

Regional Transportation System Initiative

Technical Committee Meeting #7 Summary – DRAFT v 11/7/17

November 3, 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. The facilitator reviewed the meeting agenda and then participants accepted the September 8 Technical Committee meeting summary.

RTSI Timeline

The facilitator reviewed the RTSI timeline moving forward. Elected officials from jurisdictions in King County would meet on December 1, 2017 to make decisions on next steps for addressing the needs and costs of the RTSI network. Elected officials' recommendations would start being implemented in January 2018 and the RTSI Technical Committee may be reconvened later in 2018.

RTSI Needs and Cost Estimates Presentation

Gary Simonson (PSRC) reviewed PSRC's estimate of needs and costs for the RTSI network. The estimates showed the dollar amount of maintenance, preservation and capacity improvements needed for the RTSI network, through 2040, in 2018 dollars. Estimated capacity costs are \$10.6 billion, estimated maintenance and preservation costs are \$9.1 billion, and total estimated costs for the RTSI network, through 2040, are \$19.7 billion. Capacity cost estimates come from the Transportation 2040 (T-2040) Regional Capacity Project List and the Local Projects Database (based on local comprehensive plans). Maintenance and preservation costs include pavement, structures, and other features such as stormwater infrastructure and street lighting. Additional details about PSRC's cost estimate methodology are found in the slides presented at the meeting – found on the 'resources' page of the RTSI website at <https://www.regionaltransportationsystem.org/>.

Following PSRC's presentation, the Technical Committee developed and accepted the following motion: *The RTSI Technical Committee accepts the needs and costs estimate for the RTSI network presented at the 11/3/17 RTSI Technical Committee meeting. This data is accepted with the understanding that it is a rolled-up cost, for a rough order of magnitude, and not broken down by jurisdiction or by project. It is an estimate of around \$20 billion. This data is intended for the RTSI elected officials meeting on December 1, 2017.*

Questions and Comments about RTSI Network Needs and Cost Estimates:

- How much of the RTSI network capacity, maintenance and preservation costs are covered by current law revenue?
 - Region-wide for all PSRC counties, 70 percent of the need is covered by current law revenue and approximately this same percentage is assumed for King County.
- Do PSRC's current law revenue assumptions include revenue sources that have not been implemented?
 - PSRC's current law revenue assumptions exclude some revenue sources, such as certain impact fees, that are not yet implemented.
- Could PSRC show the total potential revenue from all currently authorized revenue sources?
 - PSRC will work to provide this data on potential revenue from all authorized sources.
- Where is the detailed data supporting PSRC's cost estimates presented at this meeting?
 - PSRC will make supporting data available on its website.
- What is the revenue gap profile of individual jurisdictions within King County? Is this data available?

- PSRC will check to see if jurisdiction-level revenue gap data is available, but this data is difficult to calculate for individual jurisdictions.
- How will the needs and cost estimates data be conveyed to elected officials and how will it be used?
 - The needs and cost estimates data will be presented to elected officials as the estimated costs associated with the RTSI network map elected officials accepted in June 2017. At this time, the needs and cost estimates accepted at this meeting will be presented to local elected officials for the December 1 meeting, and local elected officials can determine how to present this data to state legislators.

RTSI Revenue Options Presentation

Ben Bakkenta (PSRC) presented the regional-level (PSRC counties) individual and relative revenue-generating potential of several possible revenue sources that might be explored through the RTSI. Ben also presented the strengths and weaknesses of a few specific revenue sources, including:

- Carbon Tax on Fuel
- Paid Parking Surcharge
- Transportation Benefit Districts (TBDs)
- County Levy Lift
- Street Utility Charges

PSRC's revenue estimates came from the T-2040 Finance Working Group. Specific details about each revenue source presented by PSRC are found on the 'Resources Page' of the RTSI website at: <https://www.regionaltransportationsystem.org/>.

Questions and Comments about RTSI Revenue Options:

- Do some revenue options restrict certain types of projects from receiving tax revenue?
 - The T-2040 Finance Working Group did not specify restrictions on specific projects, but some of the revenue options reviewed by the Working Group were assumed for just local projects.
- At a recent City of Kirkland Public Works Parks and Human Services Committee meeting, several members felt the funding sources discussed through RTSI should be part of a broader policy discussion about taxes.
- Is it correct that PSRC presented a county-level needs/cost estimate but a regional level estimate, for all PSRC counties, of different revenue sources?
 - This is correct.
- Is it correct that the revenue options presented by PSRC are not currently included within PSRC's current law revenue estimates?
 - This is correct.
- Do the TBD revenue-generating potential estimates from PSRC only include potential TBDs that have not been implemented?
 - This is correct.
- The local option fuel tax and regional TBD should be considered through the RTSI. If bonded over 20 years a regional TBD could generate a lot of money.
 - A local option fuel tax or TBD could certainly be suggested to elected officials. Elected Officials could also consider revenue options beyond what the T-2040 Finance Working Group studied.
- When will T-2040 Finance Working Group data be released?
 - T-2040 Finance Working Group data will be released in Mid-December 2018 and adoption is expected in May 2018.
- Is a street utility charge a county tax on local utilities?
 - No, a street utility charge is where jurisdictions can estimate the number of trips generated by different land uses and use those estimates to assess fees for different land uses.

- What are user fees?
 - User fees can include several types of fees on road users, such as tolls.
- Can PSRC share with the Technical Committee which jurisdictions are currently using different revenue options, such as TBDs and impact fees, that were presented?
 - Yes, that data has been presented in the past and can be re-shared.
- When there is a funding gap, jurisdictions can either find more revenue or cut costs. Have jurisdictions looked at ways to cut costs as well? It seems like the RTSI is only taking a one-way approach focused on increasing revenue. Also, tolls and the cost of culverts for fish protection are a concern.
 - The 2015-2016 King County Bridges and Roads Task Force took a close look at several ways in which the King County Road Services Division has cut costs to address its revenue gap.
- When considering new revenue, jurisdictions need to be flexible to changing technologies, transportation modes, and regulations.
- Political considerations should be factored into the revenue options considered through the RTSI.
- Revenue estimates should be determined specifically for the RTSI network.
- On holidays, roadway capacity is not an issue. Perhaps elected officials should consider how to better stagger workers' hours to address capacity issues.

Revenue Options Straw Polling Discussion and Decision:

As a result of PSRC's revenue options presentation, Technical Committee participants discussed whether to conduct a straw poll at this meeting to better understand the preference among jurisdictions for different revenue options. While a few jurisdictions were unsure or did want to conduct the straw poll, most jurisdictions did not. Those against conducting the straw poll thought voicing a preference for new revenue was a political decision better left for elected officials. The Technical Committee ultimately decided not to conduct a revenue options straw poll at the November 3 meeting.

Planning on the December 1, 2017 Elected Officials Meeting

The facilitator reviewed proposed slides on what could be presented to elected officials at the December 1, 2017 elected officials meeting. The proposed slides addressed what the RTSI is and its purpose, what has been accomplished to-date through the RTSI, an RTSI timeline going forward, a summary of RTSI network cost estimates and revenue options from PSRC, and decisions needed from elected officials.

Through its discussion, the Technical Committee developed the following list of brainstormed topics and desired outcomes from the December 1 elected officials meeting:

- Clarify the purpose of the RTSI.
- Clearly identify what the RTSI Technical Committee has done to-date.
- Share pros and cons of different revenue sources and identify where there has been political opposition in the past to specific revenue sources.
- Educate elected officials with information about problems within the RTSI network.
- Review the RTSI timeline and be clear that it is a longer-term effort.
- Ensure there is time for elected officials to have conversations.
- Explain what revenue tools jurisdictions are currently using and pros/cons associated with those revenue tools.
- Ensure longer-term flexibility for revenue tools (accounting for new technology, regulations, other transportation modes, etc.)
- Show a broader list of revenue options than what was presented to the Technical Committee on 11/3/17.
- Show apples-apples needs and costs estimates and revenue estimates.

Additional Questions and Comments about the December 1 Elected Officials Meeting:

- Will the December 1 elected officials meeting result in an ask of the state legislature?
 - To-date the RTSI has focused on getting jurisdictions to talk about their common transportation problems as a first step. It is not expected that local elected officials will be ready to come up with an ask of the state legislature for the 2018 session.
 - Jurisdictions should not go to the state legislature without a clearer definition around what they are being asked to do.
- If local elected officials do not have buy-in from their respective city councils, then they may not be freed up to share what they feel at the December 1 elected officials meeting. January might be a better timeframe for the elected officials meeting.
- By January 2018 there may be significant turnover among elected officials.
- While it is difficult for PSRC to obtain current law revenue estimates for specific jurisdictions, through extrapolation PSRC could come up with a current law revenue estimate specific to King County.
- In revenue information provided to elected officials, the words “strengths” and “weaknesses” should be changed to “pros” and “cons”.

ITS Resources

Jay Osborne (King County Road Services Division) reported out on a conversation he had with Azim Sheikh-Taheri from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) about Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS). WSDOT led a project called “Traffic Busters” a couple years ago that included new traffic control software and a new traffic control center that better communicated with King County’s Traffic Control Center. While several individual cities have their own traffic control centers, they are not linked together, and some jurisdictions do not have any traffic control center, so there is room for ITS to improve regional traffic. WSDOT has offered to convene a meeting about ITS for interested jurisdictions. Additionally, WSDOT has engineers available to provide expertise to King County and other jurisdictions, as they currently are for the City of Issaquah regarding traffic reduction measures on Issaquah-Hobart Road.

As a follow up, Triangle will send the Technical Committee information from WSDOT about ITS resources for local jurisdictions.

Questions and Comments about ITS:

- If jurisdictions are pursuing ITS grant funding, the next round of grant proposals is due in February 2018, so it may be too late to obtain ITS funding this go-around.
- ITS is a great concept and the sooner cities get ITS done the better.

Next Steps

1. Triangle will email the Technical Committee the following:
 - a. Briefing materials for the December 1 elected officials meeting, including a clearer framework on what elected officials will be asked to discuss and decide at the meeting.
 - b. WSDOT information about ITS resources for local jurisdictions.
2. PSRC will address the following requests from the November 3 RTSI meeting:
 - a. Provide data on potential revenue from all authorized sources.
 - b. Provide, on the PSRC website, supporting data for all of PSRC’s RTSI needs and costs estimates.
 - c. Check if jurisdiction-level data is available on the revenue gap for maintenance, preservation and capacity improvements.
 - d. Re-share which jurisdictions are currently using different revenue options.
3. Hold the elected officials meeting at the Mercer Island Community Center on December 1, 2017 from 10 a.m. – noon.

Attachment 1: November 3, 2017 RTSI Technical Committee Meeting Participants

Name	Position	Affiliation
Will Appleton	Public Works Director	City of SeaTac
Genesee Adkins	Chief of Staff	City of Seattle, Department of Transportation
Boyd Benson (phone)	City Engineer/Public Works Director	City of Duvall
Kathy Brown	Public Works Director	City of Kirkland
April Delchamps	Senior Transportation Planner	City of Kent
Ingrid Gaub	Assistant Public Works Director and City Engineer	City of Auburn
Scott Hanis (phone)	Capital Projects Manager	City of Black Diamond
Bob Harrison	City Administrator	City of Issaquah
Tracy Krawczyk	Policy and Planning Director	City of Seattle, Department of Transportation
Steve Leniszewski	Public Works Director	City of Sammamish
Erin Leonhart	Interim Deputy City Manager	City of Bothell
Robert Lindskov	City Engineer	City of Covington
Jeff Lincoln	Public Works Director	City of Enumclaw
Andrew Merges	Transportation and Engineering Services Manager	City of Des Moines
Alex Morcos (phone)	Mayor	City of Medina
Jim Morgan	Public Works Manager	City of Pacific
Beth Mountsier	Planner/Policy Analyst	City of Redmond
Heather Mundon (phone)	Councilmember	City of Snoqualmie
Rick Perez	City Traffic Engineer	City of Federal Way
Jamie Reavis	Senior Planner	City of Tukwila
Brian Roberts	Assistant Public Works Director	City of Burien
Jim Seitz	Transportation Director	City of Renton
Kevin Snyder	Community Development and Public Works Director	City of Auburn
Nytasha Sowers	Transportation Services Manager	City of Shoreline
Jude Willcher	Capital Programming	City of Seattle, Department of Transportation

Meeting Staff

Name	Position	Affiliation
Chris Arkills	Government Relations Officer	King County Road Services Division
Ben Bakkenta	Program Manager	Puget Sound Regional Council

Name	Position	Affiliation
Craig Helmann	Senior Program Manager	Puget Sound Regional Council
Evan Lewis	Associate	Triangle Associates
Jay Osborne	Deputy Director	King County Road Services Division
Susan Oxholm	Intergovernmental Relations	King County Road Services Division
Susan West	Strategic Communications Specialist	King County Road Services Division
Brian Parry	Senior Policy Analyst	Sound Cities Association
Gary Simonson	Associate Planner	Puget Sound Regional Council
Bob Wheeler	Senior Facilitator	Triangle Associates

Other Meeting Attendees

Name	Position	Affiliation
Lise Kaye	Analyst	King County Council
Kathy Lambert	Councilmember	King County Council
Doug Levy	Lobbyist	Outcomes by Levy, LLC
Graydon Newman	Transportation Planner	King County Department of Transportation

DRAFT