# King County Bridges and Roads Task Force

# Meeting Summary

Meeting #3

October 14, 2015, 2:30 – 5:30 p.m.

King Street Center – 201 S. Jackson St., Seattle, WA 98104

## **Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review, and Summary Acceptance**

Bob Wheeler (facilitator) called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m., and the King County Bridges and Roads Task Force (Task Force) did a round of introductions.

The facilitator briefly reviewed the agenda and emphasized the meeting’s focus on reviewing and refining Task Force recommendations and developing a short list of recommendations that will have a substantive impact on the projected budget shortfall for bridges and roads.

### Review and Acceptance of the September 16, 2015 Draft Task Force Meeting Summary

The Task Force reviewed the September 16, 2015 draft Task Force meeting summary. One change was noted on page eight which clarifies a question asked by one Task Force member. The Task Force then accepted the summary with this change.

### Initial Comments and Questions

* How is road levy money used by the King County Sheriff’s Office?
	+ The one roads fund diversion allowed under state law is to the Sheriff’s Office for ongoing traffic enforcement.
* Where does Sheriff’s Office ticket revenue go?
	+ Sheriff’s Office ticket revenue goes to the court system.
* Why does some roads levy funding go to the Sheriff’s Office?
	+ This is a state law provision that allows some roads funding to go toward traffic enforcement. It is a County budget decision to determine how much money to transfer within the constraints provided by law.
* Sheriff’s Office traffic enforcement appears to have been absent in recent years in some unincorporated parts of King County.
	+ While there have been some cutbacks in motorcycle enforcement, the Sheriff’s Office is doing traffic enforcement every day on County roads and the Road Services Division (RSD) works closely with the Sheriff’s Office to identify problem areas and address them.
* Is any revenue available for RSD from King County Parks’ purchases of surplus properties from other agencies?
	+ Parks is purchasing some properties from RSD and the roads fund is being reimbursed the value of those properties.

The Task Force also discussed a chart, sent among several RSD answers to Task Force questions from meeting #2, showing a breakdown of King County spending by road tier. RSD first clarified that tier 1 roads are the most heavily used and tier 5 roads are the least used. RSD added that tier 4 roads only have one access point. While King County does prioritize maintenance by tier, the top priority is safety and all safety issues are addressed regardless of road tier. RSD then explained that the chart shows both operating and capital spending from January 1 – August 31, 2015. Some of the spending by tier, shown on the chart, is distorted by large capital projects taking place.

## **Breakout Group Consideration of Brainstormed Recommendations**

### Breakout Group Instructions:

The facilitator provided brief instructions for breakout groups to discuss and refine brainstormed recommendations to a short list of recommendations that would have a large financial impact. There were more than 130 recommendations proposed by 15 Task Force members. Task Force members contributed between one and 39 recommendations each.

Jay Osborne, RSD Deputy Director, explained that RSD identified whether each recommendation would be the responsibility of RSD, another King County entity, or the State Legislature. The Task Force was asked to focus on the recommendations that would be the responsibility of King County or the State Legislature. RSD has begun reviewing and addressing the recommendations that fall under its jurisdiction and plans to report out on these recommendations at a later meeting.

At this meeting, the Task Force was asked to identify which recommendations should move on to a short list for further consideration. The Task Force was also asked to identify the perceived financial impact of each recommendation and whether each recommendation would be implemented over the short, medium, or long-term.

### Breakout Group Discussion

Three breakout groups spent approximately 80 minutes reviewing the recommendations that were individually proposed by Task Force members after the September 16 Task Force meeting. A complete list of Task Force members in each breakout group is shown in *Attachment 2.*

## **Breakout Group Report-Outs**

Each breakout group reported out on recommendations, or the types of recommendations, its members would like to see move forward to a recommendations short list. Each group chose a different approach to reviewing recommendations, with one group focusing on larger themes it would like to see considered, another identifying the level of individual support for each recommendation moving forward to a short list, and another identifying whether recommendations would be move forward or not to a short list with some narrative comments on each. The short listed recommendations from this meeting will be made available separately from this summary.

### Group #1 Report Out

Group #1 focused on a smaller number of recommendations that it would like to see considered further. It prioritized recommendations that focused on both costs and new revenue, including: transferring road ownership and maintenance responsibilities to cities and private citizens or home owners associations; coordinating with cities around road maintenance and orphaned roads transfers; transferring debt with ownership of infrastructure; increased or new gas and utility taxes; outlawing studded tires; limiting the transfer of road levy money to the Sheriff’s Office; and providing State guidance to the Boundary Review Board.

*Comments and questions about Group #1 Report Out:*

* Group #1 desired more information about factors involved in shrinking the size of the County Road network and how significant of an impact this could have. It would also like to know any limits under state law on the ability to reduce the overall size of the road network.

### Group #2 Report Out

Group #2 was the second group to report out to the full Task Force. This group focused on recommendations that were the responsibility of the State Legislature and did not provide feedback on those that are the responsibility of King County. It identified whether each recommendation should, should not, or might move on to the short list as well. Group #2 also identified recommendations for which more information is needed.

### Group #3 Report Out

Group #3 was the last group to report out. This group discussed and commented on individual recommendations, and group members voted on whether recommendations should move forward to a short list and identified the level of group support for each. Group themes included 1) the need or coordination and communication with cities and neighboring counties, and 2) interest in and consideration of social equity of recommendations.

*Comments and questions about all group report outs*

* It appears in all group discussions there are two broad themes, including the need for recommendations that shrink the size of the County-owned road network and that identify new revenue sources.

## **Public Comments**

The following public comment was given by Mark Johnston – a Skyway resident. There is a need for equitable relief from current RSD revenue allocations. For many years communities like Skyway have not received sufficient roads maintenance and capital funding support for its neighborhood streets. However, in recent decades, unincorporated roads funding support has been around $30 million. While King County has goals to transfer more roads to cities, as infrastructure in built-up unincorporated areas is neglected these areas become less attractive to cities. Basic fairness dictates that tax revenue generated by communities should be available for their own transportation necessities. The work of this Task Force would be incomplete if these unincorporated transportation necessities were not accounted for in Task Force recommendations.

Mr. Johnston also provided a more detailed written comment that expands on his verbal comment.

No further public comments were received on paper, electronically, or orally.

## **Next Steps**

RSD plans to review the recommendations identified for moving on to a short list and to provide answers to questions asked about them. This new recommendations short list should be sent back to the Task Force, with additional clarification where requested, by Friday, October 23.

*Comments and questions:*

* While some themes came out of the group discussions, the level of support for different recommendations by different groups is unclear because each group took a different approach to evaluating recommendations. Would the Task Force be open to voting on each proposed recommendation – perhaps using dots representing support for different recommendations?
	+ While each group approached this exercise differently, there were several areas of overlap.
	+ It may be too early to start voting on each recommendation.
	+ It would be a concern if certain recommendations were off the table for discussion going forward, since some groups did not discuss every recommendation.
	+ Given the time constraints of the Task Force’s work, perhaps the Task Force can find some recommendations to move forward with immediately as it looks for more clarification on others.

Based on the Task Force input, Brenda Bauer, RSD Director, clarified that all recommendations provided are being considered by RSD. The facilitator added that all of the proposed recommendations will appear in the final report.

King County Councilmember Kathy Lambert then reminded the Task Force that it is trying to come up with recommendations that address a nearly $300 million shortfall. It is important to understand each recommendation’s financial impact as they are considered for a short list.

### Future Meetings

Task Force Meeting #4 will be from 2:30 – 5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, October 28 in the Mercer Room of the Mercer Island Community and Event Center.

## **October 14 Task Force Meeting Action Items**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Action | Due Date |
| RSD | RSD plans to review the recommendations identified for moving on to a short list and to provide answers to questions asked about them. This new recommendations short list should be sent back to the Task Force, with additional clarification where requested, by Friday, October 23.  | 10/23 |

## **Attachment 1: Task Force Attendees – Meeting #3**

**Task Force Members**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Affiliation** | **Attended?**  |
| Van Anderson | King County Boundary Review Board | No |
| John Bloomer | Enumclaw Fire Department/King County Fire District #28 | Yes |
| Josh Brown | Puget Sound Regional Council | Yes |
| Peter Eberle | Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council | Yes |
| Joe Fain | Washington State Legislature—47th District | No (represented by proxy, Noah Ullman) |
| Ashley Glennon | Fall City Community Association | Yes |
| Michael Gonzales | Teamsters Local 174 | Yes |
| Bob Harrison | City of Issaquah | Yes |
| George Irwin | King County Agricultural Commission | Yes |
| Janet Keller | Keller Dairy | Yes |
| Duana Kolou**š**ková | Transportation Concurrency Expert Review Panel | Yes |
| Andra Kranzler | Skyway Solutions | Yes |
| Matt Larson | City of Snoqualmie | Yes |
| Hank Lipe | Vashon Island Fire & Rescue | Yes |
| Ceci Mena | Professional & Technical Employees Local 117 | Yes |
| Louise Miller | Former King County Councilmember and State Representative | Yes |
| Louis Moscoso | Washington State Legislative—1st Legislative District | No |
| Amy Ockerlander | City of Duvall | Yes |
| Ron Paananen | Parsons Brinckerhoff | Yes |
| Blake Trask | Washington Bikes | Yes |
| Noah Ullman | Executive Assistant to Senator Fain (proxy) | Yes |
| Bryce Yadon | Futurewise | Yes |

**Meeting Organizers**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Affiliation** |
| Brenda Bauer | Road Services Division, King County |
| Jay Osborne | Road Services Division, King County |
| Susan West | Road Services Division, King County |
| Bob Wheeler | Triangle Associates |
| Evan Lewis | Triangle Associates |

**Other Meeting Attendees**

| **Name** | **Affiliation** |
| --- | --- |
| Tricia Davis | King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks |
| Wes Edwards | King County Department of Transportation |
| Jeremy Ferguson | King County Roads Services Division |
| Mark Johnston | Skyway Resident |
| KatieKuciemba | Sound Cities Association  |
| Kathy Lambert | King County Council |
| Susan Oxholm | King County Roads Services Division |
| Alan Painter | King County Community Service Areas |
| Stephanie Pure | King County Department of Transportation |
| Brandy Rettig | King County Department of Transportation |
| Harold Taniguchi | King County Department of Transportation |

## **Attachment 2: Breakout Groups for Task Force Meeting #3**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Group 1** | **Group 2** | **Group 3** |
| Josh Brown (Puget Sound Regional Council) | John Bloomer (Enumclaw Fire Department/ King County Fire District #28) | Ashley Glennon (Fall City Community Association) |
| Peter Eberle (Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council) | George Irwin (King County Agricultural Commission) | Duana Kolou**š**ková (Transportation Concurrency Expert Review Board) |
| Michael Gonzales (Teamsters Local 174) | Andra Kranzler (Skyway Solutions) | Ceci Mena (Professional / Technical Employees Local 17) |
| Bob Harrison (City of Issaquah) | Mayor Matt Larson (City of Snoqualmie) | Louise Miller (Former King County Council member and Legislator) |
| Janet Keller (Keller Dairy) | Ron Paananen (Parsons Brinckerhoff) | Councilmember Amy Ockerlander (City of Duvall) |
| Hank Lipe (Vashon Island Fire and Rescue) |  | Blake Trask (Washington Bikes) |
| Bryce Yadon (Futurewise) |  | Noah Ullman (proxy for Senator Joe Fain – WA State Legislative District #47th) |