

Eastside Transportation Partnership (ETP)
February 10, 2012
Meeting Summary

ETP Members

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Councilmember Kimberly Allen | Redmond (Chair) |
| Mayor Bernie Talmas | Woodinville (Vice-Chair) |
| Councilmember Andrew Rheaume | Bothell |
| Councilmember Josh Schaer | Issaquah |
| Councilmember Bob Hensel | Kenmore |
| Councilmember Allen Van Ness | Kenmore |
| Councilmember Jane Hague | King County |
| Councilmember Kathy Lambert | King County |
| Chris Arkills | King County Executive (Alternate) |
| Councilmember Amy Walen | Kirkland |
| Councilmember Dave Asher | Kirkland |
| Mayor Tom Odell | Sammamish |
| Councilmember Don Gerend | Sammamish (Alternate) |
| Councilmember Brahm | Mercer Island |
| Councilmember John Stilin | Redmond |
| Councilmember Susan Boundy-Sanders | Woodinville |
| Mayor George Martin | Clyde Hill (Small Cities) |
| Mayor David Cooper | Yarrow Point (Small Cities) |
| Councilmember Amy Ockerlander | Duvall (SVGA) |
| Brian Doennebrink | Community Transit |
| Dick Paylor | Eastside Transportation Association |
| Mike Cummings | PSRC (Alternate) |
| Peter Camp | Snohomish County |
| Deputy Council President Fred Butler | Sound Transit |
| Charles Prestrud | WSDOT (Alternate) |

Other Elected Officials

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| Councilmember Doug Dicharry | Medina (Small Cities) |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------|

I. Public Comment

No public comment.

II. Approval of January 13, 2012 Meeting Summary

The January 13, 2012 meeting summary was approved with no corrections.

III. Transportation's Role in our Economy (Port of Seattle Commissioner Bill Bryant)

Port of Seattle Commissioner Bill Bryant was unable to attend, and asked to present at a later meeting. Staff will work to reschedule Commissioner Bryant for a later date.

IV. Legislative Discussion among Members

Report from February 10 Joint Subarea Meeting

Chair Allen provided a report from the February 10 Joint Subarea meeting. Executive Constantine thank everyone for helping pass the \$20 congestion reduction charge last year that will fund Metro Transit service for two years, after which a new stable funding source is needed. Deputy Executive Jarrett explained that the Connecting Washington Task Force identified a ten-year statewide transportation need of \$60 billion throughout the state. To be politically viable, the Task Force recommended the State adopt a ten-year package worth \$20 billion for both roads and transit needs. King County Government Relations Manager, Genesee Adkins, said that currently the State House and Senate are considering alternates to the Governor's transportation funding proposal. The draft Senate bill includes a local option of a councilmanic vehicle license fee up to \$40; an MVET of up to 1% with a public vote; options to cities and counties for fuel tax increases; and increasing county road levies. The draft House bill includes the local options from the Governor's proposal: local option of a councilmanic vehicle license fee up to \$40, and a 1% MVET to counties, with a requirement to obtain agreement from 60 percent of the cities representing 75 percent of the population in King County. Harold Taniguchi, the King County Department of Transportation Director, explained that the short legislative session means that many decisions about this legislation will be made quickly in the next few weeks. The State revenue forecast is due February 16. He indicated that after that, the cities and county may need to reconvene to determine if there is agreement on local options, and if how to send a message to the legislature.

Chair Allen added that each Subarea discussed their legislative priorities for the 2012 session, identifying many similar concerns between all the subareas.

Discussion and Possible Recommendation of Revenue Option(s)

A handout was provided summarizing the major transportation revenue bills under discussion in the legislature.

Senate Bill 6582: Senate Transportation Revenue Bill

Status: February 7, approved in Senate Transportation Committee as a substitute bill. Sent to Senate Rules committee to schedule floor vote. For latest status, please see the Washington State Legislature's website.

Summary:

A transportation benefit district (TBD) is authorized to impose or expand a vehicle fee of up to \$40 with a majority vote of the district's governing board, or a motor vehicle excise tax (MVET) of up to one percent of the value of the vehicle with a vote of the people. A

TBD may impose a vehicle fee or a MVET, but may not impose both. Authority is also given to cities to impose a \$0.01 per gallon fuel tax.

House Bill 275: House Transportation Revenue Bill

Status: February 7, approved in House Transportation Committee as a substitute bill. Sent to House Rules committee to schedule floor vote. For latest status, please see the Washington State Legislature's website.

Summary: A TBD is authorized to impose up to impose or expand a vehicle fee up to \$40. A county is given authority to impose a 1% MVET that can be use for roads and transit projects. An MVET requires an interlocal agreement between jurisdictions, approved by the county and 60% of the cities; or approved by the county and cities that represent 75 percent of the population. Changes will also be made to how counties can receive local fuel taxes.

House Bill 2053: Transportation Fee Bill

Status: On February 9, by resolution, this bill was reintroduced and retained in present status. For latest status, please see the Washington State Legislature's website.

Summary: Introduced in the 2011 session and brought back for the 2012 session. Increases various driver and vehicle fees. Various appropriations are made to the Washington State Patrol, WSDOT, FMSIB, TIB, CRAB, and State Treasurer.

Chair Allen said that the Joint Subarea meeting was to gauge the cities' support for various funding options under consideration in the legislature and see if a unified position can be developed amongst King County cities and King County.

Dick Paylor expressed concern that it is still too early for any body to take position until the legislature's proposals are further fleshed out and more information on the impacts of their proposals are available. Councilmember Gerend said he is not prepared to support any option without his city's review first.

Councilmember Hague said that the current forms of the bills do consider councilmanic authority for VLF and MVET which is preferable. Mayor Odell added that he would like to see local revenue options included in whatever is passed in the Legislature.

In response to a question about current legislation, Ron Posthuma, Assistant Director for the King County Department of Transportation, clarified that no public vote would be required for the MVET to be approved in the current proposed form, but these bills have not yet been introduced in the opposite houses so they will likely be subject to amendments in the coming weeks.

V. Report and Proposal from Procedures Subcommittee

Councilmember Schaer said that the Rules Subcommittee's discussion arose from confusion about the procedure used to approve an ETP position against Initiative 1125 in 2011. Some members have asked to develop more clarity in what the parliamentary procedure will be for ETP meetings to avoid similar confusion in the future. The Rules Subcommittee shared a draft supplemental rules document that helps address issues identified when ETP approved I-1125. The notable new provisions include:

1. Abstentions shall not count as a voting member present, except if the number of abstentions is greater than the number of voting members present responding in the affirmative, then the motion shall not be approved. A representative is deemed to have abstained when he or she neither votes in the affirmative or negative.
2. At a particular meeting, no item subject to voting consideration shall be brought to a vote without being listed on the agenda; except where an item not previously listed on the agenda is proposed for voting consideration at a subsequent meeting, a two-thirds vote of voting members present shall be sufficient to override and become a matter subject to vote at that particular meeting.
3. Provide guidance that in the absence of a specified Rule, consultation with Robert's Rules of Order, and those rules relevant to small groups, may be necessary to assist with interpretation and application; however, they shall not be controlling.

Some of the concern the Rules Subcommittee expressed is that the existing rules are left open to interpretation. Specifically, when voting, a 'quorum' could be interpreted as being based on "majority present," or based on "majority of all voting members." Also, the Rules Subcommittee has considered if ETP may need a parliamentarian to help ensure the subarea follows the established parliamentary procedure.

Councilmember Van Ness added that the current interlocal agreement (ILA) is between all the cities and King County, and an amendment to the ILA would require all jurisdictions to agree to the ILA. However, the ILA does not lay out any parliamentary procedure relating to Robert's Rules.

Councilmember Schaer added that he believes Robert's Rules should be used as a guide for conducting meetings when necessary, but not as a requirement for operating the entire meeting. Not everyone around the table knows all the details about how to implement Robert's Rules. If Robert's Rules is used more strictly, a parliamentarian would be helpful to ensure proper implementation. However, Councilmember Schaer shared concern that strict adherence to Robert's Rules might bog down future meetings. Chris Arkills agreed that ETP has always been a collegial body with very few instances of voting problems, and says that Roberts Rule's would get in the way.

Councilmember Van Ness, in support of adopting a parliamentary procedure, said that he believes that members of ETP are courteous and respectful, but when there are questions such as how I-1125 was voted on, rules need to be in place to provide clear direction.

Chair Allen added that the Agreement does provide that a simple majority of members present have the ability to vote and represent the body. This intent is further clarified in the 2007 Procedures and is consistent with historical practice of ETP. *

** This was clarified after the meeting in a letter to the Rules Subcommittee*

Vice-Chair Sanders suggested that the quorum requirement should be reviewed when the new agreement for ETP is drafted later this year.

Chair Allen asked the for the Rules Subcommittee meet again to review the 2007 ETP Procedures and provide recommendations to modify the existing procedures that can be brought back before ETP. *

** This request was clarified after the meeting in a letter to the Rules Subcommittee*

Councilmember Gerend requested, and was appointed, to the Rule Subcommittee.

Councilmember Stilin suggested that there also be clarification on who can vote since the current ILA outlines various issues that different parties can and cannot vote on. Councilmember Van Ness suggested a distinction on the nametags designating voting rights.

VI. Review Draft 2012 Work Program and 2011 Annual Report

Chair Allen asked members to review the DRAFT 2012 ETP Work Program to provide comments. The following comments were made:

- Clarify ETP's different roles for selecting project's in the PSRC's Transportation 2040 Project Prioritization process and the Regional FHWA 2013-2014 funding process.
- Add item to 'Seek potential funding opportunities for maintenance and operations programs.'
- Revise item to say 'Monitor the impacts of SR 520 tolling on the transportation network with reports every two months, specifically the diversion of SR 520 traffic to SR 522, I-90, I-5, I-405, and the various interchanges.'
- Add item to 'Establish a list of ETP priority projects, including truck stops.'
- Weave ETP's concern to address congestion issues into the existing items in the work program.

Chair Allen also asked if members had any comments on the DRAFT 2011 ETP Annual Report. Hearing no comments on the Annual Report, the Chair requested approval the DRAFT 2012 ETP Work Program with suggested changes and the DRAFT 2011 ETP Annual Report.

ACTION: ETP approved the 2012 ETP Work Program with suggested changes and the 2011 ETP Annual Report.

Members also requested that a 'New Business' item be included on each new ETP agenda so that members can directly bring issues before the body.

Dick Paylor added that ETP used to pay to send members to Washington D.C. to advocate for various positions, and this could be something ETP could do in the future.

VII. Reports

Transportation Policy Board (TPB)

Mike Cummings, Program Manager for the PSRC, said the PSRC TPB recommended a policy framework to the Executive Board to select transportation projects to receive the PSRC's share of Federal Highways Association (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration funds. The Project selection process will align with meeting the regional priorities outlined in Transportation 2040, VISION 2040, and the Regional Economic Strategy. The estimated funding available for fiscal years 2013 and 2014 is \$441.9 million and projects receiving these funds will be selected later this year. The board recommended continuing with the recommended policies and procedures along with an additional funding set-aside exclusively for preservation and maintenance projects or programs. The draft 2012 Policy Framework was presented to the Executive Board at its February 23 meeting and adopted.

In follow up to questions about ETP's role in this process, the PSRC has capped the number of applications for FHWA funds to be submitted for Regional Surface Transportation Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) competition to 36 proposals. The distribution of the 36 applications slots are: 6 each from Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish countywide groups; 12 from the King countywide group; and 2 each from WSDOT, Sound Transit, and the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency.

The King County Project Evaluation Committee's (KCPEC) responsibility is to develop a recommendation to the King County Members of the Transportation Policy Board of which 12 projects should be submitted for consideration to the Regional Competition from the King County area. Due to the limited application slots available to the King County area, the KCPEC has limited the number of proposals to 20 candidate projects that can compete to be one of the 12 projects from the King County area. These 20 candidate projects have been distributed as follows: ETP (5), SCATBd (5), SeaShore (5 (Seattle 3 and the rest of SeaShore 2), King County (4) and Port of Seattle (1).

The process that the KCPEC uses for developing the recommendation for the 12 application slots will be based on the project recommendations from the Subarea Boards (ETP, SCATBd, and SeaShore) within King County and the King County members of the PSRC's Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC). The Subarea Boards are responsible for selecting the five projects from their area.

Once the Subarea Boards and specified agencies (Seattle, Port of Seattle, and King County) have selected their projects and the agencies have submitted their proposals to the KCPEC, the King County members of the RPEC will score and rank the projects using the PSRC Regional Competition criteria. This ranking will be reviewed by the KCPEC which will develop and

forward a recommendation to the King County Members of the PSRC Transportation Policy Board for review and approval.

As a separate process at the PSRC, Mr. Cummings clarified that the PSRC is undertaking a Transportation 2040 Project Prioritization process includes a commitment to better prioritize transportation projects in the future. Work is underway to develop the ways projects in the plan will be prioritized to best meet the objectives of the region's growth strategy – VISION 2040. The work is guided by the Transportation Policy Board, which has created a special working group representative of diverse regional interests. The Transportation Policy Board is also actively reaching out to PSRC's boards and committees for input.

Councilmember Lambert indicated that she recently attended a T2040 Project Prioritization meeting, and the methodology for scoring projects was not ready.

ETP Budget

Wes Edwards, Transportation Planner with King County Department of Transportation, provided a report on the available funding in ETP's budget. At the end of 2011, ETP had \$27,242 remaining in its account after paying annual expenses of \$1,254. ETP is also expected to collect approximately \$2,650 in dues from member cities in 2012. Chair Allen suggested that ETP members should find ways to utilize funding from ETP's budget.

Chair Allen closed the meeting.

Other Attendees:

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Monica Whitman, SCA | Terry Marpert, Redmond |
| Ed Conyers, WSDOT | Wes Edwards, KCDOT |
| Paul Carlson, MKCC | Jack Whisner, KC Metro |
| Denise Cieri, WSDOT | Ron Posthuma, KCDOT |
| Dave Godfrey, Kirkland | Don Samdahl, Fehr & Peers |