Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP)
November 18, 2011
Meeting Summary

ETP Members

Councilmember Kimberly Allen	Redmond (Chair)
Councilmember Sonny Putter	Newcastle (Vice-Chair)
Councilmember Kevin Wallace	Bellevue
Mayor Ava Frisinger	Issaquah
Councilmember Josh Schaer	Issaquah
Councilmember Bob Hensel	Kenmore
Councilmember Allen Van Ness	Kenmore
Councilmember Kathy Lambert	King County
Chris Arkills	King County Executive (Alternate)
Councilmember Dave Asher	Kirkland
Deputy Mayor Tom Odell	Sammamish
Councilmember Bruce Bassett	Mercer Island
Councilmember Jane Brahm	Mercer Island
Deputy Mayor Steve Buri	Newcastle
Councilmember John Stilin	Redmond
Councilmember Susan Boundy-Sanders	Woodinville
Mayor George Martin	Clyde Hill (Small Cities)
Mayor Dave Cooper	Yarrow Point (Small Cities)
Deputy Mayor Jim Berger	Carnation (SVGA Alternate)
Councilmember Amy Ockerlander	Duvall (SVGA)
Peter Camp	Snohomish County
Councilmember Fred Butler	Sound Transit
Charlie Howard	PSRC
Stacy Trussler	WSDOT

Other Elected Officials

Councilmember Doug Dicharry	Medina (Small Cities)

I. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

II. Approval of October 14, 2011 Meeting Summary

The October 14, 2011 meeting summary was approved.

III. King County Roads Services Division Presentation on the Strategic Plan for Roads Services (SPRS)

Chair Allen introduced Doug Hodson, Deputy Director of King County DOT's Roads Service Division (RSD). Mr. Hodson presented on King County's Strategic Plan for Roads Services

(SPRS). The SPRS plan outlines how King County will be addressing future road maintenance in unincorporated King County. With 1,600 miles of road and 184 bridges (including those shared with cities), King County faces a growing maintenance backlog. These roads still carry one million daily trips that connect cities and jobs. Because of a growing road maintenance backlog and reduced revenues to perform maintenance work, RSD is struggling financially to keep up with the rate of infrastructure deterioration.

In 2012, the King County RSD's expected revenues will come from a numbers of sources. These sources are:

- 65% from property tax
- 14% from reimbursable fees
- 12% from gas tax revenues
- 6% from grants
- 3% from other sources

Of these sources, annual revenues have been decreasing from property tax, gas tax, and grants. In 2015, after annexations, revenues are expected to be $102 million per year. RSD expects King County's 2015 maintenance, preservation, and capital improvement needs to be $240 annually, which is a $138 million higher than the expected revenues. In RSD's SPRS plan, we have outlined three scenarios to mange annual roadway maintenance needs. Scenario A will maximize the life cycle of roadway infrastructure at an annual cost of $170 to $180 million; $70 to $80 million higher than the expected revenue. Scenario B will moderate the decline in asset condition at an annual cost of $120 to $130 million; $20 to $30 million higher than expected revenue. Scenario C will manage risk in the declining system by matching operating costs of $102 million to the expected revenue of $102 million. Council selected that RSD plan for Scenario B.

SPRS establishes a five tiered maintenance plan for roadways based, assigning each roadway a tier based on a facility's importance and traffic volume. The tier defines the level of maintenance King County plans to provide the roadway. These tiers are described below:

Tier 1: Consistently reliable access (50% of all daily trips). Will receive highest storm/snow response. Users should expect good road and bridge conditions.

Example is Novelty Hill Road NE

Tier 2: Generally reliable access (20% of all daily trips). Expect lower lever of storm/snow response. Will generally have good road and bridge conditions as long as funding allows.

Example is Renton Ave S from 128th ST to S 130th St

Tier 3: Somewhat reliable access (15% of all daily trips). Will receive little or no storm/snow response. Maintenance will be provided to slow deterioration.

Example is SE 144th St

Tier 4: Less reliable access (5% of all daily trips). Will receive no storm/snow response. Maintenance limited to preserving access, many turning to gravel if funding not available.

Example is 15 Mile Creek Bridge

Tier 5: Least reliable access (10% of all daily trips). Will receive no storm/snow response. Maintenance will be limited to life safety and risk needs. Many will turn to gravel over time and may be closed.

Example is SE Mirrormont Way

King County has been meeting with schools, public safety agencies, and a number of public groups to discuss the SPRS plan and prepare them for the upcoming changes in maintenance standards. RSD is looking to the Washington Transportation Task Force to identify funding opportunities for King County's roads so we can improve the level of maintenance King County provides to unincorporated facilities. In addition, the PSRC is focusing more on prioritizing projects based on preservation which could help fund additional maintenance work.

Councilmember Lambert added that the King County Council has heard from the public that snow removal in unincorporated areas is a major concern. So in a recent reorganizing of King County RSD, a number of positions were cut in planning and administration, but two additional positions were added for snow removal.

Vice-Chair Putter asked if a map of the road "tiers" was available. Mr. Hodson said it is available on their website at the following address:

http://www.kingcounty.gov/transportation/kcdot/Roads/NewServiceLevels.aspx

Vice-Chair Putter followed up by stating that it seems like the SPRS plan is a triage plan, but what is the long term plan? Mr. Hodson said that the PSRC shift in focus on preservation will be good, but that a lot of hope is laying in the Washington Transportation Task Force to find a funding solution.

Councilmember Butler said that it looks like this plan deals with maintenance and preservation, but not capacity. What is the potential to add capacity through this plan. Mr. Hodson responded that King County is relying on the Task Force to identify a funding solution that could lead to capacity projects, otherwise the availability of grant funding will be the driver in building capacity projects.

Councilmember Stilin asked if there has been any calculation about how much additional tax a home would incur to improve travel time by a specific amount. This would be helpful for people to understand the benefit of increased taxes to pay for roads. Mr. Hodson responded that it was an interesting idea that RSD has not yet done.

Vice-Chair Putter asked what the reactions have been of unincorporated area groups to this plan. Mr. Hodson said that they have not been happy with the proposals.

Councilmember O'Dell said the cost to repair a roadway later will cost the public much more than providing early maintenance. Additionally, waiting will cost citizens more money through increases in vehicle repairs and lost time.

Deputy Mayor Berger asked if the County has looked at any savings through staff changes or streamlining the permit processing time. Councilmember Lambert responded that the Council reduced the number of employees in the Department of Development and Environmental Services (DDES) from 400 to 104 employees and adjusted their hourly fee structure to a flat fee structure. Mr. Hodson added that RSD is working on a programmatic permit application process to reduce the time needed for permit application.

IV. Overview of ETP Procedures

Wes Edwards, Transportation Planner with King County DOT, provided a quick history of when ETP's rules and procedures were adopted. There are two documents that outline the rules and procedures, the 2009 to 2012 ETP Agreement and the ETP Operating Procedures adopted in 2007. Section 4.5 of the 2009 to 2012 ETP Agreement allows ETP to "establish its own bylaws and rules of procedures and may modify these as appropriate." The agreement that was in place in 2007 also included this provision, leading to the creation and adoption of the ETP Operating Procedures in 2007. ETP adopted a new agreement in 2009, but did not update the ETP Operating Procedures. This created a few incongruencies between the two documents with the new agreement superseding the older adopted operating procedures. At the end of 2012, the current 2009 to 2012 ETP Agreement expires, so discussions on how to restructure the agreement will occur mid-2012. This will also be a good time to update the ETP Operating Procedures to reflect the new agreement and any changes the membership would like to make to the rules and procedures.

Based on comments from the October 14 meeting regarding procedures, three procedural issues were raised that needed further clarification; what is the quorum requirement, what parliamentary procedure does ETP use, and what is the process for voting on action items. Reviewing the existing agreement and operating procedures resulted in the following conclusions:

1. **Quorum Requirement:** Section 4.7 of the 2009-2012 agreement states that a "simple majority of voting members… can adopt resolutions, authorize correspondence, request studies, or provide other advisory input…" The 2007 Operating Procedures adds that "With a majority vote of those voting members present, the Partnership can adopt resolutions in support of member jurisdictions or regional activities, authorize studies or approve correspondence and requests for information."
2. **Parliamentary Procedure**: No parliamentary procedure is specifically identified for ETP meetings. The Partnership could consider if they want to adopt Robert's Rules or another parliamentary procedure, or partially adopt procedures just for the process of voting.
3. **Process for Voting on Action Items**: The agreement is silent on rules for introducing action items and when those action items can be voted on. Most frequently, ETP has introduced a potential action item at a meeting and voted to take action on that item at the next meeting. A number of times the process has been expedited to include introduction and action in the same meeting when immediate action by the

Partnership was perceived as necessary. The Partnership may want to consider continuing or revising this standard

Councilmember Van Ness suggested that ETP adopt Robert's Rules in lack of any other formally adopted parliamentary procedure.

Councilmember Schaer recommended that ETP form a subcommittee to review the existing rules and make a recommendation. Chair Allen asked if Councilmember Schaer would accept to be chair on the subcommittee. Councilmember Schaer accepted. Councilmembers Asher and Van Ness agreed to serve on the subcommittee.

Mr. Camp suggested that not adopting Robert's Rules allows for more collegial discussion without strict rules. Mayor Martin agreed that the issues of the previous meeting were not typical and ETP has functioned well for years in the lack of any formally adopted procedures.

Councilmember Stilin recalled reviewing a section of Robert's Rules that allows advisory committees more freedom in parliamentary procedure as opposed to a legislative body that should follow the formal structure of Robert's Rules. He believes that ETP would be considered as an advisory committee.

Councilmember Stilin asked about the current requirement in the 2009 to 2012 ETP Agreement stipulating that there be an annual joint subareas meeting and if one was being planned for this year. Chris Arkills responded that King County staff has been in discussions with the subarea chairs to plan a joint meeting for early 2012. In addition, a joint-subarea meeting was held earlier this year.

V. 2012 Metro Service Changes

David Hull, Supervisor for King County Metro Service Planning, provided an overview of the proposed June 2012 Metro Transit service change. Based on the new Transit Service Guidelines, Metro is reallocating resources to make much need improvements in serve quality. This includes alleviating crowding, enhancing on-time operation, and increasing ridership of the transit system. The June 2012 proposal will be considered by King County Council in early December with an expected adoption in January.

The 20 dollar congestion reduction charge that was approved earlier this year required that Metro utilize the Strategic Plan to make the system more cost-effective for the two years that the charge is in effect. Council directed Metro to reduce 100,000 hours from poorly performing routes and reinvest those hours into routes with poor service or that are underserved. The June changes will include about 40,000 hours of reinvestment.

Some services have been proposed for reduction or elimination because they have relatively low productivity. Low productivity is based on comparing the number or riders on routes serving the

same market and on comparing the miles traveled per passenger on routes serving similar markets.

This restructuring will include changes to the following routes:

Routes for deletion: 38, 42, 79EX, 129, 162, 175, 196, 219, 600EX, 912, 925
Routes receiving reductions: 25, 99, 119, 139, 935
Route revisions: 177
Routes receiving investment in crowd relief: 1, 8, 9EX, 41, 44, 128, 169, 218, 372EX, 36, 73
Routes receiving investment in on-time performance: 2N & 2S, 5, 7, 8, 15, 16 ,17, 18, 21EX, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 37, 39, 43, 48N & 48S, 49, 54EX, 54, 55, 57, 60, 66EX, 68, 71, 72, 81, 105, 106, 113, 119EX, 120, 121, 121, 122, 124, 125, 128, 131, 132, 150, 166, 169, 181, 182, 187, 205EX, 209, 224, 240, 251 (931), 255, 280, 309, 311, 330, 358EX, 373EX
Route receiving investment into underserved corridors: 180

Chair Allen asked what the notification process has been for those who are losing service. Mr. Hull said that they have been reaching out to impacted communities, but most people in the Metro service area will not see a change. Some riders will now have DART service instead of regular bus service, and in many cases the DART will be able to pick up and drop off riders at their door. However, increases in DART service is limited to a total of three percent of all bus service based on current union contracts. The proposed June 2012 increase in DART service brings Metro close to the three percent threshold, limiting future expansion of DART services.

VI. Governor's Connecting Washington Task Force Update

Chris Arkills, Transportation Advisor to the King County Executive, reported that the Task Force canceled its last meeting that would have taken place a couple days before ETP. The next scheduled meeting will take place on November 29. Discussions of what transportation revenue options will begin at the next meeting.

Vice-Chair Putter asked what the timeline is for the Task Force to report out. Mr. Arkills said the Task Force plans to provide recommendations after the next two meetings.

Councilmember Asher expressed concern that the Task Force will recommend a "pre-cooked" package. With only one likely shot to go to voters this year, the proposal has to be right.

Charlie Howard added that other states have been looking at regional approaches to raising and distributing revenue when their states have been insufficiently able to provide transportation funding. This has been seen in the Phoenix area, and voters are also considering regional entity in the Atlanta area. This could be an option for a new approach in the Puget Sound Region. Vice-Chair Putter added that a regional government may be a better equipped to handle local transportation issues.

Mr. Arkills added that the Initiative 1125 results are telling that our region has different transportation needs than the state, and voters in the Puget Sound Region understand and support addressing these issues in ways that may not be right for the rest of the state.

Councilmember Lambert said that the Regional Transit Committee (RTC) could serve as that body. Vice-Chair Putter said that the regional body needs to expand beyond the RTC to include roads, transit, ferries, etcetera, and include Snohomish and Pierce Counties. This would require a legislative change to allow the PSRC to be more than just a planning organization. The state must grant the authority to implement such a regional body.

Deputy Mayor Buri said that a regional body would need to consolidate agencies and have directly elected representatives. Councilmember Asher added that this issue should be a topic of further discussion. Chair Allen requested that this be an agenda item for a future joint-subarea meeting.

Mr. Arkills said that discussion of a regional entity would be good because there are clear advantages and disadvantages that need to be fleshed out.

Vice-Chair Putter said that he raised this issue at the PSRC Executive Board by asking if having seven transit agencies in the region is truly sustainable. The PSRC's Executive Board directed the PSRC Transportation Policy Board to "explore the finance and governance of transportation infrastructure and transit in the region and the long term funding of transportation and discuss the possibility of creating a working committee to begin discussions for dealing with these issues." Mr. Howard added that he has been communicating with Chair Balducci about how to bring this issue before the Transportation Policy Board. It will likely be part of the Transportation Financing discussion set to take place in January of 2012.

VII. Reports

Chair Allen requested volunteers for ETP's Legislative Subcommittee. The following members volunteered and were appointed by the chair:

Councilmember Stilin (Chair)
Councilmember Ocklander
Councilmember Boundy-Sanders
Councilmember Asher
Councilmember Lambert

Chair Allen requested volunteers for ETP's Nominations Subcommittee. The following members volunteered and were appointed by the chair:

Councilmember Butler (Chair)
Deputy Mayor Berger
Vice-Chair Putter

At the request of Chair Allen for Councilmember Butler to Chair the Nominations Subcommittee, Councilmember Butler said that he would be happy to serve and chair the Nominations Subcommittee if members are comfortable that he is a non-voting ETP member. No members raised concern, so Chair Allen appointed Councilmember Butler as Chair of the Nominations Subcommittee.

Other Attendees:

Monica Whitman, SCA	Terry Marpert, Redmond
Jon Pascal, Transpo Group	Wes Edwards, KCDOT
Paul Carlson, MKCC	Jack Whisner, KC Metro
Charles Prestrud, WSDOT	Claudia Hirschey
Salima Hamlin, HNTB	Doug Hodson, King County
Don Samdahl, Fehr & Peers	Will Knedlik, ETA