King County Bridges and Roads Task Force Recommendations – *ROAD SERVICES DIVISION (RSD) RESPONSIBILITY* MASTER LIST (35 Total)
DRAFT Version 10/28/15

Category / Subcategory	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
Efficiencies **(1) Teaming and partnerships**	Look to coordinate maintenance efforts with local municipalities that can help reduce costs.		• Cities may want to see how the County improves cost-efficiency and accountability before coordination.
	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.	**Pro** • Increased cost to developers in these areas as they would be participating in two fee systems. • The true mitigation of the incremental impact of developments on all systems impacts.
	Partner with National Guard; Customs or the Department of Homeland Security for various efficiencies	Determine what assets these orgs. have that might be "shareable."	**Pro** • These entities also have a stake in keeping bridges and certain roads safe and passable in most scenarios • Possible storage facilities as well
	Privatize road repair	Open up road work and repairs to private industry/contractors	**Pro** • May reduce costs **Con** • Complexities abound for incompetent contractors
Efficiencies **(2) Transfer responsibilities**	Consider privatizing or contracting more road services	Reduce costs and drive efficiencies by having others bid for roadwork	**Pro** • Potential for substantial cost savings **Con** • Managing the privatization process will likely be complex • Incompetent service providers will product major headaches
	Contract roads repair to private firms	Bidding process for repair and new roads	**Pro** Reduce junk and facility expense
	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.	**Pro** • Could result in laser focus on road maintenance and construction • Could reduce costs substantially **Con** • May have already been considered • Could result in road svc. runaround while departments determine who owns the problem
Efficiencies **(3) Additional studies and analysis**	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,	Staff has worked diligently on efficiencies and improvements in the roads division. With new technologies, strategic partnerships	• 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.

Category / Subcategory	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
	continue to investigate and implement additional efficiencies in staffing, resource deployment, construction and road materials.	and improved construction materials additional efficiencies may be possible in the years to come.	
	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.	• 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.
	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. **Pro** • Non-bias Report and recommendations **Con** • Could be costly
Efficiencies **(4) Labor and organization**	Add expert bridge engineers to the task force to provide expertise and knowledge	Use consultants, County bridge engineers / WSDOT bridge engineers	• Consultants may work pro-bono. WSDOT/County engineers can be cost effective.
	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 increase tax revenue. These workers are able to work in their community which is good for the environment and community	• 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.
	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.).	
Efficiencies **(5) Engineering and design**	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 • Expense of engineering is reduced Con • loss of engineers

King County Bridges and Roads Task Force Recommendations – *ROAD SERVICES DIVISION (RSD) RESPONSIBILITY* MASTER LIST (35 Total)
DRAFT Version 10/28/15

Category / Subcategory	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
Efficiencies **(6) Miscellaneous**			

King County Bridges and Roads Task Force Recommendations – *ROAD SERVICES DIVISION (RSD) RESPONSIBILITY* MASTER LIST (35 Total)
DRAFT Version 10/28/15

Category / Subcategory	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
Infrastructure **(1) Coordination with other jurisdictions**	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	Pro • Equipment repair capabilities and fuel already on site
	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.	• Always manned • Allows closer/faster access **Con** • Stuff distributed everywhere
	Increase the number/miles of county bridges and roads maintained by city road departments.		**Con** • 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.
Infrastructure **(2) New policies**	Bid process for a geographic area to a private contractor	One company does all maintenance for an area.	**Pro** • Review of quality for renewed contracted will be easy
Infrastructure **(3) Additional studies and analysis**	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.	**Pro** • More efficient and cost-effective transportation network. **Con** • Potential political pushback from users of these non-essential roads.
	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. **Pro** • Cost efficient **Con** Potential political fallout.
Infrastructure **(4) Reduce infrastructure**	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	**Pro** • Public confidence in the roads system. **Con** • Expensive in some areas.

King County Bridges and Roads Task Force Recommendations – *ROAD SERVICES DIVISION (RSD) RESPONSIBILITY* MASTER LIST (35 Total)
DRAFT Version 10/28/15

Category / Subcategory	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
(4) Reduce infrastructure	Reduce bridge and road infrastructure responsibilities	Reduce disproportionate impact and potential unintended consequences	• Should be based on priorities and focused on equity • Potential liabilities and safety concerns could dwarf any cost savings.
	Allow some roads to "go back to nature."		• Need to identify other forms of transportation for this idea to be successful (bike paths, fixed rail, alternate routes, etc.) • To make this happen without increasing liability, 100% of abutting property owners all must to agree to purchase vacated right-of-way. **Pro** • Reduces liability and O&M costs.
	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?		
Infrastructure **(5) Technology and best practices**	Explore new composite materials and innovations for fixing potholes and minor road patches		
Infrastructure **(6) Miscellaneous**			

King County Bridges and Roads Task Force Recommendations – *ROAD SERVICES DIVISION (RSD) RESPONSIBILITY* MASTER LIST (35 Total)
DRAFT Version 10/28/15

Category / Subcategory	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
Revenues and Funding **(1) Legislative changes**			
Revenues and Funding **(2) New funding sources**	Offer up roads services to other counties and cities		**Con** • Short staffing. • Not a steady source of income.
Revenues and Funding **(3) New Policies**	Invest Equitably and focus on results.		
Revenues and Funding **(4) Coordination and cooperation efforts**			
Revenues and Funding **(5) Additional Studies and Analysis**	Explore utility and viability of Interlocal Agreements with respect to already annexed areas based off us actual vehicle usage of County arterials.		
Revenues and Funding **(6) Miscellaneous**			

King County Bridges and Roads Task Force Recommendations – *ROAD SERVICES DIVISION (RSD) RESPONSIBILITY* MASTER LIST (35 Total)
DRAFT Version 10/28/15

Category/Subcategory	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
Outreach **(1) Partnering**	Partner with neighboring cities and counties for construction project coordination, public notification, and more (road closures, upcoming construction, etc.)		
Outreach **(2) Outreach content**	Create brief YouTube videos explaining the road situation we are in		**Pro** • The public would appreciate knowing
	Create YouTube videos explaining where road revenues come from		**Pro** • WSDOT could control the message
	Host a roads roadshow that combines educational materials, presentations and an opportunity for public comment.	Public outreach roadshow	**Pro** • People would have an opportunity to have their voices heard
Outreach **(3) Receiving Public Feedback**			
Outreach **(4) Media**	Media outreach. Better use of social media of all varieties to communicate road costs, situations, status, etc. (Interactive)		
Outreach **(5) Additional study and analysis**			
(5) Additional study and analysis,			
Outreach ***(6)* Miscellaneous,**			