

MOTION NO. 7979

1
2
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
34
35
36

A MOTION expressing King County's intent to establish the local option vehicle license fee as soon as possible, requesting resolutions of support from cities over 8,000 population for implementing the fee, and directing the executive to prepare a plan of expenditures for the county's share of the fee revenues as part of the 1991 budget process.

WHEREAS, the county council through motion 7102 and 7211 established a multijurisdictional process to identify transportation needs in the King County region through the year 2000, to develop a forecast of revenues to meet those needs, to determine the shortfall between the identified needs and forecasted revenues, and to develop new transportation funding sources to address the transportation revenue shortfall, and

WHEREAS, a transportation revenue shortfall of \$1.502 billion (1990 dollars) was identified for King County and the cities within the boundaries of King County between the years 1988 and 2000, and

WHEREAS, the local option vehicle license fee is a regional revenue source which will benefit the county and each of the cities within the boundaries of the county as shown in Attachment A, and the county recognizes that some cities have urgent need for new transportation revenues in addition to revenues provided by the increase in the statewide motor vehicle and special fuel tax authorized by the 1990 Legislative Session, and

WHEREAS, at a meeting held of May 16, 1990 to which the county invited representatives of all the cities within the boundaries of the county and of private sector and other public agencies which have worked to secure the Legislature's approval of new transportation revenues to express their views on how the new local option transportation revenues should be implemented, and

1 designate a group of elected officials to work with a
2 multijurisdictional staff group as a part of King County
3 Transportation Financing Strategies Project in the development
4 of a common process as described in Attachment C.

5 PASSED this 16th day of July, 1990.

6 KING COUNTY COUNCIL
7 KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

8 Lois North
9 Chair

10 ATTEST:

11 Gerald G. Peterson
12 Clerk of the Council

ATTACHMENT A

VEHICLE REGISTRATION FEE REVENUE ESTIMATED DISTRIBUTION

Jurisdiction	Estimated 1989 Pop.	Distribution Percent*	1990-2000 Distribution	1991 (12 mos.) Distribution
Algona	1,705	0.10%	\$171,992	\$15,748
Auburn	32,460	1.92%	\$3,274,410	\$299,806
Beaux Arts	298	0.02%	\$30,061	\$2,752
Bellevue	86,350	5.10%	\$8,710,577	\$797,544
Black Diamond	1,375	0.08%	\$171,992	\$15,748
Bothell (part)	10,430	0.62%	\$1,052,129	\$96,333
Carnation	1,250	0.07%	\$126,094	\$11,545
Clyde Hill	3,060	0.18%	\$308,678	\$28,263
Des Moines	14,820	0.87%	\$1,494,971	\$136,880
Duvall	2,205	0.13%	\$222,430	\$20,366
Enumclaw	6,380	0.38%	\$643,584	\$58,927
Federal Way	64,000	3.78%	\$6,456,016	\$591,115
Hunts Point	528	0.03%	\$53,262	\$4,877
Issaquah	7,440	0.44%	\$750,512	\$68,717
Kent	34,860	2.06%	\$3,516,511	\$321,973
Kirkland	36,620	2.16%	\$3,694,051	\$338,229
Lake Forest Pk.	2,790	0.16%	\$281,442	\$25,769
Medina	2,990	0.18%	\$301,617	\$27,616
Mercer Island	20,380	1.20%	\$2,055,838	\$188,233
Milton (pt.)	555	0.04%	\$65,585	\$6,005
Normandy Park	6,320	0.37%	\$637,532	\$58,373
North Bend	2,310	0.14%	\$233,022	\$21,336
Pacific	3,740	0.22%	\$377,273	\$34,543
Redmond	33,400	1.97%	\$3,369,233	\$308,488
Renton	38,480	2.27%	\$3,881,679	\$355,408
SeaTac	24,000	1.42%	\$2,421,006	\$221,668
Seattle	497,200	29.35%	\$50,155,172	\$4,592,226
Skykomish	238	0.01%	\$24,008	\$2,198
Snoqualmie	1520	0.09%	\$153,330	\$14,039
Tukwila	11,420	0.67%	\$1,151,995	\$105,477
Yarrow Point	1,020	0.06%	\$102,893	\$9,421
Total Incor.	950,144	56.10%	\$95,888,897	\$8,779,624
Unincorporated	495,856	43.90%	\$75,029,394	\$6,869,720
TOTAL	1,446,000	1,693,928	\$170,875,403	\$15,645,416

* The distribution is based on a per capita formula which weights the unincorporated area population by a factor of 1.5.

c:\tfs\vrf2 3/23/90

ATTACHMENT B

Summary of discussion of participants at the Post-Legislative Session Transportation Forum held on May 16, 1990.

I. OPTIONS In what order and how rapidly should decisions be made about implementing countywide and/or city/county only options?

Implement the Vehicle Registration Fee as soon as possible.

II. STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT PROCESS To what extent should decisions on timing and selection of revenue source for the local options be subject to a common regional strategy development process or left to the implementing jurisdiction?

Conduct a strategy development process as soon as possible for the remaining options including the high capacity transit option, the commercial parking tax and the street utility. The process should produce:

- Time lines for implementing the options.
- Objectives, policies and programs for expenditures of the revenues.
- Emphasis on Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and High Occupancy Vehicle programs.

III. PLANNING AND COORDINATION REQUIREMENTS. To what extent should planning/coordination requirements be addressed cooperatively, and what is the timing and mechanism for doing so?

Support an agreement on a common planning and coordination process.

- Do not wait to finalize institutional issues such as the Puget Sound Council of Governments (PSCOG) and King Subregional Council (KSRC) reorganization or ESHB 2929.
- Relate the process to mechanisms already under development.

ATTACHMENT C

The direction provided at the Post-Legislative Transportation Forum held by King County on May 16, 1990, was that King County and the cities within King County should agree to a common process for carrying out the transportation planning and coordination provisions of Chapter 42, Session Laws of 1990 [Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6358] Section 212. This common process should also be consistent with Engrossed Substitute House Bill 2929 and plans for reorganizing the Puget Sound Council of Governments and the King Subregional Council. The common process should:

1. Ensure that the vehicle registration fee revenues are expended for transportation uses consistent with the adopted transportation and land use plans of the jurisdictions expending the funds and consistent with any applicable and adopted regional transportation plan for the Central Puget Sound metropolitan planning area; (Section 212 (2))

2. Ensure that the County and city over 8000 population develop and adopts a specific transportation program which:

A. Identifies the geographic boundaries of the area(s) within which the local option transportation revenues will be levied and expended; (Section 212 (a))

B. Is based on an adopted transportation plan for the geographic area in which the expenditures are to be made, and identifies proposed operation, construction of improvements and services in the designated plan area; (Section 212 (3)(b))

C. Indicates how the local transportation plan is coordinated with applicable transportation plans for the region and for adjacent jurisdictions; and, (Section 212 (3)(c))

D. Includes at least a six-year funding plan to be updated annually; (Section 212 (d))

4. Ensure that local transportation programs are periodically updated and consistent with applicable local and regional transportation and land use plans, and within the means of estimated available public and private revenues.

5. Ensure that expenditures for new or expanded transportation facilities, improvements, and services are made based upon the following criteria, which are stated in descending order of weight to be attributed:

- a. First, the project serves a multijurisdictional function;
- b. Second, it is necessitated by existing or reasonably foreseeable congestion;
- c. Third, it has the greatest person-carrying capacity;
- d. Fourth, it is partially funded by other government funds or by private sector contributions; and
- f. Fifth, it meets such other criteria as the local government determines is appropriate. (Section 212 (5))

6. Encourage local governments to enter into interlocal agreements to jointly develop and adopt with other local governments the transportation programs required by Section 212 for the purpose of accomplishing regional transportation planning and development. (Section 212 (7))