

Updated Short List of King County Bridges & Roads Task Force Recommendations – DRAFT v 10/29/15

Key for the ID list below: “E” = “Efficiencies”; “I” = “Infrastructure”; “R” = “Revenues & Funding”; “O” = “Outreach”; KC = “King County responsibility”; SL = “State or Legislative Role”

ID	Recommendation	Consider for Short-list of Final Recommendations? Is Additional Information Needed?
E1	<p>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</p> <p>Added at 10/28 meeting for this recommendation: Revisit turning roads over to HOAs.</p>	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVED TO INFRASTRUCTURE CATEGORY – COMBINE WITH I3</p> <p>Other notes from 10/28 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider moving to infrastructure – but double check whether it is duplicative with recommendation I3. • Significant concerns were raised about this • Double check the wording of this recommendation
E2	<p>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</p>	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: DO NOT MOVE THIS FORWARD, but consider the statement below.</p> <p>Potential statement for report: The Task Force recognizes that, through King County’s implementation of the GMA, KC’s unincorporated population is significantly less than other counties. As a result of this, there have been significant decreases in revenue generated from unincorporated areas.</p> <p>Other notes from 10/28 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that there are facts in the report to back up the statement above or any statements made by the Task Force that appear in the final report. • The statement above will need to be refined. • Bryce Yaden will provide a 1-2 page summary to the Task Force, prior to the 11/12 meeting, explaining what the GMA spells out about the distribution of funds from incorporated to unincorporated areas.
E3	<p>Increase the amount of work that the county crews can perform “in-house” without having to go to bid with contractors where it saves dollars and time.</p>	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is in the category of <i>smaller impact</i> recommendations.
E4	<p>Update outdated state statutes for local roads, including at least the county road engineer laws to reflect current day technology and practices.</p>	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</p>
E5	<p>Outlaw studded tires.</p>	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Smaller impact recommendation</i> • Consider a report section of “other” ideas that were strongly considered. • Could be considered a small recommendation that could add up to a lot when combined with other recommendations. • Consider a tax on studded tires.

ID	Recommendation	Consider for Short-list of Final Recommendations? Is Additional Information Needed?
E6	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.	<p><i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i></p> <p>Notes from 10/28 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional information is needed on this to see what road conditions actually are compared to what tier the road is in. • Data is desired to back up the tier system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ KC has asset data it can provide to address this.
E7	Renegotiation with unions on hourly pay rates.	<p><i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i></p> <p>Notes from 10/28 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These negotiations come up periodically • How do these negotiations take place?
E8	Reduce the number of unions and bargaining units.	<p><i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i></p> <p>Notes from 10/28 Meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has this been explored? • Is this feasible and could there be fewer bargaining units.
I1	<p>City annexation of county roads that are “islands” between two nearby jurisdictions.</p> <p><i>Alternate version (or to add):</i> Increase the number/miles of county bridges and roads maintained by city road departments.</p>	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: <i>MOVED FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</i></p>
I2	Is it possible to create an in-state version of the Civilian Conservation Corps?	
I3	<p>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”.</p> <p>Alternate or to combine: 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.</p>	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: <i>MOVED FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION - BUT MERGED WITH E1</i></p>
I4	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	

ID	Recommendation	Consider for Short-list of Final Recommendations? Is Additional Information Needed?
	notch in Sammamish. Or Lake Alice Road coming out of Fall City.	
I5	Plan for potentially closing county infrastructure. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this happen anyway be attrition? • Is this possible as a recommendation? • Note that this would not be done in a way that limits access to properties. 	ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at whether this was previously identified for the short list
PROPERTY TAX EFFORTS		
R1	Lift 1% cap on property taxes through initiative or legislative process. Direct these funds to county roads. Additions/alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to increase the \$2.25 per \$1000 of assessed value max levy rate, as well as increase the state maximum of \$5.50 (double check this) • To be effective this would also have to be a property tax to incorporated residents in cities. • Consider tying together with R14 (creating transportation benefit districts) • Some kind of countywide tax is needed – it is just not clear who and where it will come from. • Original R1 is assumed to be county-wide • Consider moving county-wide tax revenue into a pool for regional roads – a regionally-shared revenue source. • Additional recommendation: Real estate excise tax Additional (merged from another recommendation): State legislature should increase the tax revenue growth rate to 6% or the rate of inflation	Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION At its 10/28 meeting, the Task Force discussed the need for a county-wide revenue source and/or sources from which funding was captured from all road users and county residents and dedicated to roads. The Task Force saw the 1 percent cap as broken and unsustainable. Notes from 10/28 meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More data on this is desired from King County PSB Office. • Consider what would be required for this recommendation to actually generate revenue for roads. Concerns were raised about assurances that revenue from lifting a 1 percent cap would in fact go toward roads. • To be effective, revenue would have to be generated from incorporated residents. • Consider creating a regional funding pool for regional roads projects from revenue generated by this recommendation.
NEW TAXES		
R2	Increased or New Taxes/revised taxing system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Charge a utility tax • Increase the local option gas tax (NOTE: this combines three similar recommendations about increasing the gas tax) • Determine a mechanism to appropriately tax or surcharge electric vehicles (since no gas tax is collected) • Consider a tax per mile driven 	Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: DO NOT MOVE THESE FORWARD Notes from 10/28 meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support initially voiced for funding from tribal gambling revenue since it could be a potentially large revenue source (but not the scratch ticket or lottery idea). The TF later decided to retract this support. • TF should initially considered one recommendation related to several of these tax ideas. Taxes related to: sales, automobile, property, income, and utilities – these are the five categories to consider

ID	Recommendation	Consider for Short-list of Final Recommendations? Is Additional Information Needed?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tax auto parts differently • Create a more progressive tax system that doesn't just focus on Roads/Transit, multi-pronged – could be called an adopted income tax. • Change State law to allow a higher unincorporated levy amount for roads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider 1) what you're going to tax, 2) who you're going to tax, and 3) where you're going to tax. • Caution raised around sales tax
R3	<p>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.</p>	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</p> <p>Notes from 10/28 meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support voiced for this • Could be improved by building in a way to proportionately reduce the fee
R4	<p>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%.</p> <p>Addition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider focusing this recommendation within UGAs. 	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</p> <p>Notes from 10/28 meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This creates an opportunity to have a conversation about <i>connecting places</i> and how this can be done. • An important aspect of this recommendation is equal access to services – although services differ by community so this must be tailored for specific areas. • While some strong support was raised about this among the Task Force, there was also significant concern raised about the impacts and applicability of this recommendation to areas outside of the UGA.
R5	Sin taxes	<p><i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i></p> <p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</p>
R6	Taxation of electric vehicles. Internal combustion vehicle use will decline over the next several years.	<p><i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the opportunity that exists here.
R7	<p>Real estate excise tax.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New tax enacted by the state legislature 	<p><i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i></p> <p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</p>

ID	Recommendation	Consider for Short-list of Final Recommendations? Is Additional Information Needed?
FEDERAL AND GRANT FUNDING		
R8	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).	
R9	Utilize grant funding for some road drainage and flooding issues.	
R10	Provide more variety of grant sources in addition to PSRC and TIB (traditional sources)	
R11	Use more federal funds to support existing county infrastructure/transportation system.	Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION
R12	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.	
USER FEES, TOLLS		
R13	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)	
R14	Create a toll-tag or road usage tracker toll system and charge different usage rates for different areas	
R15	Find a user fee solution.	
R16	Crowd-funding for road fixes (see also the efficiencies category)	
R17	User mileage fee programs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Could be more equitable • Could incorporate revenue from electric vehicles and new fuel sources in the future. • Could replace the gas tax. • Could incentivize people to use other forms of transportation and reduce the number of vehicles on the road. • Perhaps consider as a longer-term recommendation after data is gathered from other areas? 	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What data can be gathered on this from Oregon and other areas? • Could this generate enough revenue to cover the KC gap?

ID	Recommendation	Consider for Short-list of Final Recommendations? Is Additional Information Needed?
BENEFIT/LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS		
R18	Create a transportation benefit districts that charges money countywide, not just in rural and unincorporated areas.	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</p> <p>Notes from 10/28 meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some strong support voiced from at least one TF member (see additional notes on final report)
FUNDING COORDINATION AMONG LOCAL AGENCIES		
R19	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 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.	
R20	Eliminate diversion of County Road Tax to other uses, such as Sheriff’s Office.	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: DO NOT MOVE FORWARD AS A RECOMMENDATION, BUT CONSIDER ADDING THIS TO THE REPORT IN AN “OTHER” SECTION OF IDEAS TO CONSIDER.</p> <p>Notes from 10/28 meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See notes above voicing support for this – or at least transparency around how roads funding is used for sheriff’s office. • Also, not clear if this is germane to the work of this TF
R121	Build city support for county roads funding. Collaborate with other jurisdictions – including cities and counties.	Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION
OTHER REVENUE SOURCES		
R22	Find alternatives to funding roads beyond property taxes.	
R23	Change the bonding formula so annexing cities have to pay outstanding debt left to County	<p>Takeaway from 10/28 meeting: MOVE FORWARD FOR FINAL CONSIDERATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KC has very little outstanding debt.
R24	Create a lottery game that exclusively funds roads	
R25	Ask for road donations at the gas pump. “Would you like to contribute \$1, \$5 or \$10 to help roads?”	
R26	Study the ability to collect Impact Fees from new construction county-wide to provide new revenue	
R27	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>
R28	Raise the price of getting a driver’s license.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>

ID	Recommendation	Consider for Short-list of Final Recommendations? Is Additional Information Needed?
GENERAL		
R29	Create a three-part funding strategy focused at the local, cross-jurisdictional, and state levels.	
R30	Research and peruse changes to Washington State Law for a more modern funding scheme for the roads system.	
R31	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"> • This might be considered as an implementation strategy along with a recommendation 	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>
R32	Pull from insurance data.	<i>ADDED AT THE 10/28 TASK FORCE MEETING</i>
O1	Conduct a countywide campaign encouraging employees to use and employers to subsidize the use of alternative transportation	
O2	Utilize the Unions resources to reach out to their membership	
O3	Create educational pieces that don't focus on a specific group, county, city, etc.	
O4	Engage PSRC to look at new federal funding models that focus on Fix-it-First, instead of capacity or road expansion projects.	
O5	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.	
O6	Educate/Inform the public.	

ID	Recommendation	Consider for Short-list of Final Recommendations? Is Additional Information Needed?
O7	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>