Initial Short List of King County Bridges & Roads Task Force Recommendations – DRAFT v 10/28/15

Key for the ID list below: "E" = "Efficiencies"; "I" = "Infrastructure"; "R" = "Revenues & Funding"; "O" = "Outreach"

ID	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation	Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis
E1	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	**Pro** • Offloads maintenance costs **Con** • Could generate headaches if new hosts are incompetent	**Group 1:** Yes – mentioned support of this as far as homeowners/HOA's taking over roads and interlocal agreements with cities. Work with cities for to transferring maintenance responsibility of half streets and orphaned roads to cities. **Group 1** specifically wants KC to look more thoroughly at what this would require and what would be involve. **Group 2:** Yes (long term and 0+) **Group 3:** Yes (2 votes) Significant social justice issues that arise. More votes for cities to do this.
E2	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	**Pro** • The GMA may have already spelled out the funding solution(s) **Con** • May be politically challenging	**Group 2:** Yes (long term, +, more research) **Group 3:** Yes (7 votes + 3 for bullet #1) Concerned about big assumptions and funding landscape has changed. Big assumptions and goals.
E3	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.	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.	**Group 2:** Yes (med term, +) **Group 3:** Yes (4 votes) but Assumes this is the less expensive route?
E4	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.	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.	**Group 2:** Yes (long term, +) **Group 3:** Yes (2 votes)
E5	Outlaw studded tires.	Studded tires increase wear and tear on pavement.	• This has been a sensitive topic at the state level. WSDOT has pursued legislation in the past with no success.	**Group 1:** Yes – group expressed support for this **Group 2:** Yes (+) **Group 3:** Yes (3 votes)

ID	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation	Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis
I1	City annexation of county roads that are "islands" between two nearby jurisdictions. *Alternate version (or to add):* Increase the number/miles of county bridges and roads maintained by city road departments.	• ~~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.~~ **(Group 1 crossed this out)** • 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. • Allows the County to focus its resources in the larger unincorporated areas.	• 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! • 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. • 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. • 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.	**Group 1:** Yes – voiced support for this concept. Also raised the idea of state guidance for boundary review boards for ensuring there are no orphaned roads inside city boundaries. **Group 2:** Yes (long term, +): Revisit the boundary line issue. There is no reason for the County to pay for roads between 2 jurisdictions. What city would have to take the road **Group 3:** Yes (7 votes) need lots of details to be sorted out. Ask cities to identify county road segments that are most significant to their constituents and then push contribution or transfer of maintenance. **Group 3 (for alternate version):** Yes (1 vote)
I2	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	**Pro** • Could be a huge political win at the state level • Would likely get National contribution funding or big grant support **Con** • Complicated to get started Would likely take a long time to see first results	**Group 2:** Yes - Explore legal challenges but need more information **Group 3:** No
I3	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". **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.	Allow the county to consider "other public benefits" like reducing liability, reducing O&M costs, etc., instead of having to charge fair market value. **Alternate:** Provides more flexibility in criteria to review what public benefit is for roadway vacations.	This would be an option, not required. So this should only have benefits. **Alternate:** 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.	**Group 2:** Yes (+) - This is similar to another recommendation above, consolidate. **Group 3:** Yes (7 votes) **Alternate:** **Group 2:** NO **Group 3:** Yes (7 votes)
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 notch in Sammamish. Or Lake Alice Road coming out of Fall City.			**Group 1:** While not directly addressing this, Group 3 expressed concerns about lost road revenue due to GMA implementation and the potential need for state guidance on boundary decisions – particularly to ensure fewer orphaned roads. **Group 3:** No

ID	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation	Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis
		Property Tax Efforts		
R1	Lift 1% cap on property taxes through initiative or legislative process ***Addition (merged from another recommendation):*** 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 **Con** • Political feasibility • Cost	**Group 2:** Yes (long term, +) **Group 3:** Yes (4 votes) <u>For addition:</u> **Group 2:** Yes??? -increase the cap, 6% is not realistic, maybe 3% **Group 3:** Yes (3 votes)
		New Taxes		

R2	**Increased or New Taxes/revised taxing system**
	• 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
	• Tax auto parts differently
	• Create a more progressive tax system that doesn't just focus on Roads/Transit, multi-pronged
	• Change State law to allow a higher unincorporated levy amount for roads.
		• **Charge a utility tax:** no explanation
		• **Increase 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. 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.
		• **Tax or surcharge for electric vehicles:** 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
		• **Consider a tax per mile driven:** no explanation
		• **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)
		• **More progressive tax system:** Focusing on a funding source that will not only bring in money for Roads but for social services, public health, etc.
		• **Higher unincorporated levy for roads:** No explanation
			• **Charge a utility tax:** 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.
			• **Increase local option gas tax:**
			  ○ Pro: People would accept it for better roads
			  ○ Con: Too much taxing already
			• **Tax or surcharge for electric vehicles:**
			Pro:
			  ○ EV car owners may NOT be price sensitive
			  ○ Strategic for the future: Get EV road usage charges in place now before it's too late
			Con:
			  ○ 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
			• **Consider a tax per mile driven**
			Pro:
			  ○ This would capture electric car responsibility
			Con:
			  ○ Deciding how to implement it.
			• **Tax auto parts differently**
			Pro:
			  ○ Auto-parts industries would dislike this
			  ○ Captures revenue being lost from gas tax and places it into a tidy and relevant category
			Con:
			  • Might hurt lower income although tax
				<u>Charge a utility tax</u>
				Group 1: Yes
				Group 2: NO (-)
				Group 3: Yes - 3 votes for a street utility tax (more limited concept)
				
				<u>Increase the local option gas tax</u> (combines two separate recommendations)
				Group 2: Maybe?? (0)
				Group 3: No
				Group 2: Yes (long term, +) more information
				Group 3: Yes (5 votes) to discuss further along with recommendation below
				Group 1: Yes – voiced support for a dedicated gas tax dedicated to counties and cities for roads.
				Group 2: Yes (long term, +)
				Group 3: Yes (3 votes)
				
				<u>Tax or surcharge for electric vehicles</u>
				Group 2: NO (-)since people are in the process of converting to electric) – perhaps in 10 or 15 years (a virtue tax)
				Group 3: Yes (5 votes) MVET
				
				<u>Consider a tax per mile driven</u>
				Group 2: Yes (long term, +)
				Group 3: No
				
				<u>Tax auto parts differently</u>
				Group 2: NO (-)
				Group 3: Yes (1 votes)
				
				<u>More progressive tax system</u>
				Group 2: Yes (long term, +): Need more specific information

ID	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation	Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis
			should not be extravagantly high • **More progressive tax system:** 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? • **Higher unincorporated levy for roads:** No pros/cons listed	**Group 3:** Yes (2 votes) <u>Higher unincorporated levy for roads</u> **Group 2:** Yes (+) Clarification needed, any higher property tax levy must be voted on **Group 3:** No
R3	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.			**Group 2:** NO (-) **Group 3:** Yes (5 votes)
R4	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.	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.	**Group 2:** Yes (+) **Group 3:** No
Federal and Grant Funding				
R5	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).			**Group 2:** Maybe?? (0) Need more information, numbers don't seem accurate **Group 3:** Yes (5 votes)
R6	Utilize grant funding for some road drainage and flooding issues.			**Group 2:** Yes (+) Yes, it is available and not already being utilized – Re-fund (more funding) the public works trust fund **Group 3:** Yes (7 votes) Use flood control $$
R7	Provide more variety of grant sources in addition to PSRC and TIB (traditional sources)	In addition to TIB, PSRC/FHWA	**Pro** Increase chances of getting grants	**Group 2:** Maybe?? (0) Redundant **Group 3:** Yes (4 votes)
R8	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.	**Pro** 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.	**Group 2:** Yes (+) More information **Group 3:** Yes (7 votes)
R9	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			**Group 2 STOPPED HERE – DID NO REVIEW FURTHER** **Group 3:** Yes (3 votes)

ID	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation	Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis
	vehicle miles traveled.			
User Fees, Tolls				
R10	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	**Pro** • Good source of revenue • Built in mechanism to ensure that locals don't have to pay as much **Con** • Toll scheme is slightly complicated although very effective • Locals will not likely like this approach at all	**Group 2:** NO (-) **Group 3:** Yes (4 votes) significant reworking of the recommendation
R11	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.	**Pro** • You only pay if you are using certain roads **Con** • People would perceive they are being tracked (privacy concerns)	**Group 2:** Yes (+) **Group 3:** No
R12	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).	• The Transportation Futures Task Force is evaluating this as a potential funding source. **Con** • Administrative complexity and management that could reduce the potential funding benefit.	**Group 2:** Yes (+) **Group 3:** No
R13	Crowd-funding for road fixes (see also the efficiencies category)	Ask the public to contribute or match the cost of repairs	**Pro** • The public picks the priorities • Should result in less complaints	**Group 2:** NO (-) **Group 3:** Yes (1 votes)
Benefit/Local Improvement Districts				
R14	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.		**Group 3:** Yes **Group 2:** Yes (long term, +) Should this be on the County recommendation sheet? (ie does county have the authority to do this? Should this instead be on the county list?) **Group 3:** Yes (7 votes)
Funding Coordination Among Local Agencies				
R15	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.			**Group 3:** Yes (1 vote)
R16	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.		**Group 1:** Yes – also expressed interest in this **Group 3:** Yes (3 votes) to have a review of this funding approach. Also

ID	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation	Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis
				strong objection from at least 1 to discussing this. Very passionate and controversial discussion on the topic.
R17	Build city support for county roads funding. Collaborate with other jurisdictions – including cities and counties.	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. Some proposed solutions will require legislative action, which may be more compelling if local agencies across the state are pursuing the request.	**Group 3:** Yes (7 votes) **Group 3** (for second part of recommendation)**:** Yes (5 votes) – to review
Other Revenue Sources				
R18	Find alternatives to funding roads beyond property taxes.			**Group 2:** Yes (+) – What would that be? **Group 3:** No
R19	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	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.	**Group 1:** Yes – group expressed support for this (debt transfer with annexation of infrastructure) **Group 2:** Yes (+) Need more information and to continue to explore the challenges. **Group 3:** Yes (2 votes)
R20	Create a lottery game that exclusively funds roads			**Group 2:** NO (-) **Group 3:** Yes (1 vote)
R21	Ask for road donations at the gas pump. "Would you like to contribute $1, $5 or $10 to help roads?"			**Group 2:** NO (-) **Group 3:** Yes (2 votes) Good opp for public education; "round up for roads" – Ashley's quote
R22	Study the ability to collect Impact Fees from new construction county-wide to provide new revenue	RCW 82.02.050 Impact fees—Intent—Limitations.	• Partnerships must be forged with Cities **Pro** • More Revenue, • Collaborative county-wide effort **Con** Cost of construction will rise.	**Group 3:** Yes?? (?? Votes for short list)
General				
R23	Create a three-part funding strategy focused at the local, cross-jurisdictional, and state levels.			**Group 2:** Maybe ??: Need more information, what would that funding strategy be? **Group 3:** No
R24	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		**Group 3:** Yes (4 votes)

ID	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation	Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis
		Model Ts were common and it's time for them to be updated along with our roads and bridges.		
O1	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.		**Group 3:** Yes (2 votes for short list) for this and recommendation below if there is new work to be done here
O2	Utilize the Unions resources to reach out to their membership	• Ask for volunteers from the membership to volunteer phone banking, door knocking, calling elected officials, etc. • Bring in someone from the campaign to educate Union stewards, leaders and staff who will then take the message to the membership • Create educational pieces to be sent out to members • Work within the Coalition of Unions to reach out to other Unions and their memberships who are not directly involved in the Task Force • Political and educational trainings on the importance and significance of a specific campaign, initiative, etc. • Lobby days in Olympia • Use the Unions lobbyist to focus on specific initiatives, laws, etc. • Joint effort between King county and Union to bring in more support from the membership Reach out to community partners and get them on board		**Group 3:** Yes (5 votes)
O3	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.		**Group 3:** Yes (5 votes)
O4	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	**Pro** • Saving money by preserving the system before it falls into disrepair that is more expensive in the long-run. **Con/considerations** • Fixing first is not as enticing politically.	**Group 3:** Yes (7 votes)
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.	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		**Group 3:** Yes (7 votes) Another comment that this needs clarification to understand what this really is trying to do.

ID	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation	Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis
		the conversation statewide.		
O6	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.	**Group 3:** Yes (7 votes) of a hybridized recommendation, namely: Use social media to educate and inform the public on the status of road needs, road updates etc.