SCA Public Issues Committee
AGENDA
May 8, 2013 – 7:00 PM
Renton City Hall
Council Chambers, 7th Floor
1055 S. Grady Way - Renton, WA 98057

6:00 PM Workshop `Sponsored by the Small Cities Caucus of SCA ` All are welcome!
Managing Conflict...
And Moving On!
Featuring Jurassic Parliament’s Ann Macfarlane

1. Welcome and Roll Call – Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac - Chair

2. Public Comment – Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac

3. Approval of minutes – April 10, 2013 meeting
   Page 4

4. Chair’s Report – Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac
   5 minutes

5. Executive Director’s Report – Deanna Dawson, SCA
   10 minutes

6. King County Metro Long Range Planning
   ACTION ITEM
   Monica Whitman, SCA
   Page 18
   (3 minute update, 7 minute discussion)

7. Comprehensive Approach to Regional Tolling Implementation
   ACTION ITEM
   Monica Whitman, SCA
   Page 22
   (3 minute update, 12 minute discussion)
8. **Growing Transit Communities**
   DISCUSSION ITEM 15 minutes
   Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park
   Page 28
   (5 minute update, 10 minute discussion)

9. **PSRC Transportation 2040 – Pavement Condition Index (PCI)**
   DISCUSSION ITEM 10 minutes
   Monica Whitman, SCA
   Page 38
   (3 minute update, 7 minute discussion)

10. **Informational Items**
    a) **WA State House Environment Committee – Interim Stakeholder Group**
        Page 40
    b) **Mental Health and Drug Dependency (MIDD) Annual Report 2013**
        Page 45

11. **Upcoming Events**
    a) Next SCA Networking Dinner - Wednesday, May 29, 2013 5:30 PM - Tukwila Embassy Suites – SCA will be joined by King County Sheriff Urquhart
    b) Next SCA Public Issues Committee meeting – Wednesday, June 12, 2013 7:00 PM - Renton City Hall
    c) Future SCA Networking Dinners:
        • Wednesday, September 25, 2013 5:30 PM – TPC Snoqualmie Ridge Golf Club – SCA will be joined by Attorney General Bob Ferguson
        • Wednesday, November 20, 2013 5:30 PM – Location TBD – SCA will be joined by Governor Jay Inslee

12. **For the Good of the Order**

13. **Adjourn**

---

**Did You Know?**

Beginning January 1, 2014, 180,000 uninsured King County residents will gain access to affordable health coverage through the expansion of the Medicaid program and Washington Healthplanfinder, our state’s Health Benefit Exchange. Learn more about health reform in King County at [http://kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/partnerships/HealthReform.aspx](http://kingcounty.gov/healthservices/health/partnerships/HealthReform.aspx).
Sound Cities Association

Mission
To provide leadership through advocacy, education, mutual support and networking to cities in King County as they act locally and partner regionally to create livable vital communities.

Vision
To be the most influential advocate for cities, effectively collaborating to create regional solutions.

Values
SCA aspires to create an environment that fosters mutual support, respect, trust, fairness and integrity for the greater good of the association and its membership.

SCA operates in a consistent, inclusive, and transparent manner that respects the diversity of our members and encourages open discussion and risk-taking.
1. **Welcome and Roll Call**
Mia Gregerson, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Twenty-seven cities had representation. See Attachment A to these minutes. Guests present included: Mary Bourguignon, King County Council; Michelle Allison, King County Councilmember Joe McDermott’s office; Kevin Brown, King County Parks Division.

2. **Approval of the March 6, 2013 Minutes**
Dave Hill, Algona, moved, seconded by Ross Loudenback, North Bend, to approve the March 6, 2013 meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

3. **Chair’s Report**
Chair Gregerson reported that the Sound Transit Citizens Oversight Panel is currently looking for applicants that live and/or work in South King County to serve on the panel. The Citizen’s Oversight Panel meets from 8:30am-11:00am on the First and Third Thursday of each month at Union Station in Seattle. For more information, contact King County Councilmember Julia Patterson’s office, or visit [http://www.soundtransit.org/About-Sound-Transit/Accountability/Citizen-Oversight-Panel-(COP)](http://www.soundtransit.org/About-Sound-Transit/Accountability/Citizen-Oversight-Panel-(COP)).

4. **Executive Director’s Report**
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, thanked SCA Administrative Services Manager Kristy Burwell for attending the PIC meeting to provide staff support.

ED Dawson introduced SCA Intern Jennifer Hooper, a student from The Evergreen State College, studying urban planning. Jennifer will be researching ways to engage citizens in local government. Recently, two cities gave presentations on successful civic engagement programs during the RISE (Recognize, Inspire, Share, Engage) Presentations at the SCA Networking Dinners. For example, in recent months, Shoreline shared its Piano Time project and Snoqualmie gave a presentation on its Citizens Academy. Jennifer will be working with cities to help understand the benefits of different local projects that have been implemented, as well as researching nationwide programs to compile a best-practices manual and presentation.
ED Dawson announced that Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, is the newest member on the SCA Board of Directors representing the North Caucus. The PIC Members congratulated Mayor Baker on his election to the Board.

ED Dawson reported that the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) authorized the approval of the Medic One/Emergency Medical Services 2014-2019 Strategic Plan, including the financing package for the 2014-2019 levy funding period, earlier in the day.

ED Dawson reported that many SCA members participated in Olympia on April 3, 2013 to “Keep King County Moving” by stressing the importance of local transportation funding options to State Senators and Representatives. ED Dawson invited members to go to Olympia on April 19, 2013 to once again encourage their legislators to support local funding options for transportation. Contact Deanna, deanna@soundcities.org, if you or another representative from your city is interested in attending phase 2 of “Keep King County Moving.”

ED Dawson reported that ten members have expressed interest in participating on the SCA Economic Development Subcommittee. The first meeting will be held in the next week or so. Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, will chair this subcommittee and Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, will provide staff support.

Small cities members have expressed interest in having Registered Parliamentarian Ann Macfarlane from Jurassic Parliament conduct a workshop. ED Dawson announced that there will be a Pre-PIC Workshop on May 8, 2013 at 6:00 p.m. This workshop will be video taped and available on the SCA website for members only.

At the SCA Leadership meeting with King County Executive Dow Constantine, the Executive invited SCA members to attend the GoGreen Seattle Conference on April 24, 2013. SCA Member Joan McBride, Mayor of Kirkland, is one of the featured speakers at this event. ED Dawson passed around a flyer detailing the event.

ED Dawson extended birthday wishes to Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline, and Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall.

5. **PIC Nominating Committee Recommendations**

Jim Haggerton, 2013 PIC Nominating Committee Chair, reported that the PIC Nominating Committee met on April 8, 2013 to review, discuss, and recommend candidates for the open vacancies on multiple critical committees. Chair Haggerton provided a review of the appointing process: the PIC Nominating Committee makes a recommendation to the PIC, who in turn makes a recommendation to the SCA Board of Directors. Background information on the vacancies on the Regional Transit Committee (RTC), Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Growth Management Planning Board (GMPB), Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC), and King Conservation District (KCD) Task Force and Conservation Panel as provided in the PIC packet. Chair Haggerton reported that the PIC Nominating Committee tried to give current alternates on these committees the advantage of moving into member seats. He noted that alternates are expected to attend all meetings and may need to step into a voting
role at a moment’s notice if a voting member is unable to attend. Haggerton also noted that
the PIC Nominating Committee takes into consideration city size and geographic balance
when recommending nominees.

Jim Haggerton, Tukwila, moved, seconded by Hank Margeson, Redmond, to recommend to
the SCA Board of Directors the following:

That Councilmember Tom Vance, Sammamish, move from alternate to member, and to
appoint Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, as an alternate on the Regional Transit
Committee.

That Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, move from alternate to member, and to appoint
Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, as an alternate on the PSRC Growth Management
Planning Board.

That Mayor Tom Odell, Sammamish, move from alternate to member, and to appoint
Councilmember Penny Sweet, Kirkland, as an alternate on the Growth Management Planning
Council.

That Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline; Mayor Jim Berger, Carnation; and Councilmember
Kate Kruller, Tukwila, be appointed to the King Conservation District Conservation Panel.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Haggerton reported that the PIC Nominating Committee is directly recommending to
the SCA Board of Directors that Scott MacColl, Shoreline; Nicole Sanders, Snoqualmie; and
Carolyn Robertson, Auburn, be appointed to the King Conservation District Task Force.

ED Dawson added that the KCD specified three regional areas for the Task Force and
Conservation Panel members: North, East, and South. This is different from the SCA
Caucuses and the committee gave careful consideration to the different areas. In 2012, the
PIC King Conservation District Funding Subcommittee was formed to review and provide
recommendations to the PIC on KCD funding. Deputy Mayor Eggen served on that
subcommittee and the PIC Nominating Committee recommended having continuity from the
subcommittee to the panel.

Chair Haggerton thanked the members of the PIC Nominating Committee for their hard work
and time that goes into the review, discussion, consideration, and recommendations of
appointments.

6. Solid Waste Transfer Station
ED Dawson explained that this item is being brought forward from the March 6, 2013 PIC
meeting at the members’ request.

Hank Margeson, Redmond, made a motion, seconded by Layne Barnes, Maple Valley, to
recommend the following policy position to the SCA Board of Directors:
The Sound Cities Association requests that the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) and the King County Solid Waste Division review and recommend any appropriate updates to the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

7. Regional Tolling Impacts

Monica Whitman, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that this item is being brought forward from the March 6, 2013 PIC meeting at the members’ request. Whitman added that staff has been doing additional research over the last month.

David Baker, Kenmore, moved, seconded by Mary Jane Goss, Lake Forest Park, to recommend the following policy position to the SCA Board of Directors:

The Sound Cities Association supports mitigation from the State of Washington to address impacts from the current regional tolling of SR 520, as well as the potential regional tolling of I-90 and other future regional tolling.

Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, stated that the Duvall City Council had a robust discussion on this item and that it is strongly against this position.

Tola Marts, Issaquah, also stated that the Issaquah City Council had a robust discussion on this issue. This policy position could potentially create a revenue stream that would complicate the structure of tolling. It would be better to look at the system as a whole when applying the funding dollars. The City of Issaquah is unable to support this position.

Jim Berger, Carnation, commented that the Carnation City Council cannot support this position.

David Baker, Kenmore, noted that in addition to this policy position, a number of cities have expressed interest in looking at the broader issue of regional tolling. Baker stated that there has been a lot of discussion since the north end Mayor’s (Bothell, Kenmore, Kirkland, Lake Forest Park, Woodinville) sent a joint letter to governor outlining their concerns, the next step should be to talk with PSRC to engage in a comprehensive study of tolling in the region, since piecemeal tolling could cause unintended consequences. He noted that the Lake Washington Mayors will be talking more about this on April 11, 2013.

Discussion on the motion continued with Hank Margeson, Redmond, inquiring how this policy position will be put to use. Margeson wants to support the neighboring cities to the north, but posed the question, where do the impacts of tolling end?

Dave Hill, Algona, said that he would rather look at tolling in a comprehensive fashion and not on a piecemeal basis. He also expressed support for a statement to the effect that the State is responsible for mitigation to cities adversely affected by tolling.
Tom Odell, Sammamish, commented that his council has not had a chance to discuss this issue. He personally thinks that this position needs to be broader.

Marlla Mhoon, Covington, questioned how far this policy position on mitigation could extend.

Jim Haggerton, Tukwila, stated that we are trying to send a message to the State. The roads are already deteriorating and cities need to protect themselves.

Mary Jane Goss, Lake Forest Park, added that Lake Forest Park is affected by tolling and that it’ll be very difficult to deal with the impact. Goss asked for help from SCA members.

Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, stated that there are two separate issues when one looks at tolling from a regional perspective. The State should mitigate the effects on cities. Talmas would like a broad position in addition to the position on mitigation for affected jurisdictions.

Dan Grausz, Mercer Island, supports the motion. Mercer Island is in the center of the potential tolling impacts and is concerned of the consequences. By taking a position that cities need mitigation, it sends a message to the State. Tolling does have consequences which highlight the need for a regional study. SCA members need to unify and send a message to the State to look at consequences.

The motion passed. Carnation, Duvall, Issaquah, and Sammamish voted no.

Whitman added that PSRC Transportation 2040 (T2040) Plan appendix B highlights many significant highways and eventually all highways will have tolls implemented. Whitman distributed draft language to address the need for more comprehensive regional tolling implementation:

The Sound Cities Association supports a more comprehensive approach to regional tolling implementation, through the development of a comprehensive study that would include all tolling projects within SMART Corridors (as identified by the Puget Sound Regional Council Transportation 2040 – Appendix B: Projects and Programs by SMART Corridor). The purpose of the study is to identify potential traffic diversions resulting from tolling; as well as, develop a full list of alternative revenue options for consideration.

ED Dawson inquired if the body would like to bring this back to the May 8, 2013 meeting of the PIC for further discussion and potentially vote at the June 12, 2013 meeting of the PIC. PSRC has had a regional study planned for the future; members expressed support for moving ahead with a comprehensive study on regional tolling. Monica Whitman will be consulting with member cities regarding policy language between now and the May 8, 2013 Public Issues Committee.

Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, asked for feedback if the last phrase should be included. Tom Odell, Sammamish, commented that there is a need to look beyond regional tolling and that it should be included, at least for now.
Andy Rheaume, Bothell, expressed concern for residents who will have to drive through multiple tolls to get to work.

Dave Hill, Algona, asked staff how Map 21, federal funding, would integrate with the draft language. Whitman said that she can research how that might tie into the position.

Chris Eggen, Shoreline, stated that tolling is unpopular; nevertheless, project costs are increasing and the federal government is not going to fund them. Eggen suggests developing general principles to address revenue for road repair and expansion.

ED Dawson asked that members of the PSRC Transportation Policy Board (TPB) help draft the guiding principles.

Pete Lewis, Auburn, shared concerns about including the SMART corridor or Map 21 into the position. It may lock future routes into limits that cities don’t want.

Don Gerend, Sammamish, stated that T2040 anticipates regional tolling. There will be further discussion from 12pm-2pm on April 11, 2013 at PSRC. Alternatives to regional tolling could include vehicle miles traveled or increasing the gas tax.

Tom Odell, Sammamish, noted that Map 21 is only a two-year program.

Tola Marts, Issaquah, is supportive of including alternative revenue options. He noted his concern that Washington State already has one of the most regressive taxing structures.

**Note:** Based on feedback on the draft language distributed at the meeting, SCA staff distributed the following statement to members on April 11, 2013 via email for comment and review before the May 8, 2013 meeting of the PIC:

*The Sound Cities Association supports a more comprehensive approach to regional tolling implementation, through the development of a study by the Puget Sound Regional Council that would include all tolling projects in Transportation 2040. The purpose of the study is to identify potential traffic diversions resulting from tolling; as well as, develop a full list of alternative revenue options for consideration.*

8. **King County Metro Long Range Planning**

Monica Whitman, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that this item is being brought forward from the March 6, 2013 PIC meeting at the members request.

Hank Margeson, Redmond, moved, seconded by Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, to recommend the following policy position to the SCA Board of Directors:

*The Sound Cities Association supports the development of a King County Metro Long Range Plan, based on local comprehensive plans.*
Chris Eggen, Shoreline, stated that the Shoreline City Council had a robust discussion on this item. Metro is a regional system and it cannot base a long range plan on individual cities. Eggen proposed an amendment to insert the word *partially* between the words “based” and “on” in the last line. David Baker seconded the amendment.

Jim Haggerton, Tukwila, suggested that the words *that includes* be used instead of “based on” as a friendly amendment.

David Baker, Kenmore, inquired on the plan that was worked on in 2011 and passed in 2012. Lewis stated that the emergency plan was passed in 2012. Whitman clarified that the Metro Strategic Plan replaced the six-year plan.

Hank Margeson, Redmond, stated that cities are doing their part and that Metro needs to partner with cities and include service to communities in their long range plan.

Dave Hill, Algona, stated that there is a need for the planning at the city level to be integrated at the regional level. The position needs to hold Metro accountable for including service in the plan for development.

Pete Lewis, Auburn, stated that the Metro Long Range Plan needs to include local comprehensive plans.

The amendment failed. Federal Way, Shoreline, and Tukwila voted yes. North Bend abstained. The remaining cities voted against the amendment.

The main motion passed. Shoreline voted no.

9. **King County Parks Levy**

ED Dawson reported that King County Executive Constantine has proposed that a King County Parks Levy go to voters on the August 6, 2013 primary ballot. She highlighted a number of elements of the proposed levy of particular interest to cities. 7% of the levy is proposed to go to cities as pass through. Unlike the past levy, the proposed language in the new levy would allow these dollars to be used for “major maintenance” as well as capital projects, additional flexibility which is welcomed by cities. Another positive element of the proposed levy for cities is that Community Partnership & Grants Program (CPG) could be used not just for projects in county parks, but also for city parks. Dawson noted that county staff was present to answer any questions that members might have about the levy.

David Baker, Kenmore, is supportive of the levy since the cities of Lake Forest Park and Kenmore have a park that spans both cities. However, Baker also expressed concerns about parks maintenance, and that he was hesitant to express support for the levy unless these issues are resolved. Mary Jane Goss, Lake Forest Park, supports Kenmore’s comments.

Dini Duclos, Federal Way, is concerned about the impact on lower income residents.
Layne Barnes, Maple Valley, stated that the Maple Valley City Council has been talking about Junior Taxing Districts and how this will affect different taxing districts.

Jim Berger, Carnation, is in support of the levy. Berger is concerned about what would happen to the Tolt MacDonald Park if it wasn’t funded since it’s so highly used. Berger stated that King County does a good job maintaining that park and is responsive to city requests. However, Berger expressed concerns that the county packaged the maintenance & enhancements in same levy.

Rich Zwicker, Renton, noted that he did not see value for SCA to simply take a position of support for a levy as concerns were raised, but perhaps there could be value in SCA making recommendations for changes to the levy, if there were changes that the body as a whole could support.

Ross Loudenback, North Bend, attended the Pre-PIC presentation on March 6, 2013. Loudenback is concerned about 42% increase and combining the existing maintenance and enhancement pieces together. He reminded members that it was not a pleasant experience the last time the parks were not maintained. Loudenback supports not taking a position.

Melissa Musser, Des Moines, expressed concerns about the number of different levy items that would be coming before the voters in this year and coming years, and the impact on citizens.

Hank Margeson, Redmond, appreciates members concerns. A 42% increase is a large amount on top of the other levies needing funding: Juvenile Justice Center, Emergency Medical Services (EMS), Veterans and Human Services. He also noted that Redmond would like to annex Marymoor Park and the portion of the Burke Gilman trail that is in Redmond. The City of Redmond would willingly own and operate these two parks. Margeson recommends charging the RPC with bringing forward concerns expressed by cities.

Tom Odell, Sammamish, is concerned with the total amount of the increase. The operation of the maintenance piece is not the problem.

David Baker, Kenmore, agreed that asking RPC members to express the concerns raised by members would be appropriate.

Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, noted that in contrast to what he heard from other members (who felt their cities might support the funding for O & M, but not new acquisition), he felt that his council might be supportive of additional funding for acquisition, but not support the amount of funding in the levy for O & M.

Pete Lewis, Auburn, expressed concern that if SCA took no position, it might be seen as tacit approval of the levy by cities. He expressed support for some action that would bring cities’ concerns to the county’s attention.
Dan Grausz, Mercer Island, stated that Mercer Island does not have any county parks. Generally, the council supports parks inside and outside of the city. Mercer Island was fortunate to annex Luther Burbank Park. Grausz is against a split levy as it will almost guarantee that one will fail.

Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, commented that this issue would probably be a very contentious issue in her council’s discussion. Ockerlander respectfully disagreed that if a position is not taken, it would indicate to the county that cities supported the levy. Chris Eggen, Shoreline, concurred with Ockerlander, and disagreed with the notion that not taking a position would be seen as a sign of support.

Chair Gregerson asked if anyone had a motion. Pete Lewis, Auburn, moved to bring back discussion a position for possible adoption next month of support for a parks levy for maintenance of existing facilities, with the caveat that the county should address the concerns raised by cities.

Hank Margeson, Redmond, posed a friendly amendment, to include adding PCI index to existing levy rate. Lewis agreed with Margeson’s friendly amendment. Chris Eggen, Shoreline, seconded the amended motion.

Tola Marts, Issaquah, stated that he will support the motion to take back to his council for discussion.

Jamie Perry, Kent, stated that she is concerned that the body is only bringing forward for discussion a position of support for a levy that provides for maintenance of existing facilities, rather than considering support for the levy as proposed (including acquisition).

Baker clarified that the position would be one of support for the County Council placing the levy on the ballot, not a position of support for the levy itself. Staff and PIC membership concurred.

The motion as amended passed unanimously.

Tom Odell, Sammamish, moved, seconded by Mary Jane Goss, that SCA also bring back for consideration a position of support for the county council placing the “strategic enhancement” portion of the proposed parks levy on the ballot.

The motion passed. Algona, Duvall, Federal Way, North Bend, and Redmond voted no.

Note: Following the 4/10/2013 PIC meeting, SCA staff learned that the County Council’s action with regards to the parks levy would take place before the next PIC meeting, thus rendering the proposed SCA positions moot. Therefore, following discussions with PIC Chair Gregerson and SCA Board President Law, ED Dawson distributed the following email to PIC Members on April 12, 2013:

“Dear PIC Members-
Thanks for a very robust discussion on the Parks Levy Wednesday.

After the meeting, I spoke with Christie True, Director of Department of Natural Resources and Parks (DNRP) and shared with her some of the concerns raised by members. She appreciated hearing the feedback, and offered to have Parks staff come and speak to any of your councils as they discuss the levy. I followed up with Division Director Kevin Brown today, and he reiterated the offer. He also indicated that staff will look forward to following up with you on concerns he heard at the meeting.

During these discussions, it has become clear that given the timing for the August ballot, the County Council will be taking action to place a levy on the ballot in advance of the next PIC meeting. This would render the proposed action (which as you will recall, was to give direction to the County Council about putting a levy on the ballot) moot.

In order to make sure that SCA concerns are heard in advance of the Council acting, Chair Gregerson and I brainstormed and conferred with SCA Board Chair Denis Law. We agreed that having SCA make direct contact with County Councilmembers would be the most effective way to communicate SCA member concerns, absent a formal position from SCA.

We came up with a proposed list of PIC members to make contact with each County Councilmember, so that each Councilmember would hear from an SCA city within their district, where possible. (Some of the County Council districts do not contain SCA cities.) Chair Gregerson will contact Council Chair Larry Gossett. Here are the other “assignments”:

- District 1 Rod Dembowski: Mayor David Baker, Kenmore
- District 3 Kathy Lambert: Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville
- District 4 Larry Phillips: Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline
- District 5 Julia Patterson: Councilmember Jamie Perry, Kent
- District 6 Jane Hague: Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond
- District 7 Pete Von Reichbauer: Mayor Pete Lewis, Auburn
- District 8 Joe McDermott: Mayor Jim Haggerton, Tukwila
- District 9 Reagan Dunn: Councilmember Rich Zwicker, Renton

Others are of course free to make contact with Councilmembers and staff as well, but we wanted to make sure that each County Councilmember heard directly from at least one SCA member. You can also give the folks on this list additional feedback that they can in turn share with the Councilmembers.

The concerns we heard at the meeting on Wednesday included:
• Cities are concerned with the County making a big ask of the voters, given that many of our city residents are struggling financially, and that there are a number of other ballot measures headed or potentially headed (like transportation funding) to the voters. The county needs to prioritize needs, and do so in consultation with cities;
• Some cities expressed frustrations with how the Division interacted with cities with regards to County parks within or adjacent to cities, and wanted to work to improve that relationship;
• Cities would like to have more involvement in the future in developing what does or does not go into the Parks Levy earlier in the process.

On the positive side:

• The new levy includes pass through dollars for cities. Those funds are heavily relied upon by cities. The fact that those dollars can be used more flexibly in the current proposed levy (can be used not just for capital projects, but also for major maintenance) is a plus in the current levy;
• Cities also support the proposal to allow Community Partnership Grant (CPG) funds to be used for city parks, not just County parks. The County should also take action to amend the CPG guidelines to allow for this use of the funds, should the levy pass.

Your cities will still of course be free to take positions regarding the levy individually. And Parks staff have asked me to pass along the offer to provide any materials that you would find helpful, or to provide staff to come speak to your cities and answer questions.

Thanks for your feedback on the Parks Levy, and your active involvement in PIC. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me, or Chair Gregerson.

Best,
Deanna

Deanna Dawson
Executive Director, SCA
(206) 433-7170 (direct)
(206) 310-0599 (cell)"

10. PSRC Transportation 2040 Update
Monica Whitman, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that the Transportation Policy Board and the PSRC Executive Board were both briefed on PSRC’s Transportation 2040 update in April. Following these briefings, the Boards sought feedback from member cities via email. Two specific issues were raised, both related to “the State of Good Repair” section of the plan. Specific concerns included: the title “State of Good Repair,” as well as, a target Pavement Condition Index (PCI) score of 70.

City staff has indicated that the term “State of Good Repair” is potentially misleading when our regions roads are deteriorating. “State of Good Repair” is intended to address the maintenance and preservation of the existing transportation system.
Whitman noted that PCI is very technical. PCI is used to indicate the condition of pavement ranging from 0 - 100. Cities, particularly Valley Cities, are concerned that a target PCI index of 70 is too low. There is considerable risk involved; waiting until things get worse before financing road work that is already in desperate need of repair.

Layne Barnes, Maple Valley, stated that a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) of 70 is too low. Pete Lewis, Auburn, commented that the “state of good repair” is a red flag. Dave Hill, Algona, stated that the PCI of West Valley Highway is 14, just above gravel.

Whitman requested that members take this information back to their City public works staff for additional feedback. This item will be brought back next month for further discussion.

11. Industrial Lands Supply (GMPB)

Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, gave an overview of a work plan item of PSRC updating the 1998 Industrial Lands Supply and Demand Analysis in accordance with Vision 2040. The Analysis started in April and will be finished in the summer of 2014. SCA’s Growth Management Policy Board members asked that this item be brought to the PIC for feedback on what additional items should be included in the Analysis. There was a list of key questions to be addressed by PSRC in the attachment to the staff report, http://www.psrc.org/assets/9468/IndustrialLandsAnalysisHandout.pdf.

1. What is the contribution of industrial land to the regional economy?
2. How much of the region’s industrial employment is on industrial land?
3. What is the distribution of industrial land in the region? Where are the major concentrations?
4. How has the quantity, distribution, and development level of industrial land in the region changed since 1998?
5. What factors influence the development of industrial land?
6. Does the region have an adequate supply of industrial land to meet industry demand?
7. How are jurisdictions in the region planning for their industrial land (MICs, other designated industrial land, and nonindustrial land with industrial uses)?
8. What actions, investments, or strategies do stakeholders think are needed to ensure an adequate supply of industrial land?

Booth asked members if there is anything else that should be included in the industrial lands analysis, and if the proposed stakeholder list is inclusive of all stakeholders. Booth stated that GMPB members already requested the report consider the accuracy of past forecasts and asked that the new report to look at trends since 1998.

Pete Lewis, Auburn, requested that an infrastructure requirement be included. Mayor Lewis also added that there needs to be a strong emphasis on completing the Port of Seattle and Port of Tacoma projects. If we don’t upgrade our ports, our region will start losing market share. He gave examples of other regions that are funding port improvements in order to be competitive when the Panama Canal expansion occurs; funding that is not occurring in our region.
Jamie Perry, Kent, would like the impact of Streamlined Sales Tax considered in the analysis. Cities cannot support industrial land now due to the implementation of Streamlined Sales Tax. What are the incentives that are needed by cities to maintain the industrial land we already have? Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, added that since manufacturing no longer brings in sales tax for the city, transportation and infrastructure requirements should be included in the analysis. Some industrial lands currently have no transit service.

12. **Informational Items**
Chair Gregerson asked member to review the informational items on Emergency Management Performance Grants and the King County Metro Funding Shortfall and share with their councils and staffs.

13. **Upcoming Events**
   a) Next SCA Public Issues Committee Meeting – May 8, 2013, 7:00 p.m. at Renton City Hall
   b) Pre-PIC Workshop featuring Ann Macfarlane of Jurassic Parliament– May 8, 2013, 6:00 p.m. at Renton City Hall
   c) SCA Networking Dinner – May 29, 2013, 5:30 p.m. at the Embassy Suites, Tukwila

14. **For the Good of the Order**
Chair Gregerson reminded members to let ED Dawson know if they plan to go to Olympia on April 19, 2013 for Phase 2 of “Keeping King County Moving”.

Chair Gregerson reviewed the “Did you know” section of the PIC agenda:
“You can now access your meeting agendas/packets on the Sound Cities website? Go to [www.soundcities.org](http://www.soundcities.org) and click on “Mark Your Calendar”. Go to “Upcoming Meetings-Events” and find your meeting. Click on the meeting and look for the link to the agenda. This is an easy way to access your packet in meetings and save paper.”

She reminded members to let SCA staff know if they will access the PIC packet electronically and do not need a paper packet at the meetings.

15. **Adjourn**
The meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.
## 2013 Roll Call – Public Issues Committee Meeting
### April 10, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Dave Hill</td>
<td>Lynda Osborn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Pete Lewis</td>
<td>Nancy Backus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bill Peloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts</td>
<td>Richard Leider</td>
<td>Tom Stowe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>Rebecca Olness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>Andy Rheauemet</td>
<td>Tom Agnew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>Jerry Robison</td>
<td>Bob Edgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>Jim Berger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>Barre Seibert</td>
<td>George Martin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Marlla Mhoon</td>
<td>Margaret Harto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Matt Pina</td>
<td>Melissa Musser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>Amy Ockerlander</td>
<td>Will Ibershof</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>Liz Reynolds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>Jeanne Burbidge</td>
<td>Dini Duclos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>Fred McConkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Tola Marts</td>
<td>Paul Winterstein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Jamie Perry</td>
<td>Dennis Higgins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td>Amy Walen</td>
<td>Penny Sweet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Sandy Koppenol</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
<td>Mary Jane Goss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Layne Barnes</td>
<td>Erin Weaver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Tana Senn</td>
<td>Bruce Bassett</td>
<td>Dan Grausz</td>
<td>Noel Treat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Jim Manley</td>
<td>Debra Perry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Lisa Jensen</td>
<td>Rich Crisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Shawn McEvoy</td>
<td>Susan West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Ross Loudenback</td>
<td>Ken Hearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Leanne Guier</td>
<td>John Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Hank Margeson</td>
<td>John Stilin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Rich Zwicker</td>
<td>Ed Prince</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Tom Odell</td>
<td>Ramiro Valderrama</td>
<td>Don Gerend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Mia Gregerson</td>
<td>Tony Anderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Chris Eggen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
<td>Kingston Wall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Jim Haggerton</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>Bernie Talmas</td>
<td>Susan Boundy-Sanders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deanna Dawson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Electeds present are highlighted in gray. Cities represented are **bolded**.
Item 6:
King County Metro – Long Range Planning
Action Item

SCA Staff Contact
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, office 206-433-7170, deanna@soundcities.org.

SCA Regional Transit Committee Members:
Redmond Councilmember Kim Allen (SCA RTC Caucus Chair); Kent Councilmember Dennis Higgins (SCA RTC Caucus Vice Chair / alternate); Burien Councilmember Joan McGilton; Issaquah Councilmember Fred Butler; Shoreline Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen; Renton Councilmember Marcie Palmer; Federal Way Councilmember Jeanne Burbidge; Algona Mayor Dave Hill; Auburn Councilmember Wayne Osborne (alternate); Sammamish Councilmember Tom Vance (alternate); Lake Forest Park Councilmember John Wright (alternate).

SCA Board Members:
Renton Mayor Denis Law, Board President; Sammamish Councilmember Don Gerend, Treasurer; Kent Councilmember Jamie Perry, Director-at-Large; North Bend Mayor Ken Hearing, Past President; Federal Way Councilmember Dini Duclos, Shoreline Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen; SeaTac Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson; Algona Mayor Dave Hill; Maple Valley City Manager David Johnston; Snoqualmie Mayor Matt Larson; Auburn Mayor Pete Lewis; Redmond Mayor John Marchione.

Recommended Action:
At the April 10, 2013 meeting of the Public Issues Committee (PIC), the PIC took action on the following position: To recommend to the SCA Board of Directors that: The Sound Cities Association supports the development of a King County Metro Long Range Plan, based on local comprehensive plans.

At the April 17, 2013 meeting of the SCA Board, a number of board members noted that their councils had expressed concerns with the language in the proposed position. The board discussed, and rather than adopting a revised position without input from the PIC, the Board elected to send back to the PIC for further discussion and consideration. Based on feedback from the Board and the discussion at last month’s PIC, the following amendment has been drafted for the PIC’s consideration:

To recommend to the SCA Board of Directors:
The Sound Cities Association supports the development of a King County Metro Long Range Plan based on that includes the involvement of jurisdictions and integrates local comprehensive plans.
Background
On April 30, 2013, King County Executive Constantine transmitted an update to the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and the King County Metro Service Guidelines. The update includes policy language in support of a long range plan for Metro. The Regional Transit Committee has 120 days to complete their review and recommend action.

The service guidelines set priorities for adding or reducing service. As part of a long range plan scoping/implementation, it is critical that Metro continue to consult with local jurisdictions and integrate local comprehensive planning efforts.

Attachments:

April 10, 2013 PIC Long Range Planning Memo
Item 8:
King County Metro – Long Range Planning

Potential Action Item

SCA Staff Contact
Monica Whitman, Senior Policy Analyst, office 206-433-7169, monica@soundcities.org.

SCA Regional Transit Committee Members:
Redmond Councilmember Kim Allen (SCA RTC Caucus Chair); Kent Councilmember Dennis Higgins (SCA RTC Caucus Vice Chair / alternate); Burien Councilmember Joan McGilton; Issaquah Councilmember Fred Butler; Shoreline Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen; Renton Councilmember Marcie Palmer; Federal Way Councilmember Jeanne Burbidge; Mayor Dave Hill of Algona; Auburn Councilmember Wayne Osborne (alternate); Sammamish Councilmember Tom Vance (alternate); Lake Forest Park Councilmember John Wright (alternate).

Recommended Action

At the March 6, 2013 PIC meeting, members expressed strong support for Metro basing its long range planning on the comprehensive plans of cities, and asked that a public policy position to that effect be brought back to PIC for initial consideration at the April 10, 2013 PIC meeting. This is a potential future action item, scheduled as a 3 minute update with 7 minutes for feedback.

To recommend to the SCA Board of Directors:
The Sound Cities Association supports the development of a King County Metro Long Range Plan, based on local comprehensive plans.

Background

Based on the discussions currently taking place at the Regional Transit Committee, the update of the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and the King County Metro Service Guidelines will likely include policy language in support of a long range plan.

As part of a long range plan scoping/implementation section of the legislation, it is critical that Metro identify that they will base their long range plan on the comprehensive plans of cities. The service guidelines set priorities for adding or reducing service.

The linking transit and development working group identified several areas for improvement. These ranged from short-range project planning and implementation to long-range visioning
and determination of funding needs to support the levels of population, employment, and transit service growth outlined in the region’s Vision 2040 and Transportation 2040 plans. Recommendations to improve coordination to inform service prioritization include:

- Local comprehensive plans could identify transit-supportive corridors and land uses; capital plans could incorporate transit priority treatments.
- Future network additions based on growth anticipated in local comprehensive plans and anticipated transit markets.

Potential Next Steps:

Working group members recommended that Metro collaborate with jurisdictions to plan more specific corridor service levels and priorities for the long-term, beyond the near-term scope of the service guidelines. This would give the jurisdictions certainty about future corridors and enable them to target population growth for areas where Metro plans high levels of transit service. A potential next step is to begin defining a long-range planning process. This should include:

- long-range planning principles based on Metro’s strategic plan;
- concepts for a long-range service network;
- key capital improvements.

By April 30, 2013, Executive Constantine is required to transmit to the King County Council an ordinance to update the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation 2011-2021 and the King County Metro Service Guidelines recognizing that the strategic plan and guidelines are based upon Metro’s current network, which will require future changes to meet the 2010 regional transit task force recommendations.

If you have additional questions or concerns please contact Monica Whitman at monica@soundcities.org or 206-433-7169.
Item 7:  
Comprehensive Approach to Regional Tolling Implementation

Action Item

SCA Staff Contact  
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, office 206-433-7170, deanna@soundcities.org.

Background:  
At the April 10, 2013 meeting of the Public Issues Committee (PIC), the PIC had a discussion and adopted a public policy position regarding mitigation for tolling: “The Sound Cities Association supports mitigation from the State of Washington to address impacts from the current regional tolling of SR 520, as well as the potential regional tolling of I-90 and other future regional tolling.” That position was formally adopted by the SCA Board on April 17, 2013.

Leading up to the April PIC meeting, a number of SCA members approached staff and expressed interest in having SCA adopt a broader policy position regarding taking a comprehensive approach to looking at tolling in the region, rather than tolling on a piecemeal basis. Based on that feedback, staff prepared a draft position for initial consideration at the April PIC meeting:

The Sound Cities Association supports a more comprehensive approach to regional tolling implementation, through the development of a comprehensive study that would include all tolling projects within SMART Corridors (as identified by the Puget Sound Regional Council Transportation 2040 – Appendix B: Projects and Programs by SMART Corridor). The purpose of the study is to identify potential traffic diversions resulting from tolling; as well as, develop a full list of alternative revenue options for consideration.

See Attachment A.

The PIC had a discussion about that language at the April 10 PIC meeting, and asked staff to bring back for discussion a revised and refined possible policy position for initial consideration at the May PIC meeting.

After the April 10, 2013 PIC meeting, a number of SCA cities along with Seattle, Bellevue, and King County transmitted a letter expressing similar sentiments to Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Executive Director Bob Drewel and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Secretary Lynn Peterson. See Attachment B.

Based on feedback from SCA members, SCA staff worked with SCA members, and staff from King County and member cities to draft a revised policy position for consideration at the May 8, 2013 PIC meeting.
**Recommended Action:**

To recommend to the SCA Board of Directors:

The Sound Cities Association supports a more comprehensive approach to regional tolling implementation, through the formation of a special task force convened by the Puget Sound Regional Council that would advance the review of a system-wide approach to tolling our region’s major highway facilities as an alternative to the current path of implementing tolling on a corridor by corridor basis. This comprehensive review should include consideration of the following components:

- Ability to demonstrate the value to toll payers and the region at large;
- Equity for toll payers across the region and a fair distribution of costs and benefits;
- Analysis of the direct and external costs and benefits of relatively recent tolling on Tacoma Narrows Bridge, SR 520 and SR 167, and future facilities, including an assessment of overall system performance across modes, greenhouse gas emissions, vehicle miles travelled, traffic diversion and potential mitigation measures, and experiences of the traveling public;
- Review the impact of tolling by income quintile, based on household car ownership and use;
- Review of the technology available to achieve a regional solution, the implementation challenges, and a proposed phasing plan with greater definition than that provided in the region’s Transportation 2040 Plan;
- A robust discussion of the uses of both near and long-term revenues for transit to maximize the efficiency and equity of the tolled corridors and the system as a whole;
- Timing and staging of tolling implementation in tandem with the availability of choices, such as transit, that provide alternatives to paying tolls to address inequitable impacts as well as system operations; and
- Review and comparison of alternative finance options including Road Usage Charges (VMT).

**Attachments**

A) Memo Including Draft Language Distributed at the April 10, 2013 PIC
B) PSRC Tolling Study Letter to PSRC and WSDOT
Comprehensive Approach to Regional Tolling Implementation

Potential Language (Draft):

The Sound Cities Association supports a more comprehensive approach to regional tolling implementation, through the development of a comprehensive study that would include all tolling projects within SMART Corridors (as identified by the Puget Sound Regional Council Transportation 2040 – Appendix B: Projects and Programs by SMART Corridor). The purpose of the study is to identify potential traffic diversions resulting from tolling; as well as, develop a full list of alternative revenue options for consideration.

Background information:

Since the discussion at the March 6, 2013 PIC meeting, a number of cities have expressed interest in considering an additional public policy position in support of moving up the timetable at PSRC for taking a comprehensive look at tolling throughout the region.

Transportation 2040 includes the application of tolls on improved highway facilities as new investments are made, and suggests the eventual implementation of a whole system of tolled highways. Transportation 2040 also acknowledges that these changes cannot occur overnight but rather as the result of many individual steps, including legislative actions at the state and federal level.

SMART Corridors include regionally significant capital projects and key programmatic strategies, including tolling, included in Transportation 2040. Through the federally required Congestion Management Process (CMP) the central Puget Sound Region has been divided into 12 subareas called SMART Corridors. SMART Corridor Reports provide a profile of existing land use and transportation conditions for each of the 12 subareas within the four-county region. These reports include detailed information on the system, including current and previous land uses, transportation facilities and programs, and multimodal mobility performance. SMART Corridor reports, as a product of the Congestion Management Process, serve as a monitoring tool to assess the performance of the system and success of plan implementation. As issues arise out of the corridor reports, new solutions and needs may be identified which can be used as guidance in the project prioritization process.
April 22, 2013

Bob Drewel
Executive Director
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035

Secretary Lynn Peterson
Washington State Department of Transportation
310 Maple Park Avenue SE
P.O. Box 47300
Olympia, WA 98504-7300

Dear Mr. Drewel and Secretary Peterson:

We are writing to request that the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) convene a special task force to advance the review of a system-wide approach to tolling our region’s major highway facilities as an alternative to the current path of implementing tolling on a corridor by corridor basis.

In recent years, the State has imposed tolls on SR 520, SR 167 and the Tacoma Narrows Bridge. The Legislature has also directed that WSDOT study tolling of I-90, I-5, I-405, SR 509 and SR 99. The region’s transportation system suffers from serious traffic congestion and would benefit from a broad policy review and discussion on what is a reasonable vision and path for advancing tolling as both a mechanism to pay for infrastructure and a way to improve overall system performance and sustainability.

We are concerned that the State’s corridor by corridor approach to tolling is piecemeal. We believe that a system-wide study and public oversight should be considered to tackle the complex policy, financial and system reliability questions that must be answered to advance a regional vision for tolling. This is consistent with the communications coming forth from the SR 99 Advisory Committee on Tolling and Traffic Management and it is critical at this time...
with cities along Lake Washington urging mitigation for the unanticipated traffic diversion caused by SR 520 tolling.

We believe PSRC is the appropriate organization to convene regional stake holders including the State and local jurisdictions in a more comprehensive approach to toll implementation so we can avoid the unintended consequences of tolling one facility at a time. We recognize that the Washington State Department of Transportation’s participation in this effort is important for a successful outcome and we are hopeful that WSDOT will engage in and support the review.

The comprehensive review should include consideration of the following components:

- Ability to demonstrate the value to toll payers and the region at large;
- Equity for toll payers across the region and a fair distribution of costs and benefits;
- Analysis of the direct and external costs and benefits of relatively recent tolling on Tacoma Narrows Bridge, SR 520 and SR 167 and future facilities, including an assessment of overall system performance across modes, implementation and operational costs, greenhouse gas emissions, vehicle miles travelled, traffic diversion and potential mitigation measures, and experiences of the traveling public;
- Review the impact of tolling by income quintile, based on household car ownership and use;
- Review of the technology available to achieve a regional solution, the implementation challenges, and a proposed phasing plan with greater definition than that provided in the region’s Transportation 2040 Plan;
- A robust discussion of the uses of both near and long-term revenues for transit to maximize the efficiency and equity of the tolled corridors and the system as a whole;
- Timing and staging of tolling implementation in tandem with the availability of choices, such as transit, that provide alternatives to paying tolls to address inequitable impacts as well as system operations; and
- Review and comparison of alternative finance options.

We appreciate the work PSRC has done with Vision 2040 and recognize that it laid the groundwork for a regional approach to tolling and pricing. We now need to engage a wide composition of stakeholders to conduct the analysis in order to provide a deliberate and cohesive review in time to inform the 2014 legislative session.
We look forward to working with PSRC and WSDOT to further develop this request and to expeditiously seek approval for PSRC to undertake this study.

Sincerely,

Dow Constantine
King County Executive

George S. Martin
Mayor, City of Clyde Hill

David Baker
Mayor, City of Kenmore

Bruce Bassett
Mayor, City of Mercer Island

John Marchione
Mayor, City of Redmond

Mike McGinn
Mayor, City of Seattle

Conrad Lee
Mayor, City of Bellevue

Fred McConkey
Mayor, Town of Hunts Point

Mary Jane Goss
Mayor, City of Lake Forest Park

Rich Crispo
Mayor, City of Newcastle

Denis Law
Mayor, City of Renton

David Cooper
Mayor, Town of Yarrow Point
Item 8: Growing Transit Communities: A Corridor Action Strategy for the Central Puget Sound

**Discussion Item**

**SCA Staff Contact**
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, office 206-433-7147, doreen@soundcities.org.

**SCA Members on Growing Transit Communities (GTC) Oversight Committee:**
Shoreline Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen; Redmond Councilmember John Stilin.

**SCA Members on North / South / East Corridor Task Forces:**

*North*
Lake Forest Park Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford (on behalf of Leadership for Great Neighborhoods). Shoreline is also represented on the North Corridor Task Force.

*South*
The cities of Tukwila, Des Moines, Kent, SeaTac, and Federal Way are represented on the South Corridor Task Force.

*East*
The cities of Redmond and Mercer Island, and the Town of Beaux Arts Village are represented on the East Corridor Task Force.

**Discussion:** In 2011, a broad range of stakeholders came together to identify what was needed to create the sustainable, equitable communities envisioned in Vision 2040 and supported by the voter-approved investments in light rail and other transit projects. Supported by a $5 million grant from the Federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities (HUD, DOT, EPA), this coalition initiated a three-year work program as the Growing Transit Communities Partnership. A major product of that work is the draft report, *Growing Transit Communities: A Corridor Action Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region*, dated May 1, 2013. While the focus of the Growing Transit Communities Partnership is currently on the region’s long-range light rail corridors, the first strategy of the report states in part, “This effort should be expanded beyond the light rail corridors that are the focus of the Partnership’s work to include other high capacity transit nodes in the region and to involve new partners across multiple sectors.”

SCA members on the GTC Oversight Committee/North Corridor Task Force requested this item be brought to the PIC for member feedback for several reasons:

- the relevance to the cities that include existing or planned transit stations and the potential for relevance of the strategies to a growing number of member cities in the future;
• the request that will be made of the Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board in July that PSRC become a signatory to a regional Growing Transit Communities Compact; and
• the importance of this strategy in increasing the region’s economic competitiveness and achieving other long term goals.

Discussion and Feedback:
This is an opportunity for PIC members to provide feedback on the Growing Transit Communities: A Corridor Action Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region report dated May 1, 2013. PIC members are also encouraged to take this information back to their cities to consider commenting on the report; public comment continues through June 7, 2013.

Background
The Growing Transit Communities Strategy consists of three elements: a Growing Transit Communities Compact; Recommended Strategies and Actions, which are supported by a People + Place Typology; and Local Implementation Plans.

Growing Transit Communities Compact
The GTC Corridor Action Strategy is supported by the Growing Transit Communities Compact. The Compact affirms support for the Partnership’s work and a commitment to work toward regional goals by implementing the Strategy. The Compact calls for a continuing regional effort involving the region’s diverse partners. The Compact does not obligate partners to implement all recommendations, but rather to consider and adopt tools that fit best with community needs and available resources.

Signatories to the Compact, both local and regional, governmental and non-governmental, will strive to:

• Attract more of the region’s residential and employment growth to high capacity transit communities;
• Provide housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes near high-capacity transit; and
• Increase access to opportunity for existing and future residents of transit communities.

The Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board will likely consider signing the Compact at their July meeting.

Recommended Strategies and Actions
The 24 strategies are the primary recommendations of the Growing Transit Communities Partnership. They include actions for public, private, and nonprofit partners. The strategies identify effective transit community development approaches, shaped by input from experts and the Partnership’s corridor task forces and advisory committees. The strategies vary for different types of communities.

The Partnership recognizes that there is a need for new tools and resources to achieve these goals. Thus, the strategies address the need to amend state law to provide more options for
public agencies and address the need for additional funding for infrastructure, transit expansion, subsidies for affordable housing and other resources for meeting community needs.

The first five strategies are foundational and overarching in nature. As noted in the Discussion section above, the first strategy, “Establish a Regional Program to Support Thriving and Equitable Transit Communities”, also includes a statement that the effort should be expanded beyond light rail corridors to other high-capacity transit nodes, including commuter rail, bus rapid transit, streetcar, and ferries. Other foundational strategies address building partnerships and promoting collaboration; effectively engaging with stakeholders; building capacity for community engagement; and evaluating and monitoring impacts and outcomes.

The remaining strategies address three main regional goals for transit communities: attract more of the region’s residential and employment growth near high capacity transit, provide housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes, and increase access to opportunity for existing and future transit community members. The recommendations encompass policy and regulatory approaches, regional and local funding priorities, and regional guidance and support for local implementation.

**People + Place Typology**
From the outset, the Partnership recognized that one set of strategies cannot address the diversity of communities that currently exist or are planned around the region’s high-capacity transit investments. For this reason, the Growing Transit Communities Strategy includes a People + Place Typology and Transit Community Profiles. Each of the 74 transit communities is different and the communities serve different functions in the region. The Strategy tailors implementation approaches for the transit communities. The 74 communities have been examined in terms of people and place characteristics (People + Place Typology) and each of the communities has been grouped into one of eight implementation approaches. The approaches are described and key strategies for the specific approach are listed in the Strategy document.

**Local Implementation Plans**
The Local Implementation Agreements are local government, agency, or organization specific work plans which define short- and medium-term actions that can implement the Strategy. The nature and format of the Local Implementation Agreements will vary to reflect the diversity of public and private partners, legislative and decision-making processes, and actions adopted. Each community will decide for themselves, in consultation with Growing Transit Communities staff, which strategies best fit their community and those are the strategies they will pursue as station area planning takes place.

**Next Steps**
The Partnership’s Oversight Committee has authorized release of the draft Growing Transit Communities Strategy for public comment in May 2013, with comments being taken through June 7th. Final adoption of the Growing Transit Communities Strategy by the Oversight Committee is scheduled for July 2013. Growing Transit Communities staff will work with Consortium Members and other regional partners on the Regional Compact and the Local
Implementation Agreements through the end of 2013. Looking beyond the end of the grant period in early 2014, implementation will continue through regional and local work plans.

Attachments

A. Executive Summary - Growing Transit Communities: A Corridor Action Strategy for the Central Puget Sound Region
B. Frequently Asked Questions – Growing Transit Communities Strategy
Growing Transit Communities Strategy

Executive Summary

Our region has a shared vision for a sustainable future that will benefit our people, our prosperity, and our planet. VISION 2040, the central Puget Sound region’s long-range plan for growth, transportation, and economic development, describes the commitments, actions, and stewardship needed over many decades by many stakeholders to achieve far-reaching goals. As the region grows to 5 million people—a more than 30 percent increase—by the year 2040, a key goal calls for growth within existing urban areas and especially in compact, walkable communities that are linked by transit.

The region’s recent commitments to invest over $15 billion in rapid transit (light rail, bus rapid transit, express bus, streetcar, and commuter rail) present a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to locate housing, jobs, and services close to these transit investments, and to do so in a way that benefits surrounding communities. A region-wide coalition of businesses, developers, local governments, transit agencies, and nonprofit organizations—the Growing Transit Communities Partnership—has spent the last 36 months working together to create solutions that will encourage high-quality, equitable development around rapid transit.

The Challenges

Growth, as envisioned in VISION 2040, should benefit all people by increasing economic development and access to jobs, expanding housing and transportation choices, promoting neighborhood character and vitality, and improving public health and environmental quality. But, this is easier said than done. In particular, this growth may magnify several challenges currently facing the region:

1. **Living in and working in walkable, transit-served communities.** Recent market studies show that there is significant unmet demand for housing and jobs located within walking distance of transit. Many people want to live and work in compact, complete, and connected communities, but investments in transit and in transit station areas have fallen behind. Attracting growth to transit communities will require policies to encourage more housing and jobs near transit along with investments in the infrastructure and services for a growing population.

2. **Housing choices for low and moderate income households near transit.** Forty-three percent of the region’s households make less than 80 percent of the area median income. However, most new market-rate housing that is accessible to transit is unaffordable to these households. With new investment in transit communities, many lower-cost units are at risk of displacement. For the lowest income households, many of whom are transit dependent, the supply of subsidized housing is far short of the need. Building mixed-income communities that meet these needs will require improved strategies to minimize displacement, and preserve and produce diverse housing types affordable to a full range of incomes.

3. **Equitable access to opportunity for all the region’s residents.** Analysis of indicators across the region reveals that too many people do not have access to education, employment, mobility, health, and neighborhood services and amenities. These community resources are the building blocks that create the opportunity to succeed and thrive in life. Transit communities, with their access to the region’s jobs, institutions, and services are critical focal points for achieving greater equity for the region’s diverse residents. As these communities grow through public and private investment, equitable development will require targeted community improvements and strategies to connect existing and future residents to greater regional resources.
The Opportunity

In the last decade, central Puget Sound voters have approved a series of high-capacity light rail and other transit investments—a commitment of approximately $15 billion—that will serve the region’s most densely populated and diverse communities for decades to come. These investments present a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to support and improve existing communities and meet regional goals through strategies to make great places for people to live and work. In order to do this, the region must:

Leverage transit investment to build sustainable communities. Transit investments, such as light rail, streetcars, commuter rail, and bus rapid transit, create value by connecting communities to the larger region. Transit communities are the best opportunity for the region to become more sustainable, prosperous, and equitable.

Create new resources and tools. Current resources available to governmental and non-governmental agencies alike are not enough. New tools and funding sources will be necessary to meet infrastructure, economic development, housing, and other community needs.

Work together across the region and across sectors. It will take collaboration among a diverse spectrum of public, private, and nonprofit agencies and organizations working together to promote thriving and equitable transit communities. There are roles for everyone in this process.

The Strategy

How will this all be accomplished? The Growing Transit Communities Strategy calls for regional and local actions that respond to the challenges and opportunities in transit communities and represent major steps toward implementing VISION 2040. The Strategy was developed by the Growing Transit Communities Partnership, an advisory body of diverse public, private, and nonprofit agencies and organizations working together to promote successful transit communities. The Partnership, which is funded by a three-year grant from the federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities and is housed at the Puget Sound Regional Council, established three main goals for the Strategy:

- Attract more of the region’s residential and employment growth near high-capacity transit
- Provide housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes near high-capacity transit
- Increase access to opportunity for existing and future community members in transit communities

Recommended Strategies and Actions

Twenty-four strategies, guided by a People + Place Implementation Typology, constitute the “playbook” for the Growing Transit Communities Strategy. From overarching regional approaches to local and individual actions, together these provide a set of coordinated steps toward ensuring a prosperous, sustainable, and equitable future.

The Strategy presents 24 strategies recommended by the Growing Transit Communities Partnership and includes specific actions for PSRC, transit agencies, local governments, and other regional partners. The recommendations address the three main goals for transit communities. As a whole, the strategies are a call to action for partners across the region to redouble efforts to create great urban places and build equitable communities around transit. Fully recognizing the strong policy foundation embodied in regional and local plans, as well as the innovative work in implementing those plans to date, the Partnership makes these recommendations as a challenge to do more than is being doing today.
The Growing Transit Communities Recommended Strategies and Actions fall into four groupings:

The **Foundation Strategies** recommend a regional and local framework for ongoing work to support transit communities. Modeled on the relationships and values at the heart of the Growing Transit Communities Partnership, these strategies envision an ongoing regional effort involving diverse partners and community members in decision making and implementation at all levels.

The **Strategies to Attract Housing and Employment Growth** recommend actions to make great urban places that are attractive to households and businesses, remove barriers to development and support development in emerging markets.

The **Strategies to Provide Affordable Housing Choices** recommended actions to define and quantify housing needs, preserve existing and supply new housing choices, and capitalize on the value created by the private market, enhanced by transit investments, in order to achieve the broadest range of affordability in transit communities.

The **Strategies to Increase Access to Opportunity** recommend actions to understand regional disparities in access to opportunity, identify existing and potential new resources and tools to meet community needs, and build support for equitable opportunities through education, coalitions, and leadership.

---

1. Establish a regional program to support thriving and equitable transit communities
2. Build partnerships and promote collaboration
3. Engage effectively with community stakeholders
4. Build capacity for community engagement
5. Evaluate and monitor impacts and outcomes
6. Conduct station area planning
7. Use land efficiently in transit communities
8. Locate, design and provide access to transit stations to support TOD
9. Adopt innovative parking tools
10. Invest in infrastructure and public realm improvements
11. Assess current and future housing needs in transit communities
12. Minimize displacement through preservation and replacement
13. Direct housing resources to support transit-dependent populations
14. Implement a TOD property acquisition fund
15. Expand value capture financing as a tool for infrastructure and affordable housing
16. Make surplus public lands available for affordable housing
17. Leverage market value through incentives
18. Implement regional fair housing assessment
19. Assess community needs
20. Invest in environmental and public health
21. Invest in economic vitality and opportunity
22. Invest in equitable mobility options
23. Invest in equitable access to high quality education
24. Invest in public safety in transit communities
Successful implementation will require shared commitment and collaboration among governments, major stakeholders, and community members. There are roles for many different regional and local partners, each with a distinct jurisdiction, authority, and mission. Consistent with those roles, all are asked to use the Recommended Strategies and Actions as a “playbook” for taking action to advance the regional vision of creating thriving and equitable transit communities in a manner that is a best fit to each community.

People + Place Implementation Typology

No two transit communities are alike. Accordingly, there is no one-size-fits-all approach to the strategies that will help a transit community thrive and grow with equitable outcomes for current and future community members. The Strategy presents the People + Place Implementation Typology as a regional framework for local implementation. Working with stakeholders from each of three major light rail corridors, the Partnership analyzed conditions in 74 study areas as a basis for a set of locally tailored recommendations. Based on indicators of the physical, economic, and social conditions in each transit community, the results of this typology exercise suggest eight Implementation Approaches. Key strategies and investments address the needs and opportunities in different communities, while also advancing regional and corridor-wide goals. The Implementation Approaches and typology analysis are intended to complement and inform existing regional and, especially, local plans as they are implemented, evaluated, and refined in the coming years.

The Next Steps

The Growing Transit Communities Strategy includes a three-part implementation plan to promote thriving and equitable transit communities in the central Puget Sound region. The Regional Compact, which is included in its entirety at the beginning of this report, affirms the region’s diverse partners’ support for the Partnership’s work and a commitment to work toward regional goals by implementing the Strategy. The Typology and Recommended Strategies and Actions, as described above and detailed in the body of this report, include eight implementation approaches, 24 recommended strategies, and corridor specific priorities that will guide an evolving approach to transit communities. The Individual Work Plans are local government, agency, or organization specific work plans, to be developed individually and in consultation with PSRC staff, which define short- and medium-term actions that can implement the Strategy. The nature and format of the Individual Work Plans will vary to reflect the diversity of public and private partners, legislative and decision making processes, and actions adopted.

By working together, the central Puget Sound region can achieve its vision for a sustainable future that advances our people, our prosperity, and our planet. The Growing Transit Communities Strategy lays out critical tools and actions to get us there.
What is the Growing Transit Communities Partnership?

The Growing Transit Communities Partnership is an advisory body of diverse public, private, and nonprofit agencies and organizations working together to promote successful transit communities. The Partnership is funded by a three-year grant from the federal Partnership for Sustainable Communities and is housed at the Puget Sound Regional Council. The Partnership is developing recommendations for best practices and new tools and resources to address three overarching goals that advance adopted regional policy:

- **Attract more of the region’s residential and employment growth near high-capacity transit**
- **Provide housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes near high-capacity transit**
- **Increase access to opportunity for existing and future community members in transit communities**

Why equitable transit communities?

Building communities around high-capacity transit is a key strategy to promote a more sustainable, prosperous, and equitable central Puget Sound region. However, if current trends in residential and commercial development continue, the region will fall short of its goals to grow vibrant mixed-use centers. If growth does not address the needs of households and small businesses for affordable housing and commercial space, they will be displaced and excluded from the benefits of regional investment. If public improvements in transit communities do not make employment, education, healthy neighborhoods, and other opportunities more accessible to all households regardless of race, income, or national origin, then the region will have lost a chance for a more equitable future.

Why a coordinated regional effort?

While the region is already a recognized national leader on planning for sustainable development, the ongoing investment of more than $15 billion in light rail and other forms of transit requires bold, coordinated action to ensure the greatest value from these investments is realized. Success means creating a region that can compete globally for jobs and investment, and is well positioned to attract scarce state and federal funds for transportation and community development. Success also means providing the tools, resources, and public support necessary to achieve a regional vision where compact growth, improved transit connections, and a range of community investments provide benefits fairly to all.

What is the Growing Transit Communities Strategy? How will it be implemented?

The Growing Transit Communities Strategy is a three-part implementation plan to promote thriving and equitable transit communities in the central Puget Sound region.

**THE PLEDGE:** Regional Compact

The **Regional Compact** affirms support for the Partnership’s work and a commitment to work toward regional goals by implementing the Strategy. The Compact calls for a continuing regional effort involving the region’s diverse partners. The Compact does not obligate partners to implement all recommendations, but rather to consider and adopt tools that fit best with community needs and available resources.

**THE PLAYBOOK:** Recommendations & Typology

The **Recommended Strategies and Actions** include 24 detailed recommendations that identify actions for public, private, and nonprofit partners. The strategies identify effective transit community development approaches, shaped by input from experts and the Partnership’s corridor task forces and advisory committees. The strategies vary for different types of communities.

**THE PLANS:** Individual Workplans

The **Individual Workplans** are local government, agency, or organization specific work plans which define short- and medium-term actions that can implement the Strategy. The nature and format of the Workplans will vary to reflect the diversity of public and private partners, legislative and decision making processes, and actions adopted.
How do the Growing Transit Communities recommendations relate to state or regional policies and requirements?

The recommendations do not create new mandates for partners across the region; rather, they identify tools, resources, and incentives to help partners carry out what is already adopted regional policy in VISION 2040 and Transportation 2040, and in state requirements of the Growth Management Act. The Partnership’s recommendations have been developed for regional and local governments, as well as a range of private, non-profit, and community partners. Adoption of the Partnership’s recommendations will depend on appropriate legislative or board approval.

Is this just about light rail stations?

By promoting transit ridership, sustainable patterns of development, and equitable social outcomes, the Growing Transit Communities Strategy benefits the entire region. The Partnership has focused on 74 transit communities along the region’s three long-range light rail corridors identified in Transportation 2040. This includes portions of 16 cities (Everett, Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Shoreline, Seattle, Mercer Island, Beaux Arts Village, Bellevue, Redmond, Tukwila, SeaTac, Kent, Des Moines, Federal Way, Fife, and Tacoma) and three counties (Snohomish, King, and Pierce). Other important transit nodes also exist throughout the region. Future work will expand the approaches developed by the Partnership to additional transit communities not in the three light rail corridors.

What is the Transit Community Typology and how does it guide implementation?

From the outset, the Partnership recognized that one set of strategies cannot address the diversity of communities that currently exist or are planned around the region’s high-capacity transit investments. For this reason, the Growing Transit Communities Partnership has developed a People + Place Implementation Typology to link key implementation strategies to transit communities based on characteristics of the existing community. The Typology resulted in eight different types, each with priority strategies, that demonstrate the varying needs and opportunities present in different transit communities across the region.

Do the recommendations include updates to VISION 2040, Transportation 2040 or the Regional Economic Strategy?

The focus of the Growing Transit Communities Strategy is to develop tools and resources to help carry out existing regional policy. One first step will be integrating regional data and tools developed under this grant with the minor update to Transportation 2040 currently underway. As implementation of the Strategy proceeds in the coming years, PSRC may consider further refining or adding detail to its policies and plans to advance regional goals for transit communities. Any such amendments or policy changes will be subject to PSRC board approval.

Will the Growing Transit Communities Strategy affect project funding or plan certification through PSRC?

Transportation project funding can be an effective tool to support transit communities in the region. The Partnership has identified key infrastructure needs as well as opportunities to reward implementation of best practices throughout the region. The Strategy suggests adding greater detail or additional points to the current funding criteria used for competitive regionally-managed transportation funds or refinements to the local comprehensive plan certification review criteria. Adoption of changes to project funding or plan certification criteria would be subject to PSRC board approval.

What is the timeline for implementation?

The Partnership’s Oversight Committee has authorized release of the draft Growing Transit Communities Strategy for public comment in May 2013, with final adoption scheduled for summer 2013. Growing Transit Communities staff will work with Consortium Members and other regional partners on the Regional Compact and the Local Implementation Agreements through the end of 2013. Looking beyond the end of the grant period in early 2014, implementation will continue through regional and local work plans.

For more information, please contact Program Manager Ben Bakkenta at 206-971-3286 or bbakkenta@psrc.org.

April 29, 2013
Item 9:
Transportation 2040 – Pavement Condition Index (PCI) Target

Discussion Item

SCA Staff Contact
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, office 206-433-7170, deanna@soundcities.org.

PSRC Transportation Policy Board Members
Renton Councilmember Rich Zwicker (SCA Caucus Chair / alternate); Shoreline Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen (SCA Caucus Vice Chair / alternate); Federal Way Councilmember Jeanne Burbidge; Sammamish Councilmember Don Gerend; Algona Mayor Dave Hill; Kirkland Councilmember Amy Walen (alternate).

PSRC Executive Board Members
Algona Mayor Dave Hill (SCA Caucus Chair); Duvall Mayor Will Ibershof; Redmond Mayor John Marchione; Auburn Mayor Pete Lewis (alternate); SeaTac Deputy Mayor Mia Gregerson (alternate); Covington Councilmember Marlla Mhoon (alternate); Sammamish Councilmember Don Gerend (2nd alternate). *SCA cities with their own seats: Kent Mayor Suzette Cooke; Renton Mayor Denis Law; Kirkland Mayor Joan McBride; Federal Way Mayor Skip Priest.

At the April 10, 2013 meeting of the PIC, during the PSRC Transportation 2040 update discussion, SCA staff requested that PIC members take the information discussed regarding a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) target back to their city public works staff for additional feedback. This item has been scheduled for discussion.

Background
Concerns have been raised regarding PSRC’s Transportation 2040 Pavement Condition Index (PCI) Target or Goal of 70. PCI is a numerical index between 0 and 100 that is used to indicate the condition of a pavement, widely used in transportation civil engineering. Very few cities or counties in the region have a surplus of financing for pavement preservation. The region needs to invest heavily in those arterials that are between PCI 70 – PCI 80 to gain an additional 8-10 years of life before serious drops in roadway condition occur.

The following table was developed by a Technical Transportation Needs Working Group comprised of PSRC, City, SCA, and County staff that assembled this past year to identify the impending gap in funding for transportation projects in the near term. This table includes PCI ranges and average cost per square yard. Ben Brackett (bbrackett@psrc.org or 206-971-3280), Senior Transportation Planner at PSRC is an excellent resource if you have any questions about how this table was created.
Table 1: Preservation Project Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>PCI Ranges</th>
<th>Average Cost per Square Yard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Routine maintenance</strong> activities are performed to maintain safe traffic conditions and include pothole patching, patching around utility structures, and crack sealing</td>
<td>70-100</td>
<td>$2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surface repair</strong> activities are performed to preserve or extend the life of an existing pavement structure that is deemed structurally sound. This work is performed with the initial 10 years of a new pavement and helps to prevent potholes from occurring</td>
<td>50-70</td>
<td>$37.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural repair</strong> work generally consists of the preparatory work activities, including a thin or thick overlay. Structural repair is appropriate when only a small percentage of the roadway segment is damaged.</td>
<td>25-49</td>
<td>$78.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reconstruction</strong> work is done when a majority of the pavement or underlying base course has failed and can no longer serve as competent foundation for flexible pavements like asphalt.</td>
<td>&lt;25</td>
<td>$152.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

A draft Prioritization Report will be available for the Policy Board’s review in May 2013. The next decision point for the Transportation 2040 Update will be in June/July 2013, when the boards will be asked to endorse strategies and changes to the plan. Additional T2040 resources and materials are available at [http://www.psrc.org/transportation/transportation-2040-update](http://www.psrc.org/transportation/transportation-2040-update).
Item 10a:
Washington House Environment Committee – Interim Stakeholder Group
PIC Watershed Investment District (WID) Subcommittee

*Informational Item*

**SCA Staff Contact**
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, office 206-433-7170, deanna@soundcities.org.
Monica Whitman, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, office 206-433-7169, monica@soundcities.org.

**SCA PIC WID Subcommittee Members**
Woodinville Mayor Talmas, Kirkland Mayor McBride, Bothell Councilmember Andy Rheume, Kirkland Councilmember Toby Nixon, Normandy Park Mayor Pro-Tem Doug Osterman, Covington Councilmember Marla Mhoon, and Carolyn Robertson, Auburn Intergovernmental Relations Staff.

**Background Information**
On February 20, 2013, the SCA Board adopted the following policy position: “SCA supports the formation of a stakeholder group by the Washington State Legislature, as the means to reach consensus on bill language regarding watershed investment authorities, to be introduced in the 2014 legislative session.

SCA transmitted a letter in March in support of the formation of a Watershed Investment District Stakeholder Group (*Attachment A*). SCA member Toby Nixon, Kirkland, testified before the House Environment Committee in this legislative session on the importance of stable and reliable funding for watershed projects and called attention to letters from both the SCA and Kirkland (*Attachment B*).

Based on the letters from Kirkland and SCA, as well as, outreach from individual members of the PIC WID Subcommittee, Representative Upthegrove graciously included an interim stakeholder group in the House Environment Committees interim work program, the stakeholder group has been tasked with reaching consensus on bill language to be introduced in the 2014 legislative session. The attached thank you letter was transmitted to representative Upthegrove on behalf of SCA (*Attachment C*).

SCA is now working with Chair Upthegrove and non-partisan House Environment Committee staff regarding the work plan and what the makeup of the stakeholder group should be. The formation of this stakeholder group is a critical step in the continued development of stormwater management, flood protection, drinking water, and salmon recovery.
If you have any additional questions or are interested in being involved in this process, please contact Deanna Dawson deanna@soundcities.org or Monica Whitman monica@soundcities.org.

Attachments

A) SCA Letter support of the formation of a WID Stakeholder Group
B) Kirkland Letter of Support
C) SCA Letter of Thanks to Rep Upthegrove
March 12, 2013

Dear Representative Upthegrove:

I am writing to you on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Sound Cities Association to express our support for the formation of a stakeholder group as the means to reach consensus regarding watershed investment authorities. As you know, the Sound Cities Association (formerly the Suburban Cities Association) was founded in the 1970s to help cities in King County with populations of under 150,000 act locally and partner regionally to create vital, livable communities through advocacy, education, leadership, mutual support, and networking. Collectively, our members represent nearly one million constituents in King County.

Following a workshop, hosted by SCA, on the Puget Sound Partnership’s Action Agenda and Watershed Investment Authorities, a subcommittee was formed to further explore the potential advantages and challenges associated with funding multiple benefit projects which support watershed management goals. The subcommittee determined that while 2013 isn’t the appropriate timing to introduce a bill to the Washington State legislature; there are a number of reasons to support the legislature taking interim measures to further examine the pros and cons of forming Watershed Investment Districts between now and 2014.

On February 20, 2013 the SCA Board of Directors unanimously adopted a policy position: that SCA support the formation of a stakeholder group by the Washington State Legislature, as the means to reach consensus on bill language regarding watershed investment authorities, to be introduced in the 2014 legislative session.

Fortunately, much of the research on the formation of a Watershed Investment District has already been done during the process of developing the draft bill that already exists (enclosed). The purpose of the bill is not to establish an additional junior taxing district. Stakeholder group discussion and consensus could focus on the governance structure, revenue-generation options, revenue approval processes, project selection and prioritization, whether Watershed Investment District’s will build projects or only serve as fiscal agent/pass through to local jurisdictions, funding distribution methods, etc. SCA would be pleased to serve on this Stakeholder Group.

Thank you for being willing to champion this effort.

Sincerely,

Denis Law
Mayor, City of Renton
President, Sound Cities Association Board of Directors

Cc: SCA Public Issues Committee
SCA Board of Directors

Encl: Watershed Investment District Summary and Draft Legislation
April 3, 2013

Honorable Dave Upthegrove, Chair  
House Environment Committee  
304 John L. O’Brien Building  
P.O. Box 40600  
Olympia, WA 98504-0600

RE: City of Kirkland’s support of the formation of an interim stakeholder group on the Watershed Investment Authority bill

Dear Representative Upthegrove:

The City of Kirkland supports formation of an interim stakeholder group as the means to reach consensus on bill language regarding watershed investment authorities, to be introduced in the 2014 legislative session.

Kirkland actively participates on the SCA Watershed Investment Authorities subcommittee, formed this year to explore the potential advantages and challenges associated with funding multiple benefit projects which support watershed management goals. The subcommittee determined that there are a number of reasons to support the legislature taking interim measures to further examine the pros and cons of forming Watershed Investment Authorities between now and 2014.

Fortunately, much of the research on the formation of a Watershed Investment Authority has already been done during the process of developing the draft bill that already exists (enclosed). The purpose of the bill is not to establish an additional junior taxing district. Stakeholder group discussion and consensus could focus on the governance structure, revenue-generation options, revenue approval processes, project selection and prioritization, whether Watershed Investment Authorities will build projects or only serve as fiscal agent/pass through to local jurisdictions, funding distribution methods, etc.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

City of Kirkland

By Joan McBride, Mayor

Cc: Kirkland City Council  
Kurt Triplett, City Manager  
Pam Bissonnette, Interim Public Works Director  
Lorrie McKay, Intergovernmental Relations Manager  
Jenny Gaus, Surface Water Engineering Supervisor
Representative Dave Upthegrove
Washington State Legislature
304 John L. O’Brien Building
PO Box 40600
Olympia, WA 98504

Dear Representative Upthegrove:

Thank you for your leadership and support for a Watershed Investment District (WID) stakeholder group to reach consensus on bill language to be introduced in the 2014 legislative session. The SCA Board was pleased to hear that a WID stakeholder group has been included in the House Environmental Committee’s interim work plan.

The Sound Cities Association (SCA) was found in the 1970’s to help cities act locally and partner regionally to create vital, livable communities. SCA represents 35 cities of King County and provides a voice for nearly one million people.

Our cities are dedicated to finding solutions that will address stormwater management, flood protection, and salmon recovery; unfortunately, many of these solutions often lie outside the boundaries of individual jurisdictions. Cities recognize that there is a tremendous value to forming partnerships that will result in integrated implementation of actions to restore habitat and increase flood control.

Our members are particularly interested in examining the governance and funding issues associated with the formation a Watershed Investment District. The enclosed draft legislation, developed by the Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) groups, provides a framework for discussing the governance and funding issues that the cities and our many other stakeholders have faced over the past fifteen years of working together on salmon recovery within the WRIA’s.

SCA would be delighted to have representation on the stakeholder group. If there is anything we can do to be of assistance, please don’t hesitate to contact Monica Whitman, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, at (206) 433-7169 or myself.

Sincerely,

Denis Law
Mayor, City of Renton
President, Sound Cities Association Board of Directors

Cc: SCA Public Issues Committee
SCA Board of Directors
Item 10b:  
5th Annual MIDD Report  
Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Oversight Committee (MIDD)  
Informational Item

SCA Staff Contact  
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, office 206-433-7147, doreen@soundcities.org.

MIDD Members:  
Kent Councilmember Dennis Higgins; Kirkland Councilmember Dave Asher (Alternate)

The purpose of this report is to provide information on MIDD’s services and attainment of benchmarks for the time period from October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012.

This report excerpted from a staff report by Kelli Carroll, Principal Legislative Analyst at King County, to the Regional Policy Committee (RPC).

MIDD Key Facts:  
1. The tax became effective on April 1, 2008. It expires on January 1, 2017. State statute does not establish an expiration date for this tax; it was established by the King County Council by ordinance.  
2. Current actual estimates indicate that the tax generated $44.7 million in 2012, down from the 2012 adopted figure of $45.9 million. It is the fifth year of decline in actual versus estimated revenues.  
3. In 2012, $13.7 million of MIDD funds (30 percent) were budgeted to replace lost General Fund revenue supporting mental health and chemical dependency programs in the 2012 adopted budget.

Annual Report Highlights:  
• $51 million was spent implementing MIDD strategies and on programs supplanted with MIDD funds during 2012  
• At least 32,112 individuals (20,150 adults and 11,962 youth/children) received one or more MIDD-funded services during the reporting period-compared to 30,704 in 2011  
• Three of the 37 original MIDD strategies remain on hold due to budget constraints; all others have moved forward with serving their intended clientele  
• 31 of the 33 strategies with performance measurement data met at least 85 percent of their annual target for one or more key targets  
• At least 955 MIDD clients reported that they had served in the U.S. military  
• For ten of the strategies, jail utilization was reduced, and for six of the strategies, jail reductions were greater than 40 percent
• Average days in community inpatient psychiatric hospitals dropped 48 percent (from pre MIDD period) for the outcome-eligible sample
• MIDD clients were from greater Seattle (35%), south King County (34%), east (16%), north (6%), and other (<9%)

Background

State Establishes the Sales Tax
In 2005, the Washington State Legislature authorized counties to implement a one-tenth of one percent sales and use tax to support new or expanded chemical dependency or mental health treatment programs and services and for the operation of new or expanded therapeutic court programs and services.

Authorizing the Sales Tax in King County
In 2007, the King County Council adopted an ordinance authorizing the levy and collection of an additional sales and use tax of one-tenth of one percent for the delivery of mental health and chemical dependency services and therapeutic courts. The ordinance also established a policy framework for measuring the effectiveness of the public’s investment in MIDD programs, requiring the King County Executive to submit oversight, implementation and evaluation plans for the programs funded with the tax revenue.

MIDD Adopted Policy Goals
Ordinance 15949 adopted five policy goals for the programs supported with MIDD funds:
• Policy Goal 1: A reduction in the number of mentally ill and chemically dependent people using costly interventions, such as, jail, emergency rooms, and hospitals
• Policy Goal 2: A reduction in the number of people who recycle through the jail, returning repeatedly as a result of their mental illness or chemical dependency.
• Policy Goal 3: A reduction of the incidence and severity of chemical dependency and mental and emotional disorders in youth and adults.
• Policy Goal 4: Diversion of mentally ill and chemically dependent youth and adults from initial or further justice system involvement.
• Policy Goal 5: Explicit linkage with, and furthering the work of, other Council directed efforts including, the Adult and Juvenile Justice Operational Master plans, the Plan to End Homelessness, the Veterans and Human Services Levy Service Improvement Plan and the King County Mental Health Recovery Plan.

Oversight Committee
In April 2008, the King County Council adopted an ordinance establishing the King County Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Oversight Committee. The Oversight Committee is an advisory body to the King County Executive and the Council. The purpose of the Oversight Committee is to ensure that the implementation and evaluation of the strategies and programs funded by the tax revenue are transparent, accountable and collaborative. The Oversight Committee reviews and comments on quarterly, annual and evaluation reports as required. It also reviews and comments on emerging and evolving priorities for the use of the MIDD sales tax revenue. The Oversight Committee members bring knowledge, expertise, and the perspective necessary to successfully review and provide input on the development, implementation, and evaluation of the tax funded programs. The current co-chairs of the MIDD
Oversight Committee are Dan Satterberg, King County Prosecuting Attorney, and Mike Heinisch, Executive Director, Kent Youth and Family Services.

**Evaluation Plan**
In October 2008, the MIDD Evaluation Plan was adopted by ordinance. The MIDD Evaluation Plan provides the public and policy makers with the tools to evaluate the effectiveness of the MIDD strategies, as well as to ensure transparency, accountability and collaboration and effectiveness of the MIDD funded programs and strategies. The ordinance adopted a framework for evaluating the core MIDD strategies, specifying what data will be collected. Recommended revisions to the Evaluation Plan are to be identified and included in the annual reports.

**Supplantation**
The initial 2005 legislation that authorized counties to implement a one-tenth of one percent sales and use tax did not permit the revenues to be used to supplant other existing funding. The statute was revised in 2008 to allow for its use for housing that is part of a coordinated chemical dependency or mental health treatment program. During the 2009 Legislative session, Washington State Legislators approved a change to the state statute, modifying the non supplantation language of the law. The modification allows MIDD revenue to replace (supplant) funds for existing mental health, chemical dependency, and therapeutic court services and programs, not only new or expanded programs. In 2011, the statute was again modified, increasing the percentage of sales tax revenue that could be used to supplant existing programs. The 2011 modification allowed up to 50 percent of the MIDD funds to be used to supplant other lost funds in 2012, 40 percent in 2013, 30 percent in 2014, 20 percent in 2015, and 10 percent in 2016. The Legislature further amended the statute to allow revenues levied under the MIDD statute to support the cost of the judicial officer and support staff for therapeutic courts and not be counted as supplanted funds.

**Recommended MIDD Plan Revisions**
The MIDD sales tax funded programs and services may require occasional modification as evaluation data becomes available. For the reporting period of October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012 the Fifth Annual MIDD Report includes adjustments to performance targets. For example, the target number of clients screened by the Mental Health Court Expansion Strategy 11b is adjusted from 50 to 300 based on changes to screening protocols.