RON SIMS AUDREY GRUGER YNTHIA SULLIVAN
PAUL BARDEN
Gary Grant

February 18, 1988 4455B:SM:mls

INTRODUCED BY:

PROPOSED NO.

88-178

2

T.

3

4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

моттом мо. 7103

A MOTION regarding establishing a Regional Capital Review Commission for proposed voter-approved regional capital projects.

WHEREAS, King County wishes to ensure regional coordination for decision making on regional capital projects, and

WHEREAS, King County wishes to promote the development of standards for capital planning and debt capacity analysis which will facilitate better capital expenditures, and

WHEREAS, King County wishes to increase the quantity and quality of information available to the voters and decision-makers so that informed decisions can be made regarding the issuance of public debt.

WHEREAS, a regional capital review commission which would review and evaluate proposed voter-approved bond issues and levies for significant regional capital projects is desired;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED BY THE Council of King County:

- King County supports the creation of a regional capital review commission which would be independent and temporary with a sunset review of its function and organization in three years.
- The commission should have a composition and functions as В. set forth in Attachment A.

PASSED this 22nd day of February

__, 1988

KING COUNTY COUNCIL KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

y Frant

ATTEST:

? Usuens the Council

ATTACHMENT A

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE REGIONAL CAPITAL REVIEW COMMISSION (RCRC)

The RCRC would be independent and temporary subject to a sunset review of its function and organization in three years.

COMPOSITION

REGIONAL CAPITAL REVIEW COMMISSION TO BE COMPOSED OF:

- County Executive
- Two County Councilmembers representing unincorporated areas
- Seattle Mayor and one City Council representative
- Two representatives from Suburban Cities Associations
- Four citizens to be chosen from leaders in the business community, major civic organizations and other individuals to assure sufficient geographical diversity.

TECHNICAL COMMITTEES - CHANGING COMPOSITION, would include both permanent seats for individuals from the public and private sectors with finance and capital expenditure expertise and temporary seats for experts added from the specific field of each proposed bond issue. It should also include representatives of the Port, School Districts, and Metro.

PURPOSES:

A. BETTER INFORMATION

 To increase the quantity and quality of information available to the voters and decision-makers so that informed decisions can be made regarding the issuance of public debt.

B. PLANNING AND COORDINATING FUNCTION:

- To promote and enhance development of standards for capital planning and debt capacity analysis;
- To coordinate and identify the roles and needs for data development; to provide clearing house for capital proposals.

C. REVIEW PURPOSE: (First Stage)

- To review and evaluate proposed voter-approved bond issues and levies for significant regional capital projects.

FUNCTIONS:

A. COMMISSION REVIEW:

- Should provide early review of possible bond issues prior to the sponsoring entity making a final decision to place the bond proposal on the ballot. The analysis of proposed bond issues will be based upon factors which should be refined, enlarged and adjusted through experience. The initial factors include:
- 1. Review of the jurisdiction's needs assessment and the capital planning and analysis supporting the proposed means of solving the problem.
- 2. Quality of supporting cost data, both capital and operating.

4263B:SM:m1s (02-18-88)

- 3. The sponsoring jurisdiction's analysis of alternative means of addressing and financing solutions of the identified problems.
- 4. Effect on tax rate and household tax burden within the jurisdiction.

- 5. The impact on the capacity of the sponsoring jurisdiction to undertake the project including the impact on the regional capacity to fund other projects.
- 6. The impact of the project on future operating costs, and the cost of future capital replacement.

The RCRC would produce a summary of analysis including these facts, estimates and evaluations and provide it to the jurisdiction at least one month prior to the jurisdiction's decision date.

- B. COMMISSION DATA FUNCTIONS

 DEVELOPMENT OF UNIFORM CAPITAL PLANNING AND DEBT CAPACITY

 ANALYSIS, AND DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS COMPONENTS
 - Capital Review Commission shall assure development of data by drawing upon and working with existing and emerging data functions at the Puget Sound Council of Governments, King County, and other jurisdictions. Specifically, the Commission shall do the following:
 - 1. Working in conjunction with the COG, the Commission, through its technical committees, shall develop standards for capital planning and debt analysis.
 - 2. Based on the work with the COG and other jurisdictions, the Commission shall identify necessary components of data for proper regional capital planning and review and identify the development of data functions which should be enhanced. The Commission itself may undertake or agree with other entities to be reponsible for each of the specific components of data collection and analysis necessary to provide for a comprehensive, high quality system of information on which the Commission, political leaders, and the public can make informed decisions regarding the use of public resources and issuance of debt. Unnecessary cost and duplication of functions are to be avoided.
 - The Commission shall ensure that a clearing house for capital proposals is established either by itself through the COG or other jurisdictions.
 - 4. The Commission shall seek to provide, either directly or by working with other entities such as the COG, technical assistance to smaller jurisdictions in the application of the capital planning and debt analysis standards.

ORGANIZATIONAL STEPS

- 1. The public officials shall meet and formulate a specific process for the initial selection of citizen representatives.
- Initially, loaned staff from the governments involved shall be utilized.
- 3. The full Commission shall then decide on staffing, other necessary support services, and procedures to be followed. The full Commission should hold a public hearing on its proposed procedures prior to their adoption.
- 4. A formal memorandum of understanding should be prepared, but the Commission may begin on a voluntary and informal basis to assure its timely commencement.

COMPARISON OF CAPITAL REVIEW PROPOSALS

Current Proposal	King County 2000	2000	PS	PSCOG
Purpose				
o To increase the quantity and quality of information available to voters and	o Informatic o Establish planning a	Information Provision Establish a uniform capital planning and debt capacity	00	Information Provisi Establish a uniform planning and debt c
o To promote and enhance the development of standards for capital planning and debt capacity analysis. o To coordinate and identify the roles and needs for data development; to provide a clearing house for capital proposals. o To review and evaluate proposed voter-approved bond issues and levies for significant regional capital projects.	o Evaluate p	Evaluate proposed debt issues	0 0	Evaluate proposed d Direct link to Regi Strategy
Scope of Review	٠.			
o Regionally significant capital projects financed by both general obligation bonds and levies.	o Regional projo Regionally siprojects o Initially, all of regional s School districter wight be consfuture. o All GO bonds including non both voter-ap councilmanic.	Regional projects Regionally significant local projects Initially, all GO bonds/levies of regional significance; School district levies and revenue/rate bond projects might be considered in the future. All GO bonds and levies, including non-capital levies, both voter-approved and councilmanic.	0000	Regional projects Regionally signific projects Initially, all G0 b of regional signific School district lev revenue/rate bonded might be considered future. All G0 bonds and lev including non-capita both voter-approved councilmanic. Port, Metro and School

•	Current Proposal	Z E	King County 2000	S	PSCOG
ပါ	Composition				
0	King County Executive		A Port Commissioner	, 0	Citizen component
0	Two King County Council-	0	King County Executive	0 (A Port Commission
	members representing	c	Metro Council Chair	0	King County Exe
0	Seattle Mayor and one City		Mayor of Seattle	0	Metro Council Cha
			Seattle City Councilmember	0	Mayor of Seattl
0	Two representatives from	0	2 County Councilmembers	0	Seattle City Coun
	the Suburban Cities		representing unincorporated	0	2 County Councilm
	Association		areas.		representing unin
0	Four citizens to be chosen	0	Two Suburban City Association		areas.
	-		representatives	0	Two Suburban City
	ਕ	0	Possible citizen participa-		representatives
	organizations and other		tion	0	Possible citizen
	entities. Citizens chosen	0	Ad hoc advisory bodies as		tion
	to assure sufficient		appropriate	0	Ad hoc advisory b
		0	Loaned staff directed by an		appropriate
0	Technical committees with		independent director.	0	Loaned staff dire
	permanent and special				independent direc
	members as appropriate,			0	Loaned staff conv
	including representatives				and KSRC staff.
	from the Port, School	:			
	ts,				
	public and private finance				
	experts.				
0	<u>-</u>				

No new entity Existing PSCOG in agreement

00

Three-year sunset provision Memorandum of Understanding

00

00

Establishment Mechanism

Three-year sunset provision Public officials meet and formulate a specific process for the initial selection of citizen representatives.

Establishment Mechanism (cont'd)

Current Proposal

The full Commission determines staffing, other necessary support services, and procedures. The full Commission will hold a public hearing on its proposed procedures prior to their adoption. 0

A formal Memorandum of Understanding would be prepared, but the Commission may begin on a voluntary and informal basis to assure its timely commencement. 0