

## King County Bridges and Roads Task Force Master List of all Proposed Recommendations - DRAFT Version 11/6/15

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>EFFICIENCIES</b>		
Look to coordinate maintenance efforts with local municipalities that can help reduce costs.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cities may want to see how the County improves cost-efficiency and accountability before coordination.</li> </ul>
Working with adjacent jurisdictions on Traffic Impact Fees to address where there are combined impacts to both City and County systems.	Developments on the edges often have impacts in both jurisdictions but fees are only related to the jurisdiction where the building is located leaving the other agency effected without mitigation.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased cost to developers in these areas as they would be participating in two fee systems.</li> <li>• The true mitigation of the incremental impact of developments on all systems impacts.</li> </ul>
Partner with National Guard; Customs or the Department of Homeland Security for various efficiencies	Determine what assets these orgs. have that might be “shareable.”	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These entities also have a stake in keeping bridges and certain roads safe and passable in most scenarios</li> <li>• Possible storage facilities as well</li> </ul>
Privatize road repair	Open up road work and repairs to private industry/contractors	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May reduce costs</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> Complexities abound for incompetent contractors
Consider sharing road maintenance facilities with state and cities to save costs.	Shared facilities eliminate costly duplication.	Accounting for costs and who would be responsible for stocking could be a challenge.
Consider privatizing or contracting more road services	Reduce costs and drive efficiencies by having others bid for roadwork	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential for substantial cost savings</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managing the privatization process will likely be complex</li> <li>• Incompetent service providers will product major headaches</li> </ul>
Contract roads repair to private firms	Bidding process for repair and new roads	<b>Pro</b> Reduce junk and facility expense

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>EFFICIENCIES</b>		
Offer to let cities, locals or perhaps even groups of private citizens take over their own roads if they want; possibly even sell them the rights or charge something to indicate that the road has value	Create the appropriate legal guidelines then give or sell the roads to entities that want them and who can prove they will take care of them	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Offloads maintenance costs</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could generate headaches if new hosts are incompetent</li> </ul>
Reduce scope of “road services” even further. Example: Perhaps turn over downed trees, mowing and leaf cleanup to Wildlife, Environmental or Dept. of Ecology (or similar).	List all road services and determine what other departments perform similar services, then consider handoffs.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could result in laser focus on road maintenance and construction</li> <li>• Could reduce costs substantially</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May have already been considered</li> <li>• Could result in road svc. runaround while departments determine who owns the problem</li> </ul>
Of course we should look at the cuts already made and the timing of changes in operations to see if there is anything else that can be implemented, probably not likely.		
Recognizing that King County has already made great improvements and efficiencies in the Roads Division, continue to investigate and implement additional efficiencies in staffing, resource deployment, construction and road materials.	Staff has worked diligently on efficiencies and improvements in the roads division. With new technologies, strategic partnerships and improved construction materials additional efficiencies may be possible in the years to come.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I don’t have any specific improvements at this time, but feel it is important to keep this as a priority for future improvements as new opportunities present themselves in the future.</li> </ul>
Identify the strategy tools in the KC Strategic Action Plan to make sure our investment in roads and bridges will reduce pollution and maximize public transportation options	KC has drafted the Strategic Climate Action Plan, it has specific goals around transportation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Thinking about the roads and bridges financial crisis with a climate justice lens will force the county to use different tools to address the issue. County staff may not be willing to take these risks.</li> </ul>
Stop talking about roads and bridges in isolation of transit. The county and Sound Transit (Our regional transportation agency) should be looking	Having transit separate from roads and bridges seems counterintuitive and will	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will require the County staff to work cross lines which can be very difficult to do in practice!</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>EFFICIENCIES</b>		
at every street and bridge and deciding whether or not the usage warrants investment in fixed rail (Train, commuter rail, street car, monorail)	likely continue to find ways to fund these roads with minimal or no revenue.	
Further study and develop a plan specifically to study the feasibility of developing partnerships with other political subdivisions.	Chapter 39.34 RCW INTERLOCAL COOPERATION ACT	Hire a Professional Consulting Firm. <b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-bias Report and recommendations</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be costly</li> </ul>
Re-visit and enforce the original Growth Management Act (GMA) within the state of WA which was supposed to distribute funds from metro to rural areas	Allegedly the intent of the GMA has not been realized and larger cities have escaped payment for rural resources; Re-explore original intent and purpose to see if there is something there worth pursuing	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The GMA may have already spelled out the funding solution(s)</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be politically challenging</li> </ul>
Spending audit by a private industry or firm	Hire a consultant for spending review.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• accountability to the public</li> </ul>
Improve accountability within Roads Division and make it easier to terminate non-performers.	Some cities choose not to contract with Roads Division due to lack of accountability for cost overruns and schedule impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staffers have been moved to different positions during layoff period.</li> </ul>
Add expert bridge engineers to the task force to provide expertise and knowledge	Use consultants, County bridge engineers / WSDOT bridge engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultants may work pro-bono. WSDOT/County engineers can be cost effective.</li> </ul>
Increase the amount of work that the county crews can perform “in-house” without having to go to bid with contractors.	This will allow the county to move forward with some smaller projects with their staff.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saves time and money. Some of the smaller contractors may not like it. This would help reduce costs of stormwater and other required environmental components of the roads system, in particular.</li> </ul>
Local workers should help fix the roads.	If we employ local workers to fix the roads in their community we ensure money is going to be spent in unincorporated communities which will	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The American Reinvestment and Recovery Act gave stimulus dollars to help create jobs; but many of those jobs did not go to local residents. Need to look to Seattle and its Priority Hire Ordinance.</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>EFFICIENCIES</b>		
	increase tax revenue. These workers are able to work in their community which is good for the environment and community	
Need to increase staff for maintenance of roads and specialized services.		
Prison work programs	Reduce labor costs by using skilled but lower cost laborers (low risk offenses, etc.).	
Work with the unions to determine ways to drive down costs or to have the unions optimize the labor force.	Determine if there are seniority or wage factors keeping costs high; consider tradeoff analysis compared to further workforce reductions	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This exercise may already have been completed.</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unions may not like this approach but it may beat further job reductions</li> </ul>
Limit Union presence to one, not nine!		<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reduce this mess and expense</li> </ul>
Start using cities' street development standards within the cities' Potential Annexation Area (PAA).	This would be a small step in working with cities on street issues and would in the long run be a positive factor in considering annexing areas of King County and reducing their need.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cities could have higher standards and would increase the cost to developers.</li> </ul>
Better coordination with development review adjacent to the municipalities to require City standards.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Cities may want to see how the County improves cost-efficiency and accountability before coordination.</li> </ul>
The County should increase its inspection of new development to ensure standards are being met.	Often developments administered by King County have poor compaction and inadequate pavement depths, resulting in high long-term maintenance expenses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Costs are reimbursable by development. Reduces maintenance expenses and facilitates annexations.</li> <li>Developers will object to increased costs.</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>EFFICIENCIES</b>		
Use ratings for bridges based on bridge condition reports, ADT, location of bridge, economic considerations	Importance of a bridge to local and regional economy, access and connectivity	
Expand pedestrian connectivity and bicycle parking at transit stops and park and ride lots to increase access to transit.		
Infrastructure projects should be “off the shelf plans”, should be utilitarian, and not uniquely designed each time	Have a short list of plans for all bridges and repair	Pro <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expense of engineering is reduced</li> </ul> Con <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• loss of engineers</li> </ul>
Update outdated state statutes for local roads, including at least the county road engineer laws to reflect current day technology and practices.	As I understand it, there are state laws that are outdated and don’t allow for electronic storage of records and/or require the roads department to have a separate storage from the rest of the county’s records.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Save some money, easier access for roads department and the public of records. Cannot think of any cons to updating state statute to allow for safe electronic storage of materials.</li> </ul>
Outlaw studded tires.	Studded tires increase wear and tear on pavement.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has been a sensitive topic at the state level. WSDOT has pursued legislation in the past with no success.</li> </ul>
Outlaw studded tires at all times of year. Chains still allowed in heavy snow conditions.	This will greatly reduce the wear on road surfaces. New tire technologies make studs obsolete.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> </ul>
Create a mechanism for citizens to vote for area priorities using crowd-funded voting system where dollars equals votes (efficiencies realized through goodwill, PR and prioritization)	Dollars contributed towards an area for repair could supplement costs of repair and simultaneously create efficiencies because priorities are dictated by the people; note: priorities will still be addressed regardless of funding, but WSDOT would determine priority unless crowd-fund dictates higher priority	Pro <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public chooses what’s most important to them</li> <li>• Generates supplemental contributions</li> </ul> Con <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big or rich areas could siphon priorities away from other things but WSDOT could still follow a default plan</li> </ul>
\$ Cap project by head of roads (elected person?)	Head of roads fully responsible for projects over-budget	Pro <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People need a face in government</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>EFFICIENCIES</b>		
		Con <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One more elected person</li> </ul>
Provide and expand public transit services to specifically target riders using the unincorporated roads and bridges		
Expand and improve service for people who depend on public transportation—older adults, individuals with disabilities, people in rural areas, unincorporated and the poor.		
Instead of a tier system consider a PCI-based system so decisions are based on road conditions and not tier. Snohomish County is doing this. This would be an asset management system.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional information is needed on this to see what road conditions actually are compared to what tier the road is in.</li> <li>• Data is desired to back up the tier system.</li> </ul>	
Renegotiation with unions on hourly pay rates.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These negotiations come up periodically</li> <li>• How do these negotiations take place?</li> </ul>	
Reduce the number of unions and bargaining units.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has this been explored?</li> <li>• Is this feasible and could there be fewer bargaining units?</li> </ul>	

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>		
Possibly work with public schools and/or their bus storage facilities for additional road storage and staging areas	The school system seems to have large bus storage facilities with extra room	<p>Pro</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Equipment repair capabilities and fuel already on site</li> </ul>
Possibly team up with fire stations for equipment storage and staging areas	Use the broadly distributed fire stations as storage for salt, sandbags, certain equipment, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Always manned</li> <li>Allows closer/faster access</li> </ul> <p>Con</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stuff distributed everywhere</li> </ul>
Increase the number/miles of county bridges and roads maintained by city road departments.		<p>Con</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a significant Con with this: Cities are already struggling to maintain their own roads. This would require funding and the use of City standards before many Cities would consider this. Many cities aren't equipped to inspect and maintain bridges.</li> </ul>
City annexation of county roads that are "islands" between two nearby jurisdictions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the city refuses to annex these island roads then the city should be charge a user fee. What does it cost to maintain/repair these roads? Submit the bill to the City before conducting maintenance or repair. If the city refuses to pay or annex. Close the road.</li> <li>There are 62 segments of KC owned roads that are entirely surrounded by cities because the original boundary lines for annexation weren't drawn properly.</li> <li>Allows the County to focus its resources in the larger unincorporated areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The County would need to be in control of the medial and communication on this so that angry residents will force their city to act!</li> <li>Education opportunity: Some residents are under the mistaken impression that they can stay rural by not annexing. The County should educate residents about the urban growth boundary. The real question is who manages the transition.</li> <li>Will save the county money while only putting a minimal cost off to cities (since they'd likely each only be taking a couple of segments, as opposed to the county's responsibility for all of them now). Public would be happy because the roads would all be maintained to the same level in an area.</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>		
Work with all cities and the bordering County's to see what can be realistically transferred or divided responsibility for maintenance.		
Score infrastructure (roads and bridges) based on condition, regional importance, and economic consideration/job growth. Each municipality provides a list of up to 3 roads/bridges.	Would help prioritize the roads and bridges to do list region wide	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would help make the process more organized.</li> </ul> <b>Cons</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cannot make everyone happy.</li> </ul>
Increase resources to support transportation projects that better integrate housing, community economic development, and environmental sustainability goals.		
Bid process for a geographic area to a private contractor	One company does all maintenance for an area.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review of quality for renewed contracted will be easy.</li> </ul>
Is it possible to create an in-state version of the Civilian Conservation Corps?	An in-state version of the CCC might provide a great avenue to train unskilled workers or the homeless to do great things	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be a huge political win at the state level</li> <li>• Would likely get National contribution funding or big grant support</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complicated to get started</li> <li>• Would likely take a long time to see first results</li> </ul>
Change the road vacation policy to let the county give the roads (that are usually driveways) to the willing homeowners, without requiring the county to charge "fair market value".	Allow the county to consider "other public benefits" like reducing liability, reducing O&M costs, etc., instead of having to charge fair market value.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would be an option, not required. So this should only have benefits.</li> </ul>
Examine new policies for road vacations so that the county does not have to charge fair-market value and can instead look at other public benefits for said road vacations.	Provides more flexibility in criteria to review what public benefit is for roadway vacations.	Examine new policies for road vacations so that the county does not have to charge fair-market value and can instead look at other public benefits for said road vacations.

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>		
Create a rigorous and data-driven approach to understanding what parts of the system can be decommissioned to “go back to nature.”	The existing County transportation system was not built systematically and cost-effectively. There are existing roads that cost money but do not serve an essential role. The County needs to review its system and plan to close roads that cost more than they benefit the County.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More efficient and cost-effective transportation network.</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential political pushback from users of these non-essential roads.</li> </ul>
Seriously re-visit and study rail loops or equivalent to move people from major communities to work areas		<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might initially be expensive</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be most cost effective over the long haul</li> </ul>
As retentive as this may sound, do additional analysis to ensure that future roads are as straight as possible and use the least amount of material possible. The assumption here is that curvy roads cost more.		<b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It might actually cost more in Engineering and land clearing to make a straight road than the savings realized otherwise</li> </ul>
Study alternative transportation routes when a bridge or roadway is in disrepair. Through a cost/risk analysis and community impact study, make decisions accordingly as to replacements & repairs.	Spend money efficiently to maintain or re-create long-term sustainability.	Community-based conversations would be crucial to the success of this approach. <b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost efficient</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential political fallout.</li> </ul>
Maintain what you have	It’s not ethical to abandon a tax payer’s established access. Unethical, subjective, decisions will be hard to defend under scrutiny	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public confidence in the roads system.</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expensive in some areas.</li> </ul>
Reduce bridge and road infrastructure responsibilities	Reduce disproportionate impact and potential unintended consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be based on priorities and focused on equity</li> <li>• Potential liabilities and safety concerns could dwarf any cost savings.</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>		
Allow some roads to “go back to nature.”		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to identify other forms of transportation for this idea to be successful (bike paths, fixed rail, alternate routes, etc.)</li> <li>• To make this happen without increasing liability, 100% of abutting property owners all must to agree to purchase vacated right-of-way.</li> </ul> <p><b>Pro</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduces liability and O&amp;M costs.</li> </ul>
Check to see if it is possible to let some roads go back to gravel, don't think that same approach can be applied to bridges		
Shut stuff down	Plain and simple; shut down more roads and bridges	
I like the recommendations already submitted and do not feel like another one is needed. However, I do think it would be good to somehow include emphasis on reducing infrastructure responsibilities with the highest cost/benefit to King County, with the least negative impact to the public and the most politically feasible. Perhaps this can be included one or more of the recommendations already submitted?		
Explore new composite materials and innovations for fixing potholes and minor road patches		
Determine the topmost vehicle and human-based reason(s) the roads deteriorate and enforce good road stewardship aggressively (with fines for violations)	Levy heavy fines for studded tires or overweight trucks; destroying shoulders or whatever; maybe re-open weigh stations	<p><b>Con</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• might be difficult to enforce</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>INFRASTRUCTURE</b>		
Stop or reduce test pavement programs and/or rely on National test results		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National road/pavement testing may not be applicable to area conditions</li> </ul>
Suggest adding a fifth category on Land Use Policy recommendations. There are many instances where rigidity about UGA/rural boundaries unnecessarily increases cost, or diminishes the value of rural road infrastructure. Examples: the ongoing controversy surrounding the 1500 feet of rural road along the Duthie Hill notch in Sammamish. Or Lake Alice Road coming out of Fall City.		
Plan for potentially closing county infrastructure.	<p><i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Look at whether this was previously identified for the short list</li> <li>Will this happen anyway be attrition?</li> <li>Is this possible as a recommendation?</li> <li>Note that this would not be done in a way that limits access to properties.</li> </ul>	

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>REVENUES AND FUNDING</b>		
Require all gas to be pumped by a human (like Oregon); tax the gas pumpers uniquely or similar if allowed by the new law	Borrowing a page from Oregon, generate jobs and collect gas-station taxes from gas pumping employees	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Helps the economy overall</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Makes gas prices more expensive and thus an economist needs to monitor cost-benefits constantly to stay</li> </ul>
Lift 1% cap on property taxes through initiative or legislative process		<b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political feasibility</li> <li>• Cost</li> </ul>
State legislature should increase the tax revenue growth rate to 6% or the rate of inflation	The 1998 tax incentive capped the amount of collection at 1% for property taxes. The 6% estimates would address the budget shortfall.	Need to tie this legislative initiative to the implementation of the Growth Management Act
Create a more progressive tax system that doesn't just focus on Roads/Transit, multi-pronged	Focusing on a funding source that will not only bring in money for Roads but for social services, public health, etc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expanding on how funds can be used will bring us more support from elected officials, public, hidden allies. Right now we only need a simple majority to get it passed. Do we have the political support?</li> </ul>
Examine the current state policy for federal allocations and reallocate so that there is more of a fair balance between city/county and state DOT allocations (I believe the existing allocation is 33/66 in favor of WSDOT).		
Look at a legislative approach across all of King County. An approach that just looks at rural roads and bridges in unincorporated King County is incomplete		
Change State law to allow a higher unincorporated levy amount for roads.		

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>REVENUES AND FUNDING</b>		
Add a surcharge for having an auto accident	Auto accidents incur an automatic fixed price surcharge to offset cost of police and road damage costs	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insurance lobby would hate this</li> <li>• Only have to pay if you are in an accident</li> <li>• Might help the public safety funding situation as well (if rev. shared)</li> </ul>
Pay more to get a driver’s license	Raise the cost of getting a DL substantially.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased revenue for a product that is probably elastic already. Folks will pay a lot for this privilege.</li> <li>• If fewer people get DL as result, that’s a good bi-product as they will use public transport or NOT be on the road</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the cost is too high it could be a concern</li> </ul>
Pay more for vehicle registration	Tag renewal will cost more	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May help offset lack of gas tax revenue</li> <li>• Funding source is directly related to car ownership/road use</li> </ul>
Find alternatives to funding roads beyond property taxes.		
Utilize grant funding for some road drainage and flooding issues.		
Transition to more toll roads		
Weekday vs. weekend toll rates (similar to peak and off-peak charging).		
Create tolls for bridges and roads with retroactive rate structure or caps that make it lower costs for locals and higher for one time visitors (or a variation of this theme)	Cross a bridge five or fewer times per month and it’s \$2 each trip; six or more trips reduces ALL fares—including previous trips to 50 cents per trip; max \$cap per month of \$15 or similar	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good source of revenue</li> <li>• Built in mechanism to ensure that locals don’t have to pay as much</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Toll scheme is slightly complicated although very effective</li> <li>• Locals will not likely like this approach at all</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>REVENUES AND FUNDING</b>		
Create a toll-tag or road usage tracker toll system and charge different usage rates for different areas	This is an in-car system that charges users based on the types of roads they use. There are endless variations of this idea.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You only pay if you are using certain roads</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>People would perceive they are being tracked (privacy concerns)</li> </ul>
Find a user fee solution.	Require incorporated county residents to purchase a permit in order to use unincorporated county roads (long-term stable funding source).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Transportation Futures Task Force is evaluating this as a potential funding source. <b>Con</b></li> <li>Administrative complexity and management that could reduce the potential funding benefit.</li> </ul>
Use the models that Oregon and others are using to impose user fees on our road system. This is in addition to current transportation property taxes levied and state gas taxes.	This may need to be a regional solution for the greater Puget sound area, in order to make it work.	May be harder to implement. This is also a fairer way to fund roads. Those that use the road system more pay more.
Create a transportation benefit districts.		
Create a transportation benefit districts that charges money countywide, not just in rural and unincorporated areas.	With 50% of the trips being generated outside of rural and unincorporated areas, it makes sense that a part of the funding solution will include all county taxpayers.	
Pay separately for snow, tree removal	Require citizens to pay a special fee or similar ONLY if snow removal is required or tree removal is required; cap max \$ outlay per household, etc.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Helps cover cost of snow/tree removal</li> <li>Only taxed IF needed (folks might save money)</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Folks might not like the variable cost (although a max. cap is recommended)</li> </ul>
Ask for more revenue from the major employers in the region or in certain areas	Simple and non-creative approach to ask the big congestors to pay more for the problems created	<b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These major employers may feel that creating jobs is good enough...why should they pay more?</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>REVENUES AND FUNDING</b>		
Generate revenue by allowing people to pay to name new roads or re-name certain old roads based on highest bidders or similar	WSDOT could establish rules of engagement and auction off road names for new construction and/or strategically limited old roads (WSDOT would decide what gets to be named or renamed); Could loosely follow custom license plate rules	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fun and interesting</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One shot funding source (but would help)</li> <li>• Might wreak havoc on mapping companies, printed maps and software</li> </ul>
Require car inspections (and generate revenue from inspection fees)	Require car inspections every two years or via some other increment (like five years after purchase) to ensure cars are safe and not harming the roads; collect revenue and drive auto-parts and service ecosystem	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great source of relevant revenue</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complexities in setting up inspection infrastructure</li> </ul>
Charge a utility tax		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big energy users will pay a larger portion of taxes bringing in money. Is there the political support for this? Will there be tax exemptions for the big energy users therefore defeating the purpose of the tax?</li> </ul>
Offer up roads services to other counties and cities		<b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Short staffing.</li> <li>• Not a steady source of income.</li> </ul>
Local option gas tax	Because County roads are used by many from cities within county, an increased local-option gas tax could help spread the responsibility to businesses and residents county-wide	
Increase the local option gas tax.	With 50% of the trips being generated outside of rural and unincorporated areas, it makes sense that a part of the funding solution will include all county taxpayers.	

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>REVENUES AND FUNDING</b>		
Increase the gas tax		<p><b>Pro</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• people would accept it for better roads</li> </ul> <p><b>Con</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• too much taxing already</li> </ul>
Determine a mechanism to appropriately tax or surcharge electric vehicles (since no gas tax is collected)	Determine a way to create more revenue from the sale and use of an electric or hybrid vehicle; This is an area of critical concern for the future because if more cars go electric there will be NO gas taxes to fund roads	<p><b>Pro</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EV car owners may NOT be price sensitive</li> <li>• Strategic for the future: Get EV road usage charges in place now before it's too late</li> </ul> <p><b>Con</b></p> <p>Charging EV owners feels a bit contrary to the whole ECO thing BUT this group may understand as they are typically wiser and more educated</p>
Consider a tax per mile driven		<p><b>Pro</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would capture electric car responsibility</li> </ul> <p><b>Con</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deciding how to implement it.</li> </ul>
Tax auto parts differently	Determine a mechanism to collect more revenue from auto parts sales since they specifically relate to vehicles using the road(s)	<p><b>Pro</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Auto-parts industries would dislike this</li> <li>• Captures revenue being lost from gas tax and places it into a tidy and relevant category</li> </ul> <p><b>Con</b></p> <p>Might hurt lower income although tax should not be extravagantly high</p>
Change the bonding formula so annexing cities have to pay outstanding debt left to County	The annexing city gets the benefit of the road improvements, they should have to pay for those improvements even if they happened. As result KC is paying for debt services on projects that are now outside the unincorporated area. Need a State legislative strategy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The county may need to pay towards some of the bond but not all of it. Need to come up with an equitable formula so the county pays for some and annexing cities pay for some. A possible ratio could be based on how much the bond was for divided by the number of years that repair is to last. The number of years remaining on the investment should be reimbursed by the annexing city.</li> </ul>

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>REVENUES AND FUNDING</b>		
Implement the Vehicle License Fee at a level which does not require voter approval		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More information needed on how these funds would be used.</li> </ul>
Provide more variety of grant sources in addition to PSRC and TIB (traditional sources)	In addition to TIB, PSRC/FHWA	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase chances of getting grants</li> </ul>
Create a lottery game that exclusively funds roads		
Ask for road donations at the gas pump. “Would you like to contribute \$1, \$5 or \$10 to help roads?”		
I strongly believe that the State should work with the Counties to adopt a percentage of MVET. This was done and was in existence until the first Tim Eyman initiative.		
Impose a vehicle license fee (VLF) for unincorporated area residents		
Invest Equitably and focus on results.		
Use vehicle miles traveled on each road as a potential criterion for funding distributions.		
Create a three-part funding strategy focused at the local, cross-jurisdictional, and state levels.		
Crowd-funding for road fixes (see also the efficiencies category)	Ask the public to contribute or match the cost of repairs	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public picks the priorities</li> <li>• Should result in less complaints</li> </ul>
Use more federal funds to support existing county infrastructure/transportation system.	Refocus King County’s PSRC allocation on existing infrastructure, instead of capacity and expansion projects.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More efficient use of resources on existing infrastructure instead of on new capacity or expansion “improvements” that may or may not provide real long-term transportation benefits to the system.</li> </ul>
Allow development projects in unincorporated KC	Increase tax base	

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>REVENUES AND FUNDING</b>		
Rely more on local improvement districts for roads maintenance and repair.	Incorporated cities must have more responsibility	
Invest in unincorporated business district and commercial areas to increase commercial tax revenue. Expanding the Transit Oriented Development idea to rural and unincorporated commercial districts, still protect natural lands and rural lands but create spaces that allow those who live in these communities with the resources and services that can be accessible by walking or biking. This will increase the “new construction” in unincorporated areas which will allow the County to collect 2% of taxes verses 1%.	Utilize RCW 35.81 to identify blighted areas in unincorporated commercial districts, create a community renewal plan for each community with projects that can efficiently relieve the use of the roads and bridges by incorporated residents passing through.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We need to design a growing transit community’s initiative to address the transit challenges faced by these rural and unincorporated communities. These places are transportation vehicle hubs without any resources to pay for the usage. This is an equity issue. Revitalizing these small business districts will increase the resources and allow for other transportation options.</li> </ul>
Establish criteria and align federal funding to county transportation outcomes such as improved mobility for people and goods, access, transit ridership, health and safety, as well as reduced household costs, carbon emissions, and vehicle miles traveled.		
Eliminate diversion of County Road Tax to other uses, such as Sheriff’s Office.	Although the impact may not be that significant, it improves transparency.	
Utilize energy and Task Force knowledge to build coalitions and partnerships across jurisdictions, and leverage these partnerships to advocate for more state funding.		
Build city support for county roads funding.	Since they are the majority.	To do this, cities would need to see a benefit to their citizens and a reduction of impacts on their own systems.
One more around funding could be if the county and cities could pool together resources to go in for major capital projects (perhaps limited to maintenance or preservation projects?). The		

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>REVENUES AND FUNDING</b>		
South Park bridge is a perfect example where there were jurisdictional issues and pooling together resources could have aided the project before we got to crisis.		
Assist with local match	For small cities that are low on funding	
Create a new regional risk/capital pool that allows all jurisdictions in the county to pay in, and as needed, compete for major capital project funding.	If there was something like this for the south park bridge, the county and Seattle could have jointly competed for capital funds to build the new bridge.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• helps all jurisdictions with unexpected large capital costs.</li> </ul>
Collaborate with other jurisdictions – including cities and counties.		Some proposed solutions will require legislative action, which may be more compelling if local agencies across the state are pursuing the request.
Research and peruse changes to Washington State Law for a more modern funding scheme for the roads system.	Washington State tax laws that affect the roads system were enacted at a time when Model Ts were common and it's time for them to be updated along with our roads and bridges.	
Study the ability to collect Impact Fees from new construction county-wide to provide new revenue	RCW 82.02.050 Impact fees—Intent—Limitations.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnerships must be forged with Cities</li> </ul> <b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More Revenue,</li> <li>• Collaborative county-wide effort</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost of construction will rise.</li> </ul>
Explore utility and viability of Interlocal Agreements with respect to already annexed areas based off us actual vehicle usage of County arterials.		
Sin taxes	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>	

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>REVENUES AND FUNDING</b>		
Taxation of electric vehicles. Internal combustion vehicle use will decline over the next several years.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>	
Real estate excise tax. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New tax enacted by the state legislature</li> </ul>	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>	
User mileage fee programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could be more equitable</li> <li>• Could incorporate revenue from electric vehicles and new fuel sources in the future.</li> <li>• Could replace the gas tax.</li> <li>• Could incentivize people to use other forms of transportation and reduce the number of vehicles on the road.</li> <li>• Perhaps consider as a longer-term recommendation after data is gathered from other areas?</li> </ul>	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What data can be gathered on this from Oregon and other areas?</li> <li>• Could this generate enough revenue to cover the KC gap?</li> </ul>	
Legalization of fantasy sports and using the revenue for roads. A percentage of the gambling proceeds goes to roads.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>	
Raise the price of getting a driver's license.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>	
Work with the legislature to change passage requirements for many of the recommendations to a <u>simple majority</u> . <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This might be considered as an implementation strategy along with a recommendation</li> </ul>	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>	
Pull from insurance data.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>	

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>OUTREACH</b>		
Utilize the Unions resources to reach out to their membership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask for volunteers from the membership to volunteer phone banking, door knocking, calling elected officials, etc.</li> <li>• Bring in someone from the campaign to educate Union stewards, leaders and staff who will then take the message to the membership</li> <li>• Create educational pieces to be sent out to members</li> <li>• Work within the Coalition of Unions to reach out to other Unions and their memberships who are not directly involved in the Task Force</li> <li>• Political and educational trainings on the importance and significance of a specific campaign, initiative, etc.</li> <li>• Lobby days in Olympia</li> <li>• Use the Unions lobbyist to focus on specific initiatives, laws, etc.</li> <li>• Joint effort between King county and Union to bring in more support from the membership</li> <li>• Reach out to community partners and get them on board</li> </ul>	
Create educational pieces that don't focus on a specific group, county, city, etc.	Expand the educational pieces to be relevant to people in the city, rural areas and everywhere in between.	

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>OUTREACH</b>		
Create more allies/partners in the fight	Use the relationships with elected officials, community partners, etc. to get the most support possible	
Engage PSRC to look at new federal funding models that focus on Fix-it-First, instead of capacity or road expansion projects.	Transportation 2040 is overly focused on capacity and expansion and fails to address maintenance, preservation and operations for the county's existing transportation system	<p><b>Pro</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saving money by preserving the system before it falls into disrepair that is more expensive in the long-run.</li> </ul> <p><b>Con/considerations</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fixing first is not as enticing politically.</li> </ul>
Through this task force process, develop a template of identified problem statements, and solutions for use by counties statewide, particularly in discussions with state elected leaders in Olympia.	There continues to be lack of dialogue in Olympia on the looming crisis for funding the existing transportation system. Task force could be a good launching pad to help change the conversation statewide.	
Work with cities to identify alternate mechanisms for decreasing the 51% use of unincorporated roads by incorporated residents	Need to figure out a way to decrease the number of people using these roads. Conversation should start with those using the roads the most.	Need a creative way to get corporations to invest in the roads they require employees to travel. Possible city tax incentive for businesses that employ residents within a 5 mile radius of the business
Conduct a countywide campaign encouraging employees to use and employers to subsidize the use of alternative transportation	Implement the community mobility contract program in rural cities and communities heavily reliant on bridges and roads.	
Expand community partnerships with unincorporated and rural jurisdictions to implement and educate the non-drive alone travel.	The county's current focus is on Seattle and that is an equity issue.	
Partner with neighboring cities and counties for construction project coordination, public notification, and more (road closures, upcoming construction, etc.)		

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>OUTREACH</b>		
Educate/Inform the public.	Inform about role of the Task Force, value of County roads/bridges, and root causes of KC's bridges and roads funding gap.	The CSA's (Alan Painter) should give community presentation on this taskforce and get feedback on what residents would like to see. Talk about the specific roads/bridges they specifically use, their need for repair, have them identify alternatives to road/bridge closures.
Create brief YouTube videos explaining the road situation we are in		<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The public would appreciate knowing</li> </ul>
Create YouTube videos explaining where road revenues come from		<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WSDOT could control the message</li> </ul>
Create local WSDOT Facebook pages, twitter accounts, etc. to keep citizens updated on progress	More social media from WSDOT	Would require staffing to keep social network elements fresh and engaging
Create and post dynamic signage on roads in need of repair or service indicating progress or dollars needed to reach start or completion.	Let signage and social interaction govern and inform people as to status of a road project. If funding is lacking, people will know it and it will put the power back to the people.	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People will be able to see progress or the reason for lack of progress</li> <li>• Serves as a communication platform for other news as well</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost and maintenance of signage</li> </ul>
Host a roads roadshow that combines educational materials, presentations and an opportunity for public comment.	Public outreach roadshow	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People would have an opportunity to have their voices heard</li> </ul>
Informing the public. Similar to program used for 405 hot lanes.	Work using local television adds and social media to educate the public on need for additional funding. Stress that the desire for lower taxes has created this backlog of maintenance and improvement measures that now need to be funded. The Tim Eyman way of thinking must end.	This could spark a voter revolt against public officials

Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
<b>OUTREACH</b>		
Begin outreach with constant “updates” to major news organizations, updates could include a media campaign that would include traditional advertising as well as social media outreach. KC will have to differentiate its issues from the rest of the bungled transportation projects in the area.		Spokesperson, Focal Point?
Media outreach. Better use of social media of all varieties to communicate road costs, situations, status, etc. (Interactive)		
Establish a pilot program using health impact assessments to evaluate the individual and community health outcomes of transportation projects in urban, suburban, rural, and tribal communities.		
An elected “Head of Roads”	Have a county wide elected official in charge of Roads	<b>Pro</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A point person</li> </ul> <b>Con</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• one more elected official.</li> </ul>
Discrete conversations with cities about how this funding crisis plays out in different areas. There needs to be collaboration with cities about this.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>	