

1 May 26, 1988
0576C/GN:MMc/hdm

Introduced by: GREG NICKELS

Proposed No: 88-419M

2
3 MOTION NO. 7211

4 A MOTION approving the work program,
5 task force structure, and timetable for
6 a transportation funding proposal as
7 required by Motion 7102.

8 WHEREAS, Motion 7102 directed the county executive to prepare
9 a work program for addressing transportation funding needs by
10 April 15, 1988, and

11 WHEREAS, the executive did submit a proposed work program,
12 task force structure and timetable on April 15, 1988, and

13 WHEREAS, the proposed work program, task force structure and
14 timetable have been reviewed by council staff, King Subregional
15 staff, and elected officials from several suburban cities

16 WHEREAS, based on that review, minor modifications to the work
17 program have been prepared by council staff and are concurred in
18 by executive staff and PSCOG staff, and

19 WHEREAS, county executive and council staff and staff from the
20 PSCOG are prepared to expedite the program once it is approved by
21 the council;

22 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT MOVED by the Council of King County:

23 The attached revised work program is hereby approved, and the
24 executive is directed to staff the project to meet the timetable
25 set out in the work program.

26 PASSED this 13th day of June, 19 88

27
28 KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

29
30 Gary Grant
Chairman

31
32 ATTEST:

33 Juanita M. Owens
Clerk of the Council

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING STRATEGY

WORK PROGRAM

PURPOSE

By Motion 7102, the King County Council initiated a process for identifying appropriate funding mechanisms to address the growing transportation problems in King County. The motion called for the establishment of a task force to address this issue, with the particular intention of implementing available but under-utilized funding sources to address known and documented needs.

Many of the deficiencies in the County's transportation network are multi-jurisdictional in their source. The deficiencies are of sufficient scale that the resources of more than one agency/jurisdiction must be brought to bear to address them. Existing resources may not be sufficient even when several jurisdictions/agencies are committed to solving the problem.

Underutilized or unused funding mechanisms include general obligation bonds, TBD's and development mitigation payment systems, among others. Different tools may be most appropriate for certain levels of need; regional, subregional or local.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PROGRAM IS TO IDENTIFY, ON A MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL BASIS, THE BEST UNUSED OR UNDERUTILIZED FUNDING SOURCES TO ADDRESS EXISTING IDENTIFIED NEEDS, AND THEN TO WORK JOINTLY TO IMPLEMENT THE FUNDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF IMPROVEMENTS WHICH ADDRESS THE IDENTIFIED NEEDS.

THIS IS AN ACTION PROGRAM to implement existing planning work by applying funding strategies to address known problems.

PROPOSED TASK FORCE APPROACH

- o Phase I of the work program would be accomplished by a technical advisory committee (TAC) of the combined staffs of the member jurisdictions of the King Subregional Council and the PSCOG. They would prepare a needs list and a general, initial prioritization of projects.
- o Phase II would be performed by the Elected Officials Board. The EOB would focus on adopting evaluation criteria, finalizing the project prioritization and developing a recommended funding strategy for the selected projects. The EOB would then recommend a comprehensive funding strategy to the appropriate jurisdictions for implementation.

ELECTED OFFICIALS BOARD MEMBERSHIP

- o The following members representing King County, City of Seattle, suburban jurisdictions and METRO would comprise the EOB:
 - o King County Executive (1)
 - o Two King County Councilmembers (2)
 - o Mayor of Seattle (1)
 - o One Seattle City Councilmember (1)
 - o President of Suburban Cities Association (1)
 - o Three suburban city representatives selected by the Suburban Cities Association with equal representation by geographic region of the county (3)
 - o Chair of the METRO Transit Committee (1)

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)

Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)--24 members made up of community and business leaders committed to address transportation needs including:

- o Twelve representatives from King County (12)
 - o One each representing each Council District (9)
 - o Three selected by King County Executive (3)
- o Six representatives from City of Seattle (6)
- o Six representatives from Suburban Jurisdictions (6)

COMMITTEE PROCESS/ROLES/TASKS

- o EOB approves all final recommendations for submittal to the King County Executive and Council.
- o EOB members will provide policy guidance and a critical link to jurisdictions/other forums:
 - o RCRC review process
 - o KSRC
- o Task Force will conduct the major portion of the work through sub-committees of the CAC and TAC with selected involvement of EOB:
- o Project Financing Sub-Committee (TAC): Evaluate scope of funding needs for all modes of transportation and propose a strategy package.

- o Projects and Priorities Sub-Committee (TAC): Identify scope of funding needs for all modes of transportation through major solicitation from all agencies and develop funding and construction phasing proposals for the Project Financing Sub-Committee. Based on direction from the Project Financing Sub-Committee, establish criteria for project prioritization and distribution by mode and proposed funding source.
- o Community Support sub-Committee (CAC): Develop strategy to inform public and generate support for proposed multi-faceted funding strategy.

7211

COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION FUNDING STRATEGY

OUTLINE OF WORK PROGRAM

TION

<u>PROPOSAL</u>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY/COMMITTEE</u>
ted ordinance and motions. er agencies, interest groups ing, proposed decision ole/sub-committee o other forums.	May 1988	County Council with comments from suburban cities, King SRC
<u>DE OF TRANSPORTATION NEEDS</u> t from existing studies. encies. sponding to deficiencies (for example, high	April to August 1988	Technical committee consisting of staffs of SRC members and PSCOG, using data from -KC - KCTP (April) -PSCOG - KC2000(Existing) -PSCOG - RTP 2000 Draft Action Plan (June) -PSCOG - GRVTAP (Existing) -Eastside - ETP (July) -Metro - Metro 2000 (?) -LTC - Road Jurisdiction Study -WSDOT - Projects in KCTP, RTP -Local Jurisdiction Plans
<u>OFFICIALS BOARD</u> posed membership.	August 1988	County council with nominations from County Executive, County Council, City of Seattle, suburban cities per adopted formula
<u>RY COMMITTEE</u>	September	County council and Executive with input from EOB

211

<u>PHASING OF PROJECTS</u>	<u>Target Date</u>	<u>RESPONSIBLE AGENCY/COMMITTEE</u>
criteria. ects.	Aug. to Nov. 1988	Elected Officials Board with input from technical committee
nd related cash flow needs. administrative coordination.		
<u>RATEGY</u> icipated revenues and need. ancing strategies ld be potentially funded from f bond capacity/ bond(s), (if selected as a strategy). ategy.	Aug. to Nov. 1988	Elected Officials Board with input from technical committee based on: -PSCOG - RTP Implementation Strategy -PSCOG - KC 2000 (Existing) -KC - Debt Capacity Study (March) -KC - Implementation Strategy (April)
<u>ESTABLISH CAMPAIGN</u> problem message" mittee of task force. au and Editorial Board ategy.	Sept. to Dec. 1988	Elected Officials Board
<u>OF TRANSPORTATION FUNDING STRATEGY</u>		
<u>GRAM</u> pecific funding mechanisms : districts, issue,)	Nov. 1988 to March 1989	
ial funding solutions. nstitutional amendments.	Dec 1988 to April 1989	

9211