon email a spreadsheet to Technical Committee participants with road data for each jurisdiction from which RTSI network maintenance and preservation rolled-up costs will be calculated. Technical Committee members will be asked to review the data for their jurisdictions and send any edits or comments on this data to Evan Lewis with Triangle Associates ([elewis@triangleassociates.com](mailto:elewis@triangleassociates.com)) by September 22, 2017.

---

## Revenue Options – Existing and Potential

Pavithra Parthasarathi (PSRC) presented information on existing and potential future revenue options the RTSI Technical Committee might consider and which were considered as part of the PSRC Transportation 2040 Financial Strategy. She first highlighted the \$198 billion of need in PSRC counties for maintenance and preservation, regional capacity projects, and local system improvements, as well as a \$41.5 billion revenue gap through 2040 for addressing this need. Cities and counties account for half of this revenue gap.

To address this revenue gap, the proposed PSRC policy direction is to maintain and increase currently available revenue sources while transitioning to user-based fees in the long-run, as well as better addressing more local needs in the near-term using both current and new tools. This policy direction specifically includes road usage charges rather than Limited Access Highway System tolls, uses funding tools that address desired regional performance outcomes (such as greenhouse gas emission reductions), and striving for equity in benefits and impacts particularly for underserved groups. PSRC considered several factors in evaluating revenue sources including how the revenue source supported a regional transportation vision, system management potential, greenhouse gas reduction potential, equity, diversity and stability of sources, revenue potential, costs to administer, and feasibility.

The T2040 Financial Strategy involved looking at several revenue sources for city streets and county roads. Pavithra reviewed several strengths and weaknesses aspects of different revenue sources including the costs of establishing the revenue source, the feasibility of implementing it, and other considerations.

Detailed lists of strengths and weaknesses for each of these potential revenue sources are found in the PSRC presentation on the “Resources” page of the RTSI website:  
<https://www.regionaltransportationsystem.org/resources/>

Potential revenue sources reviewed, with brief notes for some sources, included the following:

- **User pricing approaches** such as limited access tolling and road usage charges.
- **Index existing tax on fuel**
- **Carbon tax on fuel**
- **Paid parking surcharge**
- **Transportation Benefit Districts (TBD):** This is a flexible source allowing cities and counties to work together. Many jurisdictions have implemented TBDs.
- **Transportation impact fees (TIFs):** 22 jurisdictions in King County have implemented TIFs, with a wide range of rates from city to city.
- **Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET):** This is an existing revenue source.
- **County Road Levy Lift**
- **Street Utility Charge**
- **Local option motor vehicle and special fuel tax for counties:** No county in Washington State has implemented this revenue option to-date.
- **Commercial parking tax:** Nine cities charge this and money can be used for general transportation.
- **Property tax road levy**
- **Real estate excise tax:** The current state rate is 1.28%.

*Questions and Comments on Revenue Options Presentation:*

- Does PSRC have information on general congestion pricing?
  - Road usage charges get at this somewhat.
- The following comments were made specifically about transportation impact fees (TIFs):
  - Highways of statewide significance are exempt from TIFs which makes implementation difficult.
  - WSDOT’s concurrency measures can affect TIF implementation.
  - Two TIF concerns include the 6-year timeframe for expending revenue and transparency around how jurisdictions use TIF revenue.

#### Revenue Brainstorming

Informed by PSRC’s presentation, participants shared several of their ideas related to revenue options for the RTSI network.

*Specific Ideas and Approaches to Consider:*

- Congestion pricing
- Transportation Impact fees: Consider advantages and disadvantages, and how to set them.
- Utility tax: This is the most equitable way to assess fees. Phoenix, AZ is looking at a utility tax right now. However, privacy concerns have been raised about GPS units in being placed in vehicles in order to assess this tax.
- Street utility charges: While Institute of Transportation Engineer (ITE) rates are suspect they not a big deal for implementation.
- Cities tend to use new transportation revenue sources to pay for other things. For example, TBD money has been used to hire more police.
  - When new revenue sources are put to voters it should be clear that the funds cannot be used for other programs.
  - In the Move Seattle Levy it was made explicit how the money could be used. This was important to voters.

- The 2015-2016 King County Bridges and Roads Task Force identified many potential revenue sources to consider, such as a roads levy.
- If a new revenue source is proposed to voters, it should be clear to voters what happens if it passes or does not pass.

*Other existing revenue sources to consider:*

- Consider generating revenue from companies that use the jurisdiction’s right of way for sensors and other “Internet of Things” features, automated cars, and other future technology.
- Seattle has a transportation network company (TNC) fee on ride-hailing (such as Uber and Lyft).
- Federal Way has explored passing utility tax revenue onto roads.

*Potential new revenue sources to consider:*

- Reprioritize the County budget. Has anyone reviewed the budget and considered what is or is not worth funding overall?
  - King County has been cutting. It cut 43 percent of employees in the Road Services Division. Money cannot be moved across accounts. The issue is not how the County has structured its budget, but rather that there is a revenue problem for roads. Until this is changed then roads funding is in a mess. This problem was foreseen early on after the Growth Management Act was passed.

*Revenue sources that are not feasible:*

- Mill Creek: Residents are maxed out with new taxes, so we are in for a battle if new sources are proposed. Mill Creek has a stormwater utility tax to fund its 30-year old system.
- Burien: Is the understanding that not all transportation revenue generated in King County is spent here? Perhaps there can be more equity in the disbursement of transportation funds. Some rebalancing is worthwhile statewide.
  - Rebalancing of State funding to the region is a consideration PSRC is looking at right now.
- Gas tax revenue is not stable enough. We need revenue sources that are more stable.
- It is a violation of state law to use franchise utility and enterprise funds for roads
- Snoqualmie struggled with collecting the TBD tax and this has generated less revenue than expected.

## **Transit Information Session**

---

Jana Demas (King County Metro Transit) gave an overview of Metro Connects. She presented on Metro Connects’ 2040 Vision of offering more service and choices. Metro Connects offers frequent service transit, express service transit, and local/flexible transit options each with different ride frequencies, stop spacing and service hours. Jana highlighted where the Metro Connects network overlaps with the RTSI network.

Long-term, Metro sees many incremental capital improvement needs networked to provide these services and improve service speed and reliability. Metro also has strategies to improve Park-and-Ride access by managing the existing parking supply, increasing the supply of parking with low-cost solutions, and building new parking facilities. In order to see Metro Connects’ plans to fruition, it has a Development Program that builds partner relationships and staff coordination, builds the case for grants, and informs the Metro budgeting process. The Metro Connects Development Program has an Advisory Committee which ensures City and Metro priorities and resources are aligned, finds efficiencies, creates a regional project schedule, and builds a case for city and Metro-led grants.

## Next Steps

---

- Triangle will email a spreadsheet to Technical Committee participants with road data for each jurisdiction from which RTSI network maintenance and preservation rolled-up costs will be calculated. Technical Committee members will be asked to review the data for their jurisdictions and send any edits or comments on this data to Evan Lewis with Triangle Associates ([elewis@triangleassociates.com](mailto:elewis@triangleassociates.com)) by September 22, 2017.
- The next Technical Committee meeting is October 6<sup>th</sup>.

## Attachment 1: September 8, 2017 RTSI Technical Committee Meeting Participants

---

Name	Position	Affiliation
Rob Brown (phone)	Transportation Engineer	City of Kent
Rob Crittenden (phone)	Traffic Operations Manager	City of Redmond
Ingrid Gaub	Assistant Public Works Director and City Engineer	City of Auburn
Tracy Krawczyk	Policy and Planning Director	City of Seattle, Dept. of Transportation
Robert Lindskov	City Engineer	City of Covington
Jeff Lincoln (phone)	Public Works Director	City of Enumclaw
Eddie Low	Deputy Public Works Director	City of Bothell
Dan Marcinko	Parks and Public Works Director	City of Snoqualmie
Kamal Mahmoud	Acting Public Works Director	City of Mill Creek
Andrew Merges (phone)	Transportation and Engineering Services Manager	City of Des Moines
Alex Morcos (phone)	Mayor	City of Medina
Jim Morgan	Public Works Manager	City of Pacific
Rick Perez	City Traffic Engineer	City of Federal Way
Joel Pfundt (phone)	Transportation Engineering Manager	City of Kirkland
Brian Roberts	Assistant Public Works Director	City of Burien
Kurt Seemann	Transportation Manager	City of Issaquah
Jim Seitz	Transportation Director	City of Renton
Azim Sheikh-Taheri		WA State Department of Transportation
Kevin Snyder	Community Development and Public Works Director	City of Auburn
Nytasha Sowers (phone)	Transportation Services Manager	City of Shoreline
Paula Stevens (phone)	Assistant Director	Transportation Department, City of Bellevue
Scott Tkach	Public Works Director	City of Maple Valley
Nytasha Sowers	Transportation Division Manager	City of Shoreline
Jude Willcher	Capital Programming	City of Seattle, Dept. of Transportation
<i>There were five additional, unannounced participants on the conference line</i>		

**Meeting Staff**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Chris Arkills	Government Relations Officer	King County Road Services Division
Jana Demas	King County Metro Transit	Supervisor of Strategic Planning
Ruth Harvey	Strategic Business Operations Section Manager	King Road Services Division
Craig Helmann	Senior Program Manager	Puget Sound Regional Council
Shay Huff	Project Associate	Triangle Associates
Evan Lewis	Associate	Triangle Associates
Jay Osborne	Deputy Director	King County Road Services Division
Brian Parry	Senior Policy Analyst	Sound Cities Association
Pavithra Parthasarathi	Principal Planner	Puget Sound Regional Council
Gary Simonson	Associate Planner	Puget Sound Regional Council
Bob Wheeler	Senior Facilitator	Triangle Associates

**Other Meeting Attendees**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
Lauren Craig	Intergovernmental Relations	King County Department of Transportation
Ed Conyers	Engineering Services Section Manager	King County Road Services Division
Tricia Davis	Budget and Business Planning Manager	King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget
Kathy Lambert	Councilmember	King County Council
Christina O'Claire	Asst. Gen. Manager of Planning & Customer Services	King County Department of Transportation