

MOTION NO. 2111

1  
2 A MOTION of the King County Council  
3 authorizing a memorandum agreement with the  
4 Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle for a  
5 joint evaluation of the PSCOG Transportation  
6 System Plan.

7 WHEREAS, a joint evaluation by King County, the Municipality  
8 of Metropolitan Seattle (Metro) and the City of Seattle of the  
9 transit elements for the Seattle-King County Metropolitan Area in  
10 the 1990 Transportation System Plan prepared by the Puget Sound  
11 Council of Governments would assist the County, the Municipality  
12 and the City in their respective transportation and general human  
13 service planning; and

14 WHEREAS, said evaluation represents a test project in the  
15 Municipality's strategy for transit development approved by the  
16 Metro Transit Committee on April 17, 1975; and

17 WHEREAS, the County has agreed to participate in said  
18 evaluation on a cost reimbursement basis and according to the  
19 terms and conditions of the attached memorandum agreement; and

20 WHEREAS, a separate memorandum agreement between the County  
21 and the Municipality, and the Municipality and the City of Seattle  
22 will facilitate timely commencement of said evaluation;

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

24 That the King County Executive is hereby authorized to  
25 execute a memorandum agreement with the Municipality to  
26 participate in a joint evaluation of the transit elements in the  
27 PSCOG 1990 Transportation System Plan.

28 PASSED this 18th day of August, 1975.

29 KING COUNTY COUNCIL  
30 KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

31 ATTEST:

32 Robert B. Quinn  
33 VICE Chairman

34 Dorothy M. Quinn  
35 Clerk of the Council

MEMORANDUM AGREEMENT BETWEEN  
MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN SEATTLE AND KING COUNTY  
FOR JOINT EVALUATION OF PSGC  
1990 TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM PLAN

THIS AGREEMENT is made this 24<sup>th</sup> day of June, 1975, by and between the MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN SEATTLE (hereinafter called "Metro") and KING COUNTY (hereinafter called the "County") to perform a joint evaluation of the transit elements for the Seattle-King County metropolitan area in the 1990 Transportation System Plan prepared by the Puget Sound Governmental Conference (hereinafter called the "Project").

A. Project Organization and Direction. The Project shall be directed by Metro and shall be performed with the assistance of the County and City of Seattle staff pursuant to separate memorandum agreements. Metro shall appoint a Project Director to coordinate staff development of research design, work programs, data collection and sampling techniques, consultant services, staff assignments and interim and final reports with the assistance of a Plan Evaluation Committee ("PEC"). The PEC shall consist of a supervisory staff representative from Metro, the County and the City of Seattle, said County representative to be the Director of Budget and Program Planning Department or his representative. The PEC shall recommend policies and Project scope and design; approve any consultants; insure the timely preparation of any reports; and develop any other techniques, programs or guidelines necessary to accomplish the Project.

B. Project Commencement. The County shall undertake and complete its portion of Project work as described in the Scope of Work attached as Exhibit "A" and as allocated by the PEC. The County shall not commence such work without the written authorization of the Project Director.

C. Staffing. The County shall complete work under the terms of this agreement through qualified and experienced personnel, subject to the approval of the Project Director. Staffing levels shall be assigned by the PEC.

D. Reports and Schedule. The County shall complete the work it is responsible for and assist Metro in the preparation of a final Project report within 17 weeks of receiving authorization to proceed from the Project Director. The completion date may be extended by the Project Director or the PEC. Any dispute as to the contents of the final report shall be referred for resolution to the PEC.

E. Funding. It is the understanding of the parties that the County shall provide \$14,675 of cost-reimbursed services to Metro on the Project as described in the Work Item Budget attached hereto as Exhibit "B". Metro may use any or all of the County services as local "in-kind" match on any federal grant it receives to aid in carrying out the Project. Metro funds shall be used to reimburse the County for Project services as provided in paragraph F.

F. Documentation and Payment. The County shall keep cost accounts suitable to the Metro Project Director consistent with any applicable federal regulations and guidelines. All such records shall be open for examination by Metro for a period of three years after the final payment to the County. The County will bill Metro for actual costs incurred for Project work within 90 days following performance of the service, and these costs shall be paid by Metro within 35 days of billing.

G. Effective Date and Term of Contract. This agreement shall be binding upon the parties hereto as of the date of execution

and shall continue in full force and effect until completion of the Project. This agreement, and any provision hereof, may be amended by written agreement of the parties hereto.

H. Termination or Suspension of Agreement. This agreement shall be terminable upon 180 days prior notice by either services by the County upon ten (10) days written notice of the Project Director.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this agreement as of the day and year first above written.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN SEATTLE

By Richard S. Page  
Richard S. Page  
Executive Director

ATTEST:

By B. J. Carol  
B. J. Carol  
Clerk of the Council

KING COUNTY

By \_\_\_\_\_  
John D. Spellman  
King County Executive

ATTEST:

By \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBIT A

## SCOPE OF WORK

EVALUATION OF THE TRANSIT  
ELEMENTS OF THE 1990 TRANSPORTATION  
SYSTEM PLAN

## GENERAL OVERVIEW

On February 14, 1974 the Puget Sound Governmental Conference adopted PSGC Resolution #1/007/1974. That Resolution contained the 1990 Regional Transportation System Plan for the highway and transit elements as an integral part of the Interim Regional Development Plan. The major elements of that 1990 Transportation System Plan are:

- \*A highway network including freeways, expressways, and major arterials.
- \*A mass transit system including exclusive transit ways, Park/Ride facilities, shelters, etc.
- \*A cross-sound ferry system.
- \*A policy element directed at maximizing the efficiency of existing transportation facilities.
- \*Estimated capital costs and operating costs for the proposed transit system.

The plan assumes that the operating agencies will implement the proposed features of the plan.

*Purpose*  
*method* The assumption that the Metropolitan area of Seattle portion of the regional transit plan of the PSGC over which Metro has jurisdiction will be implemented by Metro is based on the premise that Metro can. To determine whether this a true assumption, an evaluation of the transit elements of the 1990 Plan from a Metro perspective is vital in determining the soundness and implementability of the plan. In doing so, many of the following questions about the plan could be answered:

- Questions to answer*
1. \*Are members of Metro, King County, the City of Seattle, and other cities of the Metro area familiar with the details of the plan? Transit Elements? Do they agree with them?
  2. \*What market are we expected to serve? What are we expected to build? Can these things actually be built within the parameters that exist?
  3. \*Is the proposed system both operationally and fiscally sound? Are the costs reasonable? Do they include all costs? How does the Metro system relate to other systems (ferries, other transit systems, etc.)? Where will the money come from to finance the improvements?

4. \*How does the proposed transit system affect external variables (air pollution, energy consumption, economic activity, etc.)? And how do external variables affect the proposed transit system (energy shortages, shifts in population distribution, growth, etc.)?
5. \*What are the different agency commitments required to see that the transit plan will be implemented? What does the scheduling look like for funding versus implementation of needed service and capital improvements? Are there any legal or legislative requirements?

The opportunity to answer these questions and many others is being provided through the Urban Mass Transportation Technical Studies Grant (CSP) Program. Metro, King County, the City of Seattle, and other cities in the county will provide a team evaluation of the PSGC 1990 Plan as it applies to the Metropolitan transit service area. The \$55,000 grant will be financed based upon a one-third local share, two-thirds federal match. Metro will direct the study, receiving support from these other government agencies.

#### DETAILED STUDY DESIGN

The study will be divided into nine work tasks: 1) Concept Definition, 2) Physical Definition, 3) Demand Evaluation, 4) Operational Analysis, 5) Cost Estimates, 6) Impact Considerations, 7) Implementation Considerations, 8) Reports, and 9) Meetings, Presentations, and Management Coordination.

##### Task 1: Concept Definition

###### Objective:

To provide a description of the representative portions of the comprehensive, metropolitan-wide, all-bus plan as implied by the PSGC 1990 Transportation Plan.

###### Method:

Utilizing the PSGC 1990 Plan and other pertinent information at PSGC, prepare a descriptive report of the transit elements proposed for the King County area.

###### Product:

A paper and a series of graphics clearly depicting the transit elements of the 1990 Plan as recommended by PSGC.

## Task 2: Physical Definition

### Objective:

In order to determine whether the plan is implementable, provide the evaluation team and others with visual examples of potential designs of critical elements of the transit plan. These will be in terms of typical cross-sections, plans and profile, layout, land area design relationship to other urban facilities and activities. Example: How will a transit lane on I-405 tie in with a transit lane or busway on I-90?

### Method:

Identify a few sample areas in the transit plan where design features of the transit elements could run into some difficulties. Example: A transit lane across the Aurora Bridge--How will we do this? What design will we use? For these sample areas provide graphic illustrations of example designs that might be used in accomplishing the proposed improvement.

### Product:

A representative cross-section of designs for various parts of the transit plan. These will be sketches, showing how transit lanes, Park/Ride facilities, busways, CBD distribution systems, etc., could look and work for different subelements of the plan. These sketches will be used to raise some mental images of how a transit element looks relative to a surrounding area, or to illustrate that it is possible to actually design the facility for the given physical constraints, or to illustrate that it may not be possible to physically build the transit element because of some unforeseen constraint. These sample designs will later provide input to developing unit costs for capital items.

## Task 3: Demand Evaluation

### Objective:

To provide an assessment of the methods used to derive the 1990 transit demand. To provide an assessment of the estimated transit ridership to determine if they are reasonable. And, to provide an assessment of outside factors that could affect these estimates and what their impacts might be.

### Method:

Through a seminar or other techniques become familiar with the transit demand estimating techniques used by PSGC. Identify the market being served and establish whether or not the proposed transit plan serves that market adequately.

Also review and try to establish potential impacts on transit ridership that might result from energy shortages, environmental constraints, or changes in parking policies. *oil & higher costs of fuel oil.*

Product:

An understanding of the methods used to estimate transit demands; what those demands are and their sensitivity to outside variables, and an idea of how these estimates might change as a result of some external event(s). Since these demand estimates are essential to determining future revenues, equipment needs and operation expenses, it is important to have a handle on how these values could vary. In this way we can anticipate the worst case as well as the most optimistic case.

Task 4: Operational Analysis

Objective:

To provide a description and analysis of how the proposed transit system might operate. By this time we should have an idea of possible revisions to the plan and considerably more detail on the level of service needed.

Method:

Determine routing and level of service needed to serve the demand of these routes. This may be just a review of PSGC transit networks and expansion/modification of their work.

Research experience of other cities in implementing carpool and transit improvements together and apply this knowledge to our case.

Based upon the findings of this task, determine the operational level of involvement to make the system work.

Product:

Relevant information for operation and capital item cost estimations.

Relevant information for resolution of transit-carpool issues. *▲*

Task 5: Cost Estimates

Objective:

To provide a review of PSGC cost estimates for the transit elements of the 1990 plan.



## Method:

Review PSGC unit cost estimates for capital and operating items. Review sources to determine inflation variables to be used and life cycles to be considered. Based upon review, adopt a set of agreed-upon values for unit costs, life cycle and inflation values, contingencies values, etc. Use these values to evaluate:

- \*Capital Costs. Evaluate cost to provide capital elements of the plan. Describe how these values could be affected and which are the critical elements.
- \*Operating Costs. Evaluate operating costs and maintenance costs for the base plan. Identify how these costs could vary and specify a probable range.
- \*Miscellaneous Items. Evaluate the total costs (capital and operating) over a useful life. Total capital and operating costs will be accrued over the stated life of the system and apportioned to services performed in order to provide the decision makers with a cost on a per-passenger/per-mile basis. These costs will probably be in terms of 1975 dollars. A discussion of inflation and impacts on these costs will also be considered.

## Product:

Cost estimates of the proposed transit plan and its potential changes.

Task 6: Impact Considerations

## Objective:

To provide an assessment of impacts of the proposed transit plan on the surrounding environment.

## Method:

Utilizing the physical descriptions provided in Task 2, the operation analysis in Task 4 and elements of cost developed in Task 5, a simultaneous assessment of Metropolitan area impacts will be initiated. Provide estimates of energy consumption, noise and air pollution; social impacts on the community (especially elderly, young, poor and handicapped) including relationship to cultural and institutional conditions. Also provide some insights into potential economic impacts.

**Product:**

The pros and cons of an all-bus plan and its relation to the environment and the people it is intended to serve.

**Task 7: Implementation Considerations****Objective:**

To provide insight to how the transit elements might be implemented over a specified time frame.

**Method:**

This task will identify those requirements of implementation that are important to determining when the various parts can be implemented and include but are not limited to:

- \*Funding. Financial requirements and sources.
- \*Technology. Availability and/or required development programs for the potential technologies.
- \*Organizational and Legal. Identify implementing and operating agencies and their responsibilities, the legal constraints, and legislative requirements.
- \*Schedule requirements. Implications of items a, b, and c, above to an overall schedule.
- \*Flexibility. Identify the schedule's capability to adjust to variations in demand, opportunities and changes in development, and technology.

**Product:**

An implementation schedule, a rough sketch of funding and cash flow, a definition of areas of responsibility and agency responsible for implementation and operation, and an idea of the flexibility of the plan to change as change occurs.

**Task 8: Reports**

A draft report will be available within three months of project go-ahead. The final report will be available within thirty days of draft approval.

Task 9: Meetings, Presentations and Management Coordination

An ongoing effort of presentations and briefings to key agencies and groups will be maintained throughout the evaluation period. This evaluation program is a part of Metro's "Strategy for Transit Development" program, particularly in the areas of evaluation criteria and projections, urban design requirements, impact assessment and demand estimation.

\*Staffing. Staff personnel of Metro, the City of Seattle, and King County, with project management provided by Metro.

\*Schedule. The evaluation will be completed within 90 days of approved start. This assumes timely provision of necessary 1990 Plan data, and immediate availability of required staff personnel.

\*Citizen Review. Through existing Metro committees and procedures.



EXHIBIT B  
WORK ITEM BUDGET  
King County

<u>TASK NO.</u>	<u>TASK</u>	<u>ESTIMATED SERVICES</u>
1	Concept Definition	500
2	Physical Definition	1,250
3	Demand Evaluation	2,310
4	Operational Analysis	1,040
5	Cost Estimates	2,970
6	Impact Consideration	2,955
7	Implementation Considerations	1,650
8	Reports	1,000
9	Meetings, Presentations, and Management Coordination	1,000
	TOTAL	<hr/> \$14,675