1. Welcome and Roll Call – Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, Chair  
   2 minutes

2. Public Comment – Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, Chair  
   10 minutes

3. Approval of minutes – October 14, 2015 meeting  
   Page 5

4. Chair’s Report – Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, Chair  
   5 minutes

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

6. November 3, 2015 Election Results  
   DISCUSSION
   Page 37
   Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director
   (5 minute overview, 25 minute round robin)

7. Regional Legislative Agendas Addressing Homelessness and Affordable Housing  
   UPDATE
   Page 39
   Doreen Booth, Policy Analyst
   (5 minute overview, 10 minute discussion)

8. Bridges and Roads Task Force  
   UPDATE
   Page 51
   Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst
   (5 minute overview, 10 minute discussion)

9. United Way of King County Strategic Plan  
   UPDATE
   Page 63
   Ellie Wilson-Jones, Policy Analyst
   (5 minute overview, 5 minute discussion)
10. **Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County**
   UPDATE
   Page 81
   Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst
   (2 minute update, 3 minute discussion)

11. **Potential Upcoming SCA Issues**
   UPDATE
   Page 83
   Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director
   (2 minute update, 3 minute discussion)

12. **Informational Item**
   a. **Farmers Market and Temporary Event Fees**
      Page 85

13. **Upcoming Events**
   a. SCA Annual Meeting & Dinner – Wednesday, December 2 – 5:30 PM
      Renton Pavilion Event Center
   b. SCA Public Issues Committee Meeting – Wednesday, December 9 – 7:00 PM
      Renton City Hall
   c. Public Sector Economic Development Summit – Friday, December 11 – 9:00 AM
      Microsoft Campus
   d. South and South Valley Caucus Meeting – Wednesday, December 16 – 6:30 PM
      Truitt Building, Auburn
   e. North and Snoqualmie Valley Caucus Meeting – Thursday, December 17 – 6:30 PM
      Redmond Senior Center

14. **For the Good of the Order**

15. **Adjourn**
Did You Know?

SCA President Matt Larson, Mayor of Snoqualmie, and Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, have been visiting each SCA member city to better understand the perspective of each member city through its geographic layout, demographic data, history, triumphs, and challenges. Learning the history and current issues of each member has helped to understand individual city issues, as well as collective issues that the SCA membership faces. Each SCA member city has hidden jewels and these visits have highlighted them. President Larson and Dawson will have visited all 36 member cities on November 13, 2015.

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**

PIC Chair Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM. 26 cities had representation (Attachment A). Guests present included: Kamuron Gurol, City of Burien; Don Gerend, Sammamish City Council; Edie Gilliss, City of Seattle; Diane Carlson, King County Executive’s Office; Maria Wood, Public Health – Seattle and King County.

2. **Public Comment**

Councilmember Don Gerend, Sammamish, gave public comment on the Advanced Transportation Technologies Conference that was held on October 9, 2015. The Eastside Transportation Partnership, South County Area Transportation Board, and Seashore Transportation Forum developed and sponsored the conference held on Mercer Island. In addition to discussion on the future of automated vehicles, Gerend stated that conference attendees had an opportunity to ride on an electric bus which then drove to a recharging station. After recharging the battery for 10 minutes, the bus returned to the conference location. The conference demonstrated that the future is here and now, and very exciting.

Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, complimented the organizers of the conference. He noted that he works for the King County Department of Transportation, and commented that the battery technology for electric vehicles, especially buses, is growing by leaps and bounds resulting in longer battery life and providing opportunities to travel further distances.

3. **Approval of the September 9, 2015 Minutes**

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, moved, seconded by Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, to approve the September 9, 2015 meeting minutes.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Chair’s Report**

Chair Talmas reported that there was no October meeting between the SCA leadership and the King County Executive due to scheduling conflicts. Chair Talmas reported on the efforts of SCA members and staff, as well as city staff, surrounding the E911 oversight issue and refining the proposed ordinance. He specifically thanked Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, for her efforts.

5. **Executive Director’s Report**
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, provided a report, noting that more information on the E911 oversight issue will be covered later in the meeting. She noted that the call for nominations for 2016 SCA Boards and Committees would be coming out shortly. All the boards and committees can be found here on the SCA website. Appointments are recommended by the PIC Nominating Committee to the PIC, who in turn makes a recommendation to the Board. The Nominating Committee works to ensure that nominees represent geographic balance between the subareas of the county and a mix of large and small cities, and bring a balance of perspectives. For any questions regarding the committees or process for appointments, please contact Dawson at Deanna@soundcities.org, or at (206) 433-7170.

The PIC Nominating Committee also makes recommendations on candidates for PIC Chair and Vice Chair. Vice Chair Marlla Mhoon has indicated that she is interested in becoming Chair in 2016. If you are interested in serving as 2016 PIC Vice Chair, please contact Dawson. The Nominating Committee will discuss in December, and the election will occur at the first PIC meeting in January. The Committee looks to rotate leadership and to balance appointments such that when the Chair is from the South, the Vice Chair comes from North end cities (North and Snoqualmie Valley caucuses).

Dawson reminded members about the upcoming SCA Networking Dinner on October 28, 2015. The keynote speaker will be Attorney General Bob Ferguson. SCA is partnering with AWC to honor the 2015 “City Champions” Senator Mark Mullet and Representative Tana Senn, “Transportation Champions” Representative Judy Clibborn and Senator Joe Fain, and “City Champion All-Star” Representative Larry Springer. Dawson encouraged members to thank these legislators, and to attend to show their appreciation.

Dawson also reminded members that the 2015 SCA Annual Meeting will be held on December 2, 2015. The Board is recommending some amendments to the Bylaws, which will be voted on at the meeting. These proposed amendments will be sent to each city in advance of the meeting. The Annual Meeting is also where cities vote on dues for the upcoming year.

Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, asked whether each city should designate a voting representative for the meeting. Dawson responded in the affirmative.

Dawson continued that the SCA Board has adopted a policy to ensure that dues have predictability both for members, and the organization. The policy states that dues should be tied to the Consumer Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers (CPI-W) for Seattle/Tacoma/Bremerton for June-June, with a floor of 0% and a ceiling of 3%. Based on this, the Board is recommending a 1.1% adjustment in the dues rate for 2016. This along with the 2016 budget will be voted on by the membership at the meeting. Dawson responded to a question from Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, clarifying that the Board had selected the CPI-W for Seattle-Tacoma-Bremerton.

Also in December, SCA will be cohosting along with Seattle and King County a public sector economic development summit. This will be held on December 11, 2015. A save the date will be sent soon and more details are forthcoming.
The SCA Board met in Algona in September, and will be meeting in Woodinville in October. SCA President Matt Larson and Dawson are almost done visiting all 36 SCA cities. They have upcoming meetings scheduled in Skykomish and Mercer Island.

Dawson reported that she had presented at a Poverty Summit at the West Coast Poverty Center on the topic of suburbanization of poverty. Tukwila Mayor Jim Haggerton is convening a group of south county mayors to discuss the topic of suburban poverty in south King County. In the PIC packet, there is a summary of ways that SCA cities are tackling the challenges of homelessness in their communities. SCA policy analyst Ellie Wilson-Jones participated in a presentation to the City Managers group along with staff from Redmond and Kent, and staff from “All Home,” the new name for the Committee to End Homelessness. There was interest in SCA helping to convene a half day workshop to continue to collaborate together on this topic.

Dawson reported on a presentation at the County’s Budget and Fiscal Management Committee on the County’s budget and revenue projections. Sales tax revenues and other sources of revenue are coming in higher than anticipated. There are still challenges in many areas, notably in public health. More details on the presentation can be found in a PowerPoint presentation. The County faces ongoing challenges due to the structural gap caused by the 1% property tax cap. This is a legislative priority for the County, as is obtaining additional funding for public health. These were also adopted as SCA policies last year.

SCA President Matt Larson, Mayor of Snoqualmie, stated the multiple SCA members will be attending the Seattle Chamber’s Regional Leadership Conference.

6. Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Advisory Task Force Appointments
Redmond Council President Hank Margeson, PIC Nominating Committee Chair, thanked the nominees that submitted their interest in the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Advisory Task Force.

_Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, moved, seconded by Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, to recommend to the SCA Board of Directors the appointment of Councilmember Tom Agnew, Bothell; Mayor Dave Hill, Algona; Councilmember Michael Janasz, Skykomish; and Deputy Mayor Sean Kelly, Maple Valley, as members to the Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Advisory Task Force._

Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, noted that all cities with population of 50,000 have their own seat on the EMS Advisory Task Force. Dawson asked that cities with their own seats provide the name of the representative to ensure communication and collaboration.

_The motion passed unanimously._

Chair Margeson thanked Councilmember Ross Loudenback for his years of service on the PIC Nominating Committee. Members echoed Margeson’s appreciation by applause.

7. Appointment of 2016 PIC Nominating Committee
Chair Talmas reported that the SCA Bylaws state that the Chair of the PIC is to appoint the nominating committee members for the next year in October. The nominating committee consists of one representative from each of the 4 regional caucuses.

Chair Talmas reported that the current PIC Nominating Committee members are: Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific; Councilmember Ross Loudenback, North Bend; Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond; and Council President Ed Prince, Renton.

Chair Talmas continued that in order to have a mixture of experience and fresh voices on the PIC Nominating Committee, the PIC Chair has typically reappointed three of the existing members of the committee each year, and appointed one new member. Of the four members on this committee, Ross Loudenback and Hank Margeson have been on the committee the longest. Councilmember Ross Loudenback of North Bend, representing the Snoqualmie Valley Caucus, has graciously volunteered to step down from the committee. This creates a vacancy for one PIC member from the Snoqualmie Valley to serve on the committee.

SCA staff conducted outreach to PIC members from the Snoqualmie Valley to serve on the committee for 2016. Councilmember Amy Ockerlander of Duvall has volunteered to serve. Chair Talmas invited nominations from the floor. Seeing no nominations from the floor, Chair Talmas continued with his appointments.

Chair Talmas reappointed Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific; Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond; Council President Ed Prince; and appointed Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall as members of the 2016 PIC Nominating Committee.

Chair Talmas thanked Ross Loudenback for his years of service, and welcomed Amy Ockerlander to the committee. This committee has a very important role and focuses the future of the organization. Chair Talmas thanked all of the PIC Nominating Committee members for their hard work.

8. Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee 2016 Agenda

Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, provided an update on the activities of the Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee (RLSJC) and plans for the committee’s 2016 activities. Tukwila Council President Kate Kruller is the caucus chair for RLSJC and also serves as the Vice Chair of RLSJC. Next year, she is slated to chair the committee. PIC Members Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, and Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, are also members of RLSJC. In addition to SCA’s eight members, the RLSJC includes members from law enforcement; prosecution; superior, juvenile, district, and municipal courts; the county jail; state corrections; and other representational categories that are required by the state law that requires that such a law and justice council exist.

The RLSJC meets seven times a year to discuss issues broadly related to the fields of the law, safety, and justice, with each meeting typically centering on a theme. Tonight’s packet, page 31, lists the topics discussed by the RLJSC in 2015. Discussion at the RLSJC is meant to bring awareness to changes in the law and best practices and also to foster regional and cross-system collaboration.
Caucus Chair Kate Kruller and members of the caucus have been planning for 2016, during which leadership will rotate to SCA. So far, the following list of potential topics has been generated, with longer descriptions are included in tonight’s packet, page 32: juvenile justice, a state legislative update, disaster preparedness, surveillance equipment and body cameras, performance metrics and law enforcement, gangs, street racing, safety and fire operations, police community outreach, sexual assault, marijuana, racial disproportionality and cultural competency, heroin and opioids, and property crime. Wilson-Jones concluded by asking members to contact her with any ideas that come to them after tonight’s discussion.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, stated that RLSJC is a meeting of the City of Seattle, King County, and Sound Cities Association. Leadership rotates through these three bodies, and 2016 will be SCA’s year to put forward issues for discussion at the RLSJC.

Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, suggested two topics: heroin and the LEAD (Law Enforcement Assisted Diversion) program. Talmas stated that heroin is a huge issue in Woodinville, despite the town’s small size. With reference to LEAD, King County Prosecutor Dan Satterberg gave a pre-PIC presentation in which he stated that the program is seeking resources and that he wants to expand the program countywide and would like support from SCA to push that forward.

Councilmember Bob Keller, Sammamish, suggested underage drinking and driving, and noted that alcohol is still the number one drug for high school kids.

Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific, suggested adding youth usage of marijuana.

Deputy Mayor Dan Grausz, Mercer Island, suggested body cameras. In discussions with the Mercer Island police chief about body cameras, Grausz has heard that public records issues continue to be an obstacle.

Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, stated that body cameras were discussed briefly at the September 9, 2015 PIC meeting as an issue for the PIC to possibly discuss further. Mayor Denis Law, Renton, has been having conversations with King County Sheriff John Urquhart about body camera legislation. Law brings an added perspective to those discussions as a former newspaper owner. Dawson noted that she, Law, and members of the SCA Board would be meeting with the Sheriff to discuss, and noted that staff will come back to the PIC and RLSJC with more information about body cameras and legislation being developed for 2016.

Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, stated that Lake Forest Park had body cameras a few years ago but discontinued using them because of public records and records keeping issues. Stanford also supported marijuana as a topic.

Councilmember Bill Peloza, Auburn, suggested sex trafficking as a topic, and stated that The Seattle Times recently reported on a large trafficking case.

Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, also spoke to body cameras. Ladenburg suggested a possible option could be to limit public records requests for footage in two ways. First, by
disallowing blanket requests, and second, by requiring that requests be specific as to the video requested. Body cameras collect so much information that fulfilling broad public records requests could quickly cut into city budgets.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, stated that there are several regional anti-crime teams, such as the Auto Theft Tactical Analysis Center for King County (ATTACK), that are funded by state funds that are focused on car theft and drugs. He suggested a topic focusing on the efforts of these groups.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, said the King County Sheriff spoke to RLSJC about body cameras about a year ago. At that time, the Sheriff discussed conversations with the national and local ACLU organizations, and disagreements between those two entities. Marts suggested the RLSJC discuss drones and disaster response in 2016. With reference to disaster response, Marts stated that a number of issues emerged with drones after the Oso landslide. There are also open questions with reference to drones being used for police surveillance and the appropriate legal framework for drones being used over public and private properties.

Peloza noted that while sexual assault has been included in the list of potential 2016 topics, domestic violence should also be added.

Dawson stated that there is also a Domestic Violence Initiative (DVI) Regional Task Force that works on domestic violence issues, but that it would be good for RLSJC to consider domestic violence as well. Dawson also highlighted the October Did You Know item, contained in tonight’s PIC Packet, which notes that October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Dawson suggested members take note of the silhouette cutouts featured in the Renton City Hall lobby, which tell the story of domestic violence victims, and Kruller noted that the trees out front of Renton City Hall had been adorned in purple lights as part of the Purple Light Nights campaign.

9. Potential Amendment to Countywide Planning Policies re Affordable Housing
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, provided an overview of the proposed amendment. The King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) include policies on affordable housing. At the November 6, 2015 Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) meeting, the City of Seattle will be proposing an amendment to one of the CPPs, H-8 to the proposal would be to include language that states that jurisdictions consider a full range of programs, including mandatory programs when looking at meeting affordable housing targets.

While the IJT members, staff to the GMPC, had no concerns with the proposal, some cities expressed concerns that this would result in additional workload and that they were unclear as to what “consider” means in the policy. SCA staff has been working with Seattle staff to come up with language that meets Seattle’s needs but doesn’t place undue burdens on cities. Booth noted she is confident that we will have language for the November 6, 2015 GMPC meeting that meets Seattle’s needs but also addresses the concerns for our member cities. Booth asked for feedback on both the substance of the proposal and the timing of the proposal; Seattle has suggested the policy be acted on in one meeting as opposed to the more typical two meeting cycle.
Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, said that Kirkland would support the policy if it was permissive but not prescriptive.

Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, agreed that the policy should not contain mandates. She questioned the need for the policy. Booth responded that according to Seattle, neither state law nor county policy addressed mandatory affordable housing programs. Seattle wanted to see a specific reference to mandatory programs in the CPPs.

Councilmember Tom Stowe, Beaux Arts Village, stated that he felt the proposal was an unnecessary addition to the CPPs; that each city already had the ability to have this language in their regulations. He was concerned that it would create an additional cost for compliance for small cities.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, agreed with previous speakers and noted that Redmond has a mandatory inclusionary housing policy in place already. He expressed concern that the policy would put a burden on other cities and given that, did not think the policy as written was one the City of Redmond could support, though he noted that support could be possible if the policy said “may consider.” He encouraged Seattle to reach out to other cities that already have such policies to learn from their experiences.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, noted that language stating that a program be “considered” does not imply that a program is mandatory. Shoreline is fine with the proposal and would be fine with a revised proposal that met the needs of other member cities as stated.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, noted that in Tukwila, they are working on preserving the housing they have through restoring or replacing existing housing. She shared a previous challenge Tukwila faced with ambiguous language in a proposed policy. She was not supportive of the proposed language.

Mayor Jim Berger, Carnation, noted that in Carnation they had challenges getting any development to occur. He felt getting Carnation’s support of the proposed language would be difficult.

Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, stated that he is not sure what problem Seattle is trying to fix with the policy.

Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, noted that Woodinville has an optional affordable housing policy that yields additional benefits for developers. He did not support moving up the timeline for approving the policy.

Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, stated that he appreciated that Seattle is trying to solve an issue that is regional. He asked if Edie Gillis, City of Seattle staffer, wanted to speak to the proposal. Gillis noted that Seattle has a huge need for affordable housing and wants the language to support some of the 60 recommendations that came out of the HALA report. Gillis stated that Seattle wants to come up with language that works for SCA members and helps Seattle deal with a crisis in affordable housing.
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, noted that she had exchanged some potential language changes of the policy with Seattle staff, and would continue to work to find language that would address Seattle’s needs, while addressing the concerns raised by member cities.

Deputy Mayor Dan Grausz, Mercer Island, was concerned about the reference in the policy to “each city’s share” of affordable housing, without reference to how those targets would be established.

10. E911 Oversight
Chair Talmas introduced the item, noting Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, provided an update to the PIC on recent developments on establishing a process to develop a regional E911 strategic plan. She passed out two handouts (Attachments B and C): a new ordinance with an attached email from Regional Policy Committee (RPC) Vice Chair Talmas expressing support for the ordinance, and an email from NORCOM Director Tom Orr and a coalition of 9 PSAPs in support of the ordinance. Dawson summarized the work that was done to build consensus and address the needs of all stakeholders including SCA, the PSAPs, Seattle, and the County. She complimented the work of SCA’s representatives to the RPC in building this consensus, and noted that this was a good example of the value of SCA in creating solutions. She thanked staff at the County and Seattle for working closely with SCA on this item, particularly noting the hard work of County Council Policy Staff Director John Resha. Dawson noted that this would help the region move forward on the work of implementing Next Gen E911, which would allow citizens to (among other things) send text messages to 911.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, echoed Dawson’s thanks to the staff at the County and Seattle. He noted that this proposal was very close to the earlier proposal from SCA members on the RPC, and that working with other stakeholders to address concerns had made the proposal better. He noted that this was a process of compromise, and that no group got all that they wanted. He thanked Dawson and SCA for the work of getting to this point. He noted that the vote in support of the ordinance at RPC was unanimous.

Dawson summarized some of the provisions of the ordinance, including that it provided for seats on the governance committee for PSAP Directors. It also contained a new provision of a seat for an elected Fire Commissioner. SCA will have 3 seats on the committee. The County Council will have 3 seats, Seattle 2, and Bellevue 1. The Executive and Sheriff will each have a seat. There will also be a staff committee, with balanced representation. Margeson echoed that the committees had very balanced representation.

Dawson noted that SCA would have 14 days after adoption of the ordinance to make appointments. This may not allow for the normal appointment process, and for nominations to go through PIC and the Board. She asked if the PIC would support staff working with members of the Nominating Committee and Board leadership to seek feedback and recommend appointments without going through the normal process. The PIC supported this.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, asked what compromises SCA had to make, and what was lost in the negotiation process. Margeson responded that SCA had initially proposed 4
seats for SCA members. Dawson also noted that there was extensive debate and negotiation over various aspects of the language of the ordinance and the roles of various entities.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, echoed the comments of Margeson and complimented Dawson, joking that she deserved an award as “cat herder of the year” for her work to bring the parties together. He noted that while no one group got everything they wanted, they all gained a lot through the process of negotiation and compromise.

Councilmember Bill Peloza, Auburn, noted the importance of the PSAPs in this process. He noted that the PSAPs would provide needed technical expertise on the committee. He noted that Dawson had worked long hours, and had reached out to him and other RPC members to seek their feedback over the weekend.

Chair Talmas echoed the comments of others, and noted the importance of getting buy in from all stakeholders.

11. Service Guidelines Task Force
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reminded the PIC that the Metro Service Guidelines Task Force was established to make recommendations about adding, reducing and changing transit service. Seven SCA representatives were members of the Task Force: Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie; Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn; Mayor Suzette Cooke, Kent; Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline; Mayor Jim Ferrell, Federal Way; and Mayor John Marchione, Redmond.

Kuciemba stated that over a total of eight Task Force meetings, two technical workshops, and several smaller caucus meetings, Task Force members were required to develop a thorough understanding of how Metro’s transit system works, including many technical details. Ultimately, members reached unanimous consensus in approving a Service Guidelines Task Force Final Report, which includes revised Principles and Recommendations. The Final Report will be distributed to the PIC upon completion.

Kuciemba explained that the Task Force included the following recommendations under the framework of social equity: revise the point system to allow for a scaling of points of low-income and minority scores and address the needs of youth, elderly and persons with disabilities.

Under the framework of changes to geographic value, the Task Force recommendations included: revising the point system to allow for a scaling of points to better account for the importance of connecting centers; ensure minimum service level for each service type; develop strategies utilizing park-and-rides more efficiently; and including park and rides in to the corridor scoring. SCA members of the Task Force recently added a principal stating that “when reducing service, Metro should consider the relative impacts to all areas of the county and work to minimize or mitigate significant negative impacts in any one area.”

Since the September 2015 PIC meeting, Task Force members found agreement on a new service type called “Peak Policy Emphasis.” Kuciemba explained that this new option has the effect of identifying fewer peak-only routes for cuts in a reduction scenario, spreads reductions more
evenly across the county, and includes the lowest percentage of hours cut in low-income and minority areas in a reduction scenario than any of the other options. Additionally, the new option protects regional connections to centers; provides additional protection for Dial-a-Ride Transit services and community shuttles; and provides additional protection for peak-only service that tends to travel farther distance to start routes and has more deadhead trips. Kuciemba reiterated that Task Force members felt strongly that the Alternative Services program should be increased to address service needs where fixed routes may not be warranted, or to seed new markets, or to better provide connections for rural communities. The Final Report also includes a recommendation for a new alternative service metric to more accurately measure performance and enhance planning with local communities and jurisdictions.

Task Force members made recommendations to use service planning and a community engagement process to more thoroughly assess service reductions or investments, including assessment of the origins and destinations of riders. A new mobility metric is being developed to measure how many locations a rider can travel throughout the transit network and Metro has been asked to better define partnership programs. In planning for the future, the Task Force recognized that there’s an ongoing need to support the growth of transit resources but Metro will need to be held accountable, demonstrating transparency and increased communication with the public and local jurisdictions.

Kuciemba stated that briefings will be given to King County’s Transportation, Economy and Environment Committee (TrEE) on October 20, 2015 and to the Regional Transit Committee (RTC) on October 21, 2015. Briefings are being scheduled for interested stakeholders, including city councils and the King County transportation boards. Kuciemba encouraged PIC members to contact her if there is interest in scheduling a briefing.

The Service Guidelines Task Force Final Report will be incorporated into the Strategic Plan for Public Transportation and the King County Metro Service Guidelines, both due to the County Council on December 15, 2015; the 2016 transmittal of the Long Range Plan; and the 2017-2018 biennial budget process. It is anticipated that the Regional Transit Committee will review the Strategic Plan and the Service Guidelines Update in the 1st and 2nd quarter of 2016 with action possibly in April 2016.

Kuciemba concluded by stating that the Task Force’s recommendations will need to be integrated into the long-range planning process and resulting plan. It is important that cities and jurisdictional staff are engaged in development of the Long Range Plan to help shape transit service for the next 25 years.

SCA President Matt Larson, Snoqualmie Mayor, thanked King County Executive Constantine for convening the Service Guidelines Task Force in response to chronic complaints about the way King County Metro has implemented the Service Guidelines. SCA members have expressed concerns about unfair criteria, express routes competing with all-day routes, and routes that suffer because of greater deadhead runs. For as many frustrations that were felt during the process, great work had been done by SCA representatives on the Task Force to address issues of concern to many cities. While there were surprises in the outcomes of Metro analysis, Larson
felt satisfied with the final recommendations because the Task Force identified fair ways in balancing the needs of the whole system through consensus. Larson reflecting that the original 40/40/20 Metro service policy had good intentions but didn’t work because it required growth in the system. Larson stated that conversations need to occur with regional leaders about how to grow the system by reflecting on lessons learned from previous ballot measures.

Chair Talmas thanked Larson and other SCA representatives for their service on the Service Guidelines Task Force.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, requested that a copy of the pre-PIC presentation given by King County Metro and Sound Transit on the Future of Transit be provided to PIC members.

12. Farmers Market and Temporary Event Fees
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, summarized proposed fee increases for farmers markets and temporary events last discussed by the PIC on September 9, 2015 and provided an update regarding changes made to the proposed fee structure since that discussion. The Board of Health is scheduled to consider these fees October 15, 2015. PIC Member Mayor David Baker is the SCA Board of Health Caucus Chair.

The Board of Health regulates food businesses to ensure public safety. Under Board of Health regulations, the Environmental Health Services (EHS) Division of Public Health – Seattle & King County collects permit fees from vendors to cover the costs of oversight activities like plan reviews and inspections. County policies require that those fees recover the full cost of EHS services, and state law prevents the fees from being set any higher than is necessary for cost recovery.

While the Board of Health updated other fees charged by EHS earlier this year, farmers market and temporary event fees were not adjusted at that time because the then proposed fees were deemed to be too high. EHS staff have since worked to redesign the permitting structure to achieve greater savings and convenience for permittees with the goal of maintaining food safety. As broader context, EHS was recently involved in locating and containing an E. coli outbreak at a farmers market vendor that resulted in several children being treated at a hospital for kidney failure. That outbreak provides an example of what the Board of Health regulations aim to prevent through permitting and EHS oversight.

The redesigned permitting structure and accompanying fees reviewed by the PIC in September are summarized in tonight’s PIC packet, page 101. As discussed last month, this proposed fee structure differs from the current one in several ways. First, fees would be based on the risk associated with the types of ingredients and food preparation method used. Currently, there are just two permit fee categories—the fee for foods on an itemized “Limited Foods” list and any other foods. Second, vendors would have the opportunity to apply for a single permit to cover multiple or unlimited events in a year. Currently, a temporary event vendor must apply for a permit for each event they attend. Farmers market vendor permits are good for a season at a given market location, but the new multiple and unlimited permits would allow those vendors to apply for a single permit to attend multiple market locations. Third, event organizers could cover permitting for all vendors by getting a “blanket permit” at a rate of $215 per hour
of EHS service. This is how the organizers of the Puyallup Fair handle food permitting and would be a new option in King County.

The feedback from the PIC in September was that proposed changes to the permit structure allowing greater flexibility for permittees, particularly vendors who attend multiple events and organizations that host multiple vendors, should be encouraged, but that proposed fee increases for single event permittees were too high. Since September, EHS staff have reduced the fee for the permit category that would have seen the most dramatic increase. For the medium risk single event or market permit, the fee previously proposed was $320. These vendors currently pay $55 or $281. The revised fee proposal now before the Board of Health brings the fee down from $320 to $290. To accommodate this reduction, the highest fee has also been adjusted. The high risk unlimited permit was increased from $825 to $850.

Finally, EHS has now proposed updated fees for farmers market coordinators. Currently, Farmers Markets are charged a “coordinator” fee of $502. EHS had previously proposed to increase the fee to $1,136 for all markets, but received feedback from markets that fees should be based on market size, and not be a blanket fee. The new proposed fee structure, on page 102 of the PIC packet, has fees ranging from $780 to $1,200.

Feedback from stakeholders so far has been that they see their feedback incorporated into the new permit structure, but that fees continue to be too high. Farmers markets in particular disagree with the requirement that fees be based on a full cost-recovery model, as county policy requires.

Councilmember Bill Peloza, Auburn, asked for clarification on the proposed farmers market fee structure and how it would impact produce vendors at farmers markets. Wilson-Jones explained that the permit requirements apply to vendors who sell prepared foods at farmers markets and that produce vendors are not required to pay these permit fees.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, asked whether temporary events would be eligible to for the new permit that allows an organizer to cover all permitting. Wilson-Jones explained that the proposed blanket permit would indeed allow organizers of temporary events to handle the permitting for all their vendors at a rate of $215 per hour for all services provided.

Mayor Jim Berger, Carnation, expressed concern that the EHS hourly rate of $215 per hour seems too high. Wilson-Jones stated that the EHS hourly rate covers costs associated with administering a given permit, including plan review and inspection, as well as county overhead costs and offered to follow up with materials giving a more detailed breakdown of the components of this rate.

Councilmember Janie Edelman, Black Diamond, spoke to the rate of $215 and said that overhead plays a large part in how such rates are constructed.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, asked whether the goal of the proposed fees is to cover current costs or to expand services and broaden the scope of the program. Wilson-Jones answered that the fees are intended to recoup the existing costs associated with implementing
Board of Health regulations and are not designed to cover new costs. Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, added that EHS is not expanding their services, but rather is setting fees to cover costs in accordance with the cost recovery mandate.

Kruller asked whether there has been an assessment of what the market can bear and whether the fee increases can be afforded by vendors and markets. Wilson-Jones stated that the fees are based on a full cost recovery model, as required by the county, and the impact on markets has not been evaluated and is not taken into account.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, stated that the Board of Health should continue to find efficiencies.

Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, reminded the PIC that the Board of Health is scheduled to vote on the proposed fees October 15, 2015. Dawson stated that SCA Board of Health members will receive the feedback the PIC has provided in advance of taking a position on the fees.

13. **Bridges and Roads Task Force**
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, summarized the charge of the King County Bridges and Roads Task Force which was last discussed by the PIC on September 9, 2015. City representatives to the Task Force include: SCA President Matt Larson, Snoqualmie Mayor; Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall; Bob Harrison, Issaquah City Administrator.

Kuciemba reflected that SCA members have indicated their support in identifying efficiencies and funding strategies for regional road networks, particularly connector roads. However, not all rural roads are a regional priority. PIC members stated that cities and their residents should not be responsible for funding the roads and bridges in unincorporated King County.

Since the September PIC meeting, Kuciemba reported that two additional Task Force meetings have occurred on September 16, 2015 and October 14, 2015. At the September 16, 2015 meeting, King County Executive Constantine stated that the County cannot maintain the bridges and roads in rural or unincorporated areas on their own or by simply raising taxes on unincorporated residents. Therefore, the challenge of funding bridges and roads will require a community-wide effort.

Three presentations followed Executive Constantine’s welcome at the September 16, 2015 meeting. First, an outside hired consultant concluded that Road Services Division (RSD) estimate of need is based on reasonable methods and assumptions, that RSD generally used the best information available, and estimates reflect current understanding of asset condition and capital replacement needs.

Dwight Dively, King County Budget Director, provided the second presentation, stating that nearly 80 percent of RSD funding comes from property taxes within unincorporated areas. However, the cap on property tax revenue of one percent (plus the two percent of the value on new construction), has significantly reduced the amount of revenue RSD could potentially bring in without such limitations. Sales tax revenue is weak with less than 4% of commercial activity
in unincorporated areas. Therefore, the County is at a significant disadvantaged largely due to how King County implemented the Growth Management Act.

The final presentation by RSD staff provided an overview of ways the Division has addressed the funding challenges including: prioritizing core services to prevent and respond to operational life safety and property damage hazards; reductions of staff by 45 percent; and reducing road inventory by transferring some orphaned road segments, vacated rights of way and limited new roads.

Kuciembala stated that Task Force members were asked to make recommendations related to bridges and roads efficiencies, infrastructure, revenues and funding, and outreach. With help from SCA member cities staff, a list of recommendations and concerns was provided to the Bridges and Roads Task Force.

Kuciembala concluded her report by stating that members were asked to narrow down over 130 recommendations to a short list at the October 14, 2015 meeting. Several recommendations that garnered interest were: reducing the number of miles that the County is responsible for maintaining; removing the 1% cap on property taxes; developing partnerships with cities around maintenance of roadway; generating revenue on a countywide basis for cities and county; proposing the outlaw of studded tires; eliminating the diversion of road funds to other uses, such as the Sherriff’s Office; and more work in categorizing the distinction between a road of regional significance and a localized road.

Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, stated that it has been an interesting process to serve as a member of the Bridges and Roads Task Force. Ockerlander expressed that it was a considerable challenge to reduce the list of over 130 recommendations provided by Task Force members in the limited time given. Identifying nearly $300 million of new revenue, cost savings, or legislative change is a weighty task. Ockerlander is cautiously optimistic that Task Force can conclude their work by January 2016 and feels that it’s bringing together a diverse group of perspectives to discuss the challenges of the transportation system.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, objected to a legislative proposal to outlaw studded tires because of the significant safety assist studded tires provide to drivers who live on steep hills.

Chair Talmas questioned Ockerlander, who had previously been employed by Snohomish County, about the difference between the King and Snohomish County financial challenges considering they have a similar number of road miles to manage. Ockerlander responded that Snohomish County was nimble in their reduction of staff during the Great Recession, whereas King County had 19 different unions to negotiate with. Ockerlander believes that, if needed, staffing reductions would occur much more quickly with the current leadership at King County.

Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, inquired if the Task Force recommendation included a budget increase for the Road Services Division or if there were discussions of performance measures for RSD employees. Ockerlander responded that there weren’t discussions of performance measures; however, Task Force members suggested consolidating the unions.
Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, recalled that Tukwila asked the County to use their snow plows that were idle last year. Kr Muller also commented that Snohomish County may not have as many cities to provide services to.

14. Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that an updated list is included in the meeting material packet. She noted that the list is separated into categories of potential future ballot measures: SCA member cities; other cities; King County; and special purpose districts. Kuciemba asked that members provide SCA staff with any updates to the list.

Council President Ed Prince, Renton, stated that the Renton Regional Fire Authority ballot measure will be on the April 2016 ballot.

Councilmember Bill Boyce, Kent, stated that the Kent School District bond will be slated for 2016.

Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, stated that the Highline School District is putting together an exploratory group to address potential levy needs.

15. SCA Issues for 2015
Chair Talmas recognized Issaquah Councilmember Tola Marts to suggest a new issue for SCA staff to track. Councilmember Marts stated that there is an emerging issue that comes about from a change in Washington state law regarding donation of prepared food. Marts continued that many of the programs for senior citizens provide food that is cooked in a private home. He asked that SCA staff add this item to the list of issues as it may be of importance to other municipalities as well.

Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, provided an overview of the items contained in the meeting materials. She noted that this was a way for members to track items. As new items are requested by members they will be added to the list. Once items have been taken up by the PIC, they will be dropped off the list contained in meeting materials.

Dawson referred to an item on the list regarding low impact development, and reported that the November pre-PIC workshop will focus on this topic.

Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, inquired if the handouts from the October pre-PIC workshop could be distributed electronically. Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, confirmed that electronic versions of the handouts will be made available. Nixon also inquired if PIC would be taking up the topic of ST3, particularly the framework for ST3 project selection. Dawson responded that staff had discussed bringing to PIC an item on general principles on which cities could agree, although taking a position on individual projects would likely be divisive. Nixon concurred, and noted that Kirkland was interested in PIC exploring general principles to guide the process. He offered to send some draft language to Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst.
Deputy Mayor Dan Grausz, Mercer Island, stated that the impact of the I-90 center roadway closure, coincided with the closure of the South Bellevue Park & Ride during East Link light rail construction, is going to impact not only Mercer Island, but the whole region. In general, his council is supportive of light rail, but Grausz expressed concerns about how the region will address the increased traffic volume on other roadways during construction of this project. He asked that this topic be explored by PIC.

Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, reported that the United Way is reducing its funding for programs for seniors. He expressed strong concerns on the impacts on seniors. Given that United Way has already made a decision on this point, Baker was unsure whether action by PIC would be possible. He noted that Kenmore and other cities may need to explore providing additional funding to senior centers and other services for seniors as a result of this. Dawson noted that the United Way is realigning their funding and focusing on more upstream work including funding for children’s programs, which has resulted in fewer dollars to support services for seniors. Dawson noted that this could have an impact on cities, as they may be asked to provide additional services to make up for the cuts from United Way. She asked if there was interest in exploring this issue further. Members agreed that there was. Dawson stated that Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, will work on this issue and bring back information to the PIC.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, requested the list of members on the Technical Advisory Committee and Community Advisory Group for Metro’s Long Range Plan. She commented on the poor timing of United Way’s decision to reduce funding for senior services as the baby boomer generation approaches the years where they will start to need services.

Marts suggested having a discussion about how municipalities allocate funds for human services.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, announced that he is hosting a meeting for small cities where King County Metro staff will be present to discuss issues related to transit planning, and citizen mobility. He extended an invitation to all SCA members to attend. Hill also mentioned that while this meeting will largely focus on issues that small cities are facing, all are welcome.

16. Informational Items
Chair Talmas reported that there is one informational item in the packet regarding member city efforts to address homelessness.

17. Upcoming Events
Chair Talmas noted that the next SCA Networking Dinner will be held on Wednesday, October 28, 2015, at 5:30 PM at Renton Pavilion Event Center.

The next Public Issues Committee Meeting will be held on Thursday, November 12, 2015, at 7:00 PM at Renton City Hall.

The SCA Annual Membership Meeting and Networking Dinner will be held on Wednesday, December 2, 2015 at 5:30 PM at the Renton Pavilion Event Center.
Chair Talmas reminded members to save the date for the Public Sector Economic Development Summit scheduled for December 11, 2015.

18. For the Good of the Order
Council President Kate Kruller reminded members that the Great Shakeout Earthquake drill is at 10:15 AM on October 15, 2015.

Deputy Mayor Nancy Tosta, Burien, discussed recent work being done by the South Central Action Area Caucus Group. There is a request out for Near Term Actions proposals. There are potential funding opportunities for implementing such actions in the future from the Puget Sound Partnership and EPA. Cities could coordinate to submit Near Term Actions, for example, to have a coordinated street sweeping program. (Information on the Near Term Action proposals can be found at http://www.govlink.org/sc‐puget‐sound‐action‐area/Index.htm.)

Councilmember Marlla Mhoon, Covington, reminded members that October is domestic violence awareness month. Many cities decorate trees with purple lights, an idea that started in Covington, to remember the victims who lost their lives from domestic violence, support those who survived domestic violence, and hope for those still living with abuse.

Councilmember Mhoon thanked SCA staff for their quick response to her request for information on recommended numbers of police officers, and which cities had mandatory garbage collection. She noted that SCA is a great resource.

Councilmember Mhoon announced that at the last Covington City Council meeting, the council approved an ordinance that requires mandatory garbage collection. She noted that the Council did not approve a proposal that she supported to have mandatory collection of compostable materials. She noted that some of the opposition to this was due to misunderstanding caused by referring to mandatory “yard waste” pick up. She noted the importance of referring to compostable materials, rather than yard waste, to increase understanding.

Council President Kruller announced that the month of October is national anti‐bullying month, and October 21, 2015 has been identified as Unity Day, to raise awareness against bullying.

19. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 PM.
2015 Roll Call – Public Issues Committee Meeting  
October 14, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Alternate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algona</td>
<td>Dave Hill</td>
<td>Dawn Dofelmire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>Nancy Backus</td>
<td>Bill Peloza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts Village</td>
<td>Tom Stowe</td>
<td>Richard Leider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>Janie Edelman</td>
<td>Tamie Deady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>Tris Samberg</td>
<td>Andy Rheaueme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>Nancy Tosta</td>
<td>Stephen Armstrong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>Jim Berger</td>
<td>Kim Lisk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>Barre Seibert</td>
<td>George Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>Marlla Mhoon</td>
<td>Margaret Harto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Melissa Musser</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>Amy Ockerlander</td>
<td>Will Ibershof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw</td>
<td>Mike Sando</td>
<td>Liz Reynolds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>Dini Duclos</td>
<td>Jeanne Burbidge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>Joseph Sabey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Tola Marts</td>
<td>Eileen Barber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>David Baker</td>
<td>Allan Van Ness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Bill Boyce</td>
<td>Dennis Higgins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Toby Nixon</td>
<td>Shelley Kloba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>Catherine Stanford</td>
<td>Tom French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Erin Weaver</td>
<td>Layne Barnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>Michael Luis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Dan Grausz</td>
<td>Benson Wong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>Debra Perry</td>
<td>Jim Manley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Lisa Jensen</td>
<td>Carol Simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Shawn McEvoy</td>
<td>Doug Osterman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>Ross Loudenback</td>
<td>Ken Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>Leanne Guier</td>
<td>Vic Kave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>Hank Margeson</td>
<td>John Stilin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Ed Prince</td>
<td>Armondo Pavone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>Bob Keller</td>
<td>Don Gerend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Barry Ladenburg</td>
<td>Mia Gregerson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Chris Roberts</td>
<td>Chris Eggen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>Henry Sladek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Kingston Wall</td>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Kate Kruller</td>
<td>Verna Seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>Bernie Talmas</td>
<td>Susan Boundy-Sanders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA</td>
<td>Deanna Dawson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katie Kuciembna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellie Wilson-Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doreen Bootth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kristy Cole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voting members are highlighted in **gray**, Cities represented are **bolded**.
Dear Regional Policy Committee (RPC) Chair von Reichbauer:

As Vice Chair of the RPC and Chair of the Sound Cities Association (SCA) caucus of the RPC, I am writing to urge your support of the attached ordinance to establish a planning framework to define the process to develop a King County regional 911 strategic plan. The SCA representatives to the RPC are supportive of your introducing the attached ordinance so that it can be referred to and acted on by the RPC this week, and allow us to move forward in a timely manner with the strategic planning process.

Over the past several weeks, County Council staff have done an excellent job of seeking input from the various stakeholders, including representatives from the public safety answering points (PSAPs), the Executive’s office, the City of Seattle, and the Sound Cities Association. We wish to thank these stakeholders for their engagement in the process, and Council staff for their hard work in putting that feedback into ordinance form. The ordinance itself has been thoroughly vetted by these stakeholders. It is the product of collaboration and compromise, and represents a fair and balanced approach that addresses the interests of these stakeholders.

The attached ordinance sets forth a process for establishing a strategic plan that will collaboratively identify the priorities of the King County E-911 system; guide the ongoing processes for decision making, funding and implementing those priorities; and mutually respect the county’s regional and PSAPs’ local roles and responsibilities within the system. This in turn will allow us to move forward with our shared regional goal of implementation of Next Gen E911 technology for the benefit of all our constituents.

We thank you and the Council for your consideration. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact SCA Executive Director Deanna Dawson at (206) 495-3265, or Deanna@soundcities.org.

Sincerely,

Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville
Vice Chair, Regional Policy Committee
Sound Cities Association Board Member, Public Issues Committee (PIC) Chair

Cc: King County Council
Regional Policy Committee (RPC) Members
John Resha, Policy Staff Director, King County Council
Beth Mountsier, Senior Legislative Analyst, King County Council
AN ORDINANCE establishing a planning framework to
define the process to develop a King County regional 911 strategic plan.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

1. King County's E-911 system is delivered through two integrated functions:
   a. The regional systems, infrastructure and databases to route 911 calls, which is delivered through King County E-911 program office; and
   b. The dispatch of resources from the police, fire or emergency service agencies, or any combination thereof, which is delivered through public safety answer points ("PSAPs") as determined by local jurisdictions.

2. The King County E-911 system is funded by E-911 excise taxes throughout the county and local PSAP funding.

3. King County distributes a portion of the E-911 excise tax to the local PSAPs to support technology investments and impacts relative to call routing; however, the majority of PSAP funding is provided by their jurisdictions and contract agencies through sources other than the E-911 excise tax.

4. Stewardship of the E-911 system and excise taxes requires balancing of the regional role of the E-911 program office with the role and
responsibility of the local PSAPs to ensure that E-911 service is provided throughout the county.

5. The King County E-911 system is facing a number of financial, strategic and technological challenges with the implementation of the Next Generation E-911 technology.

6. The King County council desires to establish, in partnership between the King County E-911 program office and the PSAPs, a King County E-911 strategic plan that will:

   a. Collaboratively identify the priorities of the King County E-911 system;

   b. Guide the ongoing processes for decision making, funding and implementing those priorities; and

   c. Mutually respect the county's regional and PSAPs' local roles and responsibilities within the system.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. A. The King County E-911 strategic plan scoping committee, consisting of a leadership group and a project coordination team, is hereby established.

B. The committee's purpose is to recommend a strategic planning process report by May 31, 2016. The report shall be filed in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers, members of the regional policy committee, the executive and the policy staff director. If the committee does not transmit the report by May 31, 2016, the executive is requested to transmit a report, meeting the criteria defined
in this section, by August 30, 2016. If the executive is filing a report, the report shall be filed in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers and members of the regional policy committee and the policy staff director.

C. The report shall recommend a collaborative process to develop a King County E-911 strategic plan to address priorities for the regional portions of the King County E-911 system and guide the ongoing process for decision making, funding and implementing those priorities, including:

1. The organizational structure for the strategic planning process;
2. A timeline and milestones for completion of the plan;
3. A regular reporting process to project stakeholders;
4. A recommended work group or groups and team or teams, or any combination thereof; and
5. Other issues as identified by the committee.

D. The report shall define the roles, shared vision and measurable goals of the regional King County E-911 system that is reflective of national best practices. In addition, the report shall also, at a minimum, address the planning processes and questions needed to:

1. Integrate with the state's E911 system and the responsibilities of local jurisdictions in their delivery of E-911 dispatch services;
2. Develop a ten-year technology investment strategy for the regional King County E-911 system with tactics and a process for adapting to evolving technology and service conditions;
3. Develop a ten-year sustainable financial plan for the regional King County E-911 system with tactics and a process for adapting to evolving financial conditions; and

4. Define an ongoing decision making or governance structure for implementing and achieving the vision and goals of the regional King County E-911 system, including a conflict resolution process.

SECTION 2.

A. The leadership group of the E-911 strategic plan scoping committee will finalize the recommendations to be included in the report. These recommendations shall be made by consensus, to the extent possible. In the absence of consensus, each member shall have one vote unless otherwise noted in this section.

The leadership group shall consist of:

1. Three King County councilmembers, consisting of the chair of the budget and fiscal management committee, the chair of the law, justice and emergency management committee and the council vice chair of regional coordination, or their successors;

2. Two city of Seattle councilmembers, recommended by the city of Seattle;

3. Three elected officials recommended by the Sound Cities Association;

4. One Bellevue councilmember, recommended by the city of Bellevue;

5. One fire district elected commissioner designated by the King County Council in the appointing motion;

6. The King County sheriff;

7. The King County executive;

8. One representative of public safety answering points ("PSAPs")

recommended by Valley Communications and NORCOM;
9. One representative of the PSAPs recommended by the city of Bothell, city of Enumclaw, city of Issaquah, Port of Seattle, city of Redmond, University of Washington and Washington State Patrol;

10. One representative of the PSAPs recommended by the city of Seattle; and

11. One representative of the E-911 program office, recommended by the executive, to be the nonvoting ex officio member and technical advisor to all committee deliberations.

B. The council shall appoint the members of the leadership group by motion. Within 14 days of the effective date of this ordinance the recommending agencies shall transmit an electronic copy of their appointment recommendations to the clerk of the Council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to the chair of the Council. In the appointment of leadership group members, the King County council should strive to balance the geographic distribution of members, including specific representation for the unincorporated areas of King County.

C. The leadership group shall transmit a progress report to the King County council by March 31, 2016, identifying the committee's decisions to date and work remaining before completion of the strategic planning process report. The report shall be filed in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers and members of the regional policy committee and the policy staff director or the policy staff director's successor.

SECTION 3. A. The project coordination team of the E-911 strategic plan scoping committee shall:
1. Develop options related to or recommendations for items on the leadership group's agendas;

2. Provide recommendations to the King County executive regarding scopes of work, requests for proposals and selection of consultants to support the E-911 scoping, strategic planning and interim advisory committee processes; and

3. Develop draft agendas, review materials and identify the resources needed to support leadership group deliberations.

B. The project coordinating team shall make recommendations by consensus, to the extent possible. When consensus cannot be achieved, then options shall be identified and transmitted to the leadership group. In the absence of consensus, decisions shall be made by majority vote. The members of the project coordination team and their voting authority shall consist of staff recommended by their respective organizations, including:

1. One representative of the PSAPs operated by Valley Communications and NORCOM;

2. One representative of the PSAPs operated by the city of Bothell, city of Enumclaw, city of Issaquah, Port of Seattle, city of Redmond, University of Washington and Washington State Patrol;

3. One representative of the PSAPs operated by the city of Seattle;

4. One representative of the PSAPs recommended by the King County sheriff;

5. One representative of the King County council; and

6. One representative of the King County E-911 program office recommended by the King County executive.
C. The council shall appoint the members of the project coordination team by motion. Within 14 days of the effective date of this ordinance the recommending agencies shall transmit an electronic copy of their appointment recommendations to the clerk of the Council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to the chair of the Council.

SECTION 4. A. The King County interim E-911 advisory group is hereby established. The advisory group's purpose is to advise and consult with the King County E-911 program office regarding technology, financial and system operational issues until completion of the E-911 strategic plan and implementation of an ongoing decision making and/or governance system. The advisory group shall provide comment and recommendations on the county's E-911 program office 2017-2018 budget proposal and financial, capital, operating, technology, and other issues as they emerge associated with the regional King County E-911 system, but shall not provide recommendations regarding the day-to-day operational issues of the E-911 program office. The advisory group may create subcommittees, working groups, or both, as needed. The advisory group's recommendations shall be made by consensus to the extent possible. In the absence of consensus, decisions will be made by majority vote. The members of the advisory group and their respective voting authority shall consist of staff designated by their respective organizations, including:

1. One representative from the King County E-911 program office shall serve in a nonvoting capacity;

2. One representative of the PSAPs operated by Valley Communications and NORCOM may exercise one vote;
3. One representative of the PSAPs operated by the city of Bothell, city of Enumclaw, city of Issaquah, Port of Seattle, city of Redmond, University of Washington and Washington State Patrol may exercise one vote;

4. One representative of the PSAPs operated by the city of Seattle may exercise one vote;

5. One representative of the PSAP operated by the King County sheriff may exercise one vote;

6. Each PSAP without a designated voting member may designate a nonvoting member.

B. The King County executive shall provide written notice including rationale for the actions to the advisory group and the King County council prior to the next scheduled meeting of the advisory group implementing any actions contrary to an advisory group-voted recommendation or impasse. The notice shall be filed in the form of a paper original and an electronic copy with the clerk of the council, who shall retain the original and provide an electronic copy to all councilmembers and members of the regional policy committee and the policy staff director.

C. This advisory group shall remain in effect until an ordinance is enacted repealing this section.

SECTION 5. A. The strategic plan scoping committee shall be supported by a nonvoting project manager designated by the executive and an independent professional facilitator who is not an employee of King County or any of the PSAPs. The facilitator shall present recommendations and options from the project coordination team and provide a fair representation of the project coordination team's deliberations.
B. The strategic plan scoping committee may also be supported by an independent technical advisor who has expertise in national emergency number association standards for governance, Next Generation E-911 technology and PSAP operations, national, state and regional authorities such as the Federal Communications Commission, and the Association of Public-Safety Communications Officials.

C. The strategic plan scoping committee may request that the executive retain other persons or organizations with additional subject matter expertise, as needed, which may include a strategic planning advisor or other persons.

D. The independent facilitator, independent technical advisor, or other resources per Section 5.C. requested to support the scoping committee shall be retained under contract by the executive, as recommended by the project coordination team and through the county procurement process.

SECTION 6. For the purposes of this ordinance, "consensus" means a decision that all members can generally support, even if it is not the preferred or specific choice of an individual member or members. For all groups with consensus voting established in this ordinance, any voting member may reject consensus and require a vote.
Kristy Cole

From: Deanna Dawson
Sent: Wednesday, October 14, 2015 10:13 AM
To: Kristy Cole
Subject: FW: PSAP Letter of Support for E911 Strategic Plan Scoping Ordinance 10112015

Importance: High

For pic handout.
Sent from my Windows Phone

From: Orr, Tom
Sent: 10/14/2015 10:07 AM
To: hmargeson@redmond.gov; btalmas@ci.woodinville.wa.us; awalen@kirklandwa.gov; bpeloza@auburnwa.gov; scooke@kentwa.gov; mayor@algona.wa.gov; john.okamoto@seattle.gov; kshama.sawant@seattle.gov; scooke@kentwa.gov; mayor@algona.wa.gov; john.okamoto@seattle.gov; kshama.sawant@seattle.gov; sally.bagshaw@seattle.gov
Cc: Deanna Dawson; M. Scott Sotebeer PhD; suecarr@u.washington.edu; Micki Singer (Micki.Singer@bothellwa.gov); ‘Erik Scairpon (EScairpon@REDMOND.GOV)’ (EScairpon@REDMOND.GOV); ChrisWI@issaquahwa.gov; Lora Ueland (lorau@Valleycom.org); Orr, Tom; ‘Jo.Baumgartner@wsp.wa.gov’ (Jo.Baumgartner@wsp.wa.gov); BHuebler@police.ci.enumclaw.wa.us; Baskin.K@portseattle.org; ronald.rasmussen@seattle.gov; ‘Patrick Butschli (Patrick.Butschli@kingcounty.gov)’ (Patrick.Butschli@kingcounty.gov); teffrem@seattle.gov; mbeard@kirklandwa.gov; Noel Treat (Noel.Treat@mercer.gov); Jim Torpin (jtorpin@northshorefire.com); JNichols@bellevue.gov; Mark Risen (MRisen@bellevue.gov); Miyake, Brad
Subject: PSAP Letter of Support for E911 Strategic Plan Scoping Ordinance 10112015

Dear City Members of the RPC:

Thank you for all your effort and work on behalf of the King County PSAPs and your significant role in drafting of the attached Ordinance! We also very much appreciate the efforts of Deanna Dawson in facilitating the many discussions.

The undersigned Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) are writing to urge your support of the attached ordinance to establish a planning framework to define the process to develop a King County regional 911 strategic plan.

Over the past several weeks, John Resha, Lise Kaye and other members of County Council staff, have done an excellent job of seeking input from the various stakeholders, including representatives from each of the undersigned PSAPs, the Executive’s office, the City of Seattle, and the Sound Cities Association. We wish to thank these stakeholders for their engagement in the process, and Council staff for their hard work in putting that feedback into ordinance form. The ordinance itself has been thoroughly vetted by these stakeholders. Although not all our requested edits were accepted, we believe the Ordinance strikes a reasonable balance between the interests of all stakeholders.
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Most importantly, it accomplishes our primary goal of creating a viable framework for all stakeholders to work collaboratively for many years to come. We welcome this opportunity to turn the corner on the last four years and to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to develop a strategic plan to identify and carry out the priorities of the King County E-911 system; guide the ongoing processes for decision making, funding and implementing those priorities; and mutually respect the county's regional and PSAPs' local roles and responsibilities within the system. This in turn will allow us to move forward with our shared regional goal of implementing Next Generation E-911 technology for the benefit of all our constituents.

We thank you and the Council for your consideration. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact NORCOM Executive Director Tom Orr at 425-577-5671 or torr@norcom.org; Redmond Commander Erik Scairpon at 425-577-5671 or EScairpon@REDMOND.GOV; or Valley Communications Director Lora Ueland at 253-372-1510 or lorau@Valleycom.org.

Signed,

King County PSAP Leaders:

Commander Erik Scairpon
Redmond Police Communications

Commander Chris Wilson
Issaquah Communications

Sue Carr
Technical Services Director
University of Washington Police Department

Lora Ueland
Executive Director
Valley Communications Center

Thomas R. Orr
Executive Director
North East King County Regional Public Safety Communication Agency (NORCOM)

Micki Singer
Support Services Manager
Bothell Police Department

Jo Baumgartner
Communications Manager
Washington State Patrol – District 2 Bellevue

Bob Huebler
Operations Captain
Enumclaw Police Communications
October 14, 2015

Councilmember Pete von Reichbauer, Chair  
Regional Policy Committee  
Metropolitan King County Council  
King County Courthouse  
516 Third Avenue, 12th Floor  
Seattle, WA 98104

CC:  King County Council  
Regional Policy Committee

RE:  Support for E911 Strategic Plan Scoping Process Ordinance 10112015

Dear Chair von Reichbauer,

The undersigned Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) are writing to urge your support of the attached ordinance to establish a planning framework to define the process to develop a King County regional 911 strategic plan.

Over the past several weeks, John Resha, Lise Kaye and other members of County Council staff, have done an excellent job of seeking input from the various stakeholders, including representatives from each of the undersigned PSAPs, the Executive’s office, the City of Seattle, and the Sound Cities Association. We wish to thank these stakeholders for their engagement in the process, and Council staff for their hard work in putting that feedback into ordinance form. The ordinance itself has been thoroughly vetted by these stakeholders. Although not all our requested edits were accepted, we believe the Ordinance strikes a reasonable balance between the interests of all stakeholders.

Most importantly, it accomplishes our primary goal of creating a viable framework for all stakeholders to work collaboratively for many years to come. We welcome this opportunity to turn the corner on the last four years and to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to develop a strategic plan to identify and carry out the priorities of the King County E-911 system; guide the ongoing processes for decision making, funding and implementing those priorities; and mutually respect the county’s regional and PSAPs' local roles and responsibilities within the system. This in turn will allow us to move forward with our shared regional goal of implementing Next Generation E-911 technology for the benefit of all our constituents.

We thank you and the Council for your consideration. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact NORCOM Executive Director Tom Orr at 425-577-5671 or torr@norcom.org; Redmond Commander Erik Scairpon at 425-577-5671 or EScairpon@REDMOND.GOV; or Valley Communications Director Lora Ueland at 253-372-1510 or lorau@Valleycom.org.

Signed,

King County PSAP Leaders:

[Signatures]

Commander Erik Scairpon  
Redmond Police Communications

Commander Chris Wilson  
Issaquah Communications
**Item 6:**
November 3, 2015 Election Results

**DISCUSSION**

**SCA Staff Contact**
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, Deanna@soundcities.org, 206-495-3265 (cell)

**Discussion Item**
Results from the November 3rd General Election can be found on the King County Elections website or the Washington State Secretary of State Elections website; however, results were not yet complete by the time of PIC packet distribution. At the November PIC meeting, SCA staff will report on regional and statewide election results such as King County’s Best Starts for Kids and Initiative 1366. PIC members are encouraged to participate in a round robin discussion to inform members about election results in their own jurisdictions.

**Background**
Listed below are the November 3, 2015 General Election levy and ballot measures which have been previously identified at the PIC.

### Ballot Measures -- SCA Cities

| Year | Month   | Jurisdiction      | Measure                                                        |
|------|---------|-------------------|                                                               |
| 2015 | November| Federal Way       | Advisory Ballot: Allowing Marijuana-Related Businesses         |
| 2015 | November| Kent              | Advisory Ballot: Sale, Possession, Discharge of Consumer Fireworks |
| 2015 | November| Maple Valley      | Advisory Ballot: Sale, Possession, Discharge of Consumer Fireworks |
| 2015 | November| Normandy Park     | Property Tax Rate for Basic Services                          |
| 2015 | November| Enumclaw          | Enumclaw Transportation Benefit District                       |
| 2015 | November| Kirkland          | Kirkland Aquatics and Recreation District                     |

### Ballot Measures – Other Cities

<p>| Year | Month   | Jurisdiction | Measure                                                        |
|------|---------|--------------|                                                               |
| 2015 | November| Seattle      | Transportation Levy                                          |
| 2015 | November| Seattle      | Initiative 122: Publicly-financed election campaigns/lobbying |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Best Start for Kids (Children, Youth, Families and Communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Office of Law Enforcement Oversight Charter Amendment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Si View Metropolitan Park District Operations &amp; Maintenance Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Tukwila Pool Metro Park District Prop - Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County Fire District 2 Multi-year Lid Lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County Fire District 10 Benefit Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County Fire District 28 Commissioner Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>South King County Fire &amp; Rescue Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County Water District 1 Commissioner Decrease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 7:
Regional Legislative Agendas Addressing Homelessness and Affordable Housing

UPDATE

SCA Staff Contact
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, doreen@soundcities.org, 206-495-3525
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, ellie@soundcities.org, 206-433-7167

SCA All Home (Formerly Committee to End Homelessness) Coordinating Board Members
Nancy Backus, Mayor of Auburn (All Home Executive Committee Member); Doreen Marchione, Kirkland Councilmember

SCA Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC) Members
Pam Fernald, SeaTac Councilmember; Ken Hearing, Mayor of North Bend (Caucus Chair); Jerry Robison, Burien Councilmember (Caucus Vice Chair); Paul Winterstein, Issaquah Councilmember

Other SCA Joint Recommendations Committee Members
Representing Joint Agreement Cities (Kirkland, Renton, Redmond, Shoreline)
Rob Beem, Shoreline Community Services Division Manager; Rob Odle, Redmond Planning and Community Development Director; Michael Cogle, Kirkland Deputy Director Parks and Community Development (Alt)

Representing HOME only Cities (Kent, Auburn, Federal Way)
Merina Hansen, Kent Housing and Human Services Manager

Update
In October, the All Home (formerly Committee to End Homelessness) Coordinating Board and Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC) each adopted a slate of 2016 state legislative priorities. Both committees work on regional homelessness and affordable housing issues and the state legislative priorities adopted by each were substantially similar. The purpose of this agenda item is to inform member cities about All Home and JRC’s legislative priorities. Because member cities have identified homelessness and affordable housing as key issues, cities may wish to consider including some or all of these items as part of their legislative agendas.

All Home Coordinating Board
All Home is the new name for the Committee to End Homelessness. As the PIC previously discussed (see July 8, 2015 PIC Packet, page 51), All Home adopted a new charter in June that replaced two of its former leadership bodies, the Governing Board and Interagency Council, with a new Coordinating Board. SCA is represented on the Coordinating Board by Auburn Mayor Nancy Backus and Kirkland Councilmember Doreen Marchione. The first meeting of the
All Home Coordinating Board was October 7, 2015. During that meeting, the Coordinating Board voted unanimously to adopt a slate of 10 state legislative priorities for 2016 (Attachment A).

Joint Recommendations Committee
In addition to SCA’s four appointees to the Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC), SCA member cities Shoreline, Redmond, Renton, Kirkland, Kent, Auburn, and Federal Way have representation on the JRC. A draft list of 2016 State Legislative Priorities was discussed by the JRC in September 2015 and, after a number of refinements made at the request of SCA members, was adopted October 22, 2015 (Attachment B). JRC also adopted a list of 2016 Federal Legislative Priorities, which are not the subject of this staff report.

Shared All Home and JRC 2016 State Legislative Priorities
All Home and the JRC each developed and approved their own sets of state legislative priorities. However, their adopted lists are largely consistent. The following eight state legislative priorities were adopted by both bodies (see Attachment A and Attachment B for the specific wording used by each):

- **Housing Trust Fund**: All Home and the JRC both prioritize funding for the Housing Trust Fund (HTF), as they did during the development of the biennial budgets in 2015. The 2015-2017 Capital Budget funded the HTF at $75 million for the biennium. The HTF is a primary state source of funding for developing affordable housing, and developments in King County have historically received up to 40 percent of the HTF funds. All Home requests that the Legislature “maintain or increase state funding for building homeless and affordable housing” and the JRC supports “funding the HTF at its highest possible level” if there is a supplemental capital budget in 2016.

- **Housing and Essential Needs Program**: All Home and the JRC seek to maintain funding for the Housing and Essential Needs Program (HEN), another priority that has carried over from the 2015 budget year. The 2015-2017 Operating Budget funded HEN at $59 million. HEN has provides rental and utility assistance to disabled adults with incomes below $339 per month. HEN is not a cash assistance program. Instead, HEN services, such as rental and utility assistance, are provided directly to landlords and utility companies.

- **Washington Youth and Families Fund**: All Home and the JRC both prioritize funding for the Washington Youth and Families Fund, a public-private partnership created by the Legislature in 2004 to fund services that assist families in remaining housed. Youth and young adults were added to the populations served by the fund in 2014. During the past ten years, the state has invested $20 million dollars in the fund to leverage an additional $38.75 million in private dollars for strategies to address homelessness. As with other budget priorities, All Home and the JRC also advocated for the Washington Youth and Families Fund during the 2015 session, during which the biennial budgets were developed. In the 2015-2017 Operating Budget, the Legislature appropriated $3 million to the fund. The fund, which is managed by Building Changes, has supported 36 agencies in King County for rapid re-housing and other programs.
• **Real Estate Excise Tax for Housing:** All Home and the JRC both prioritized providing an additional local funding option for affordable housing, a local option Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) specifically to make public investments in affordable housing. All Home’s adopted legislative priority calls for an additional .25% of REET capacity, while the JRC’s legislative priority advocates for up to an additional .25% of REET capacity.

• **Youth Consent to Share Information:** To receive funding through the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, our region must maintain a local Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) to collect client-level data and data on the provision of housing and services to those experiencing or at risk of homelessness. All Home’s legislative agenda includes advocating for a change in state law next session to allow minors over the age of 13 to share their information with the HMIS. The data would allow for better understanding of the needs of youths experiencing homelessness and effectiveness of services delivered. It would also provide better information about which youth from the child welfare system are showing up in the homeless youth system.

• **Fair Tenant Screening Act:** The Fair Tenant Screening Act would give prospective tenants the opportunity to pay one fee for one comprehensive tenant screening report that could be used to apply for multiple rentals for up to 30 days. Landlords could still require a special screening report but would have to cover the cost. Currently, landlords can require prospective tenants to pay for a new screening report with each new application, leading to mounting costs for would-be-renters seeking to become or remain housed in a tight rental market. Tenants participating in programs of the Seattle-Based organization Solid Ground reported that they spent an average of $166 per housing search on repeat screening reports. In 2015, **SHB 1257** passed the House but did not receive a hearing in the Senate Financial Institutions & Insurance Committee.

• **Source of Income Restrictions/Discrimination:** Under current state law, landlords may refuse to lease to prospective renters based on the source of their income. Source of income discrimination legislation would prevent landlords from denying tenancy solely on the grounds that the prospective tenant relies on a subsidy or unearned income, such as Section 8 housing vouchers or Social Security Disability Insurance, to pay all or a portion of their rent. Landlords would still have the right to reject applications from tenants without resources to pay the monthly rent or to deny tenancy on other legal grounds. In 2015, companion bills **SB 5378** and **HB 1565** did not advance from committee in their respective chambers. In King County, several local governments have already adopted ordinances preventing discrimination based on the prospective tenant’s source of income, including Kirkland, Redmond, Bellevue, Seattle, and King County.

• **Truth in Evictions Reporting Act:** Currently, all eviction proceedings may be noted on an individual’s consumer or tenant screening report, even if the tenant prevailed in the proceeding. This can create a barrier to accessing rental housing in the future. The “Truth in Evictions Reporting Act” would prohibit consumer reporting agencies from
including eviction records in consumer or tenant screening reports if the eviction suit did not result a judgment against the tenant, the tenant was restored to tenancy, or the judgement reflects rent left owed after the tenant substantially prevailed. This proposed legislation would also prohibit landlords from failing to renew a tenancy or refuse to rent to a potential tenant based on an eviction record sealed by the court. Consumer reporting agencies are already barred, under existing law, from including information such as bankruptcies from more than 10 years ago and adult convictions or paid tax liens from more than seven years ago, among other protections. In 2015, companion bills HB 1460 and SB 4376 did not advance from their respective chambers.

**All Home-Only State Legislative Priorities**

In addition to the eight shared state legislative priorities above, All Home adopted the following three priorities for 2016 (see Attachment A):

- **HEN Eligibility and Other Assistance Programs:** As described in the section above, JRC and All Home support maintaining funding for HEN. Additionally, All Home supports expanding HEN eligibility to cover people whose primary disability is chemical dependency. All Home’s legislative priorities also address the Aged, Blind, and Disabled (ABD) Cash Assistance Program, which provides extremely low-income adults with permanent mental health illness or permanent physical disabilities with up to $197.00 monthly in financial assistance while they apply for federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI). The ABD cash grant is then retroactively reimbursed to the state when people transition to SSI. All Home seeks an increase in this ABD cash grant and/or to revise HEN eligibility criteria to allow ABD recipients to also retain HEN benefits. Individuals receiving ABD and state funded Medical Care Services are currently ineligible for HEN benefits. Finally, All Home supports funding for SSI Facilitation Services, a program that assists disabled individuals with applying for federal SSI Benefits.

- **Certificate of Restoration:** ESHB 1553, which passed out of the House 97-0 in 2015 but did not advance from the Senate Law and Justice Committee, would create a process for those with criminal records to be granted a “certificate or restoration of opportunity.” (CROP). No state, county, or municipal government authorized to assess applications for professional licenses, qualifications to engage in a profession, or make similar determinations could disqualify a qualified applicant, who has received a CROP, based solely on the applicant’s criminal history. The legislation is meant to remove barriers to employment for adults and juveniles with a criminal history.

- **Improve Data Collection and Informed Consent:** The adopted 2016 state legislative priorities for All Home currently include legislation that would change the way information is collected for the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), a local system for collecting client-level data and data on the provision of housing and services to those experiencing homelessness. Currently, under state law, individuals must “opt in” to the system but All Home has advocated shifting to an “opt out” system to improve data quality and improve compliance with federal funding requirements. However, All Home will likely amend its legislative priorities and not pursue a change
legislatively in 2016. For that reason, this item was not included in the more recently adopted JRC 2016 State Legislative Priorities.

JRC-Only State Legislative Priority
In addition to the eight shared state legislative priorities, JRC adopted the following state priority for 2016 (see Attachment B):

- **Local Tool for Affordable Housing Preservation**: Jurisdictions are currently exploring creation of a local option Preservation Tax Exemption, which would give local jurisdictions the option to provide a targeted property tax exemption to the owners of existing properties who agree to restrict rents and income-eligibility for a portion of units within their properties for 15 years. In many communities, older buildings provide affordable housing options for low-income people, but the properties are often in poor condition. A preservation tax exemption would allow property owners to use those dollars to rehabilitate such properties to high health and quality standards without raising rents and causing displacement. Property owners in high rent areas with newer buildings could use the exemption to keep rents affordable.

Next Steps
Given the importance of affordable housing and homelessness in the region, member cities may wish to consider including some or all of these items as part of their city legislative agendas.

Attachments
- **All Home 2016 State Legislative Priorities**
- **Joint Recommendations Committee 2016 State Legislative Priorities**
2016 State Legislative Priorities

The Coordinating Board approved these priorities (in principle) on October 7th. As recommended by the Coordinating Board, All Home staff will establish a public policy workgroup to identify action steps and opportunities to move these items forward and to establish local policy priorities.

Revenue

Fund the Washington State Housing Trust Fund
Key partners: WLIHA, HDC
Objective: To maintain or increase state funding for building homeless and affordable housing.
All Home Work Plan Strategies →
   1.2 – Advocate and support partners to preserve existing and create more affordable housing,
   2.5 – Increase access to permanent housing
King County depends on state HTF to help fill the equity gap in every affordable and homeless housing investment we make. Increasing the HTF expands the impact of King County housing funds resulting in more homeless and affordable housing units built. Historically, King County developments have received up to 40 percent of HTF funds. For every $10 million invested in the HTF, up to $4 million can be invested within King County. When partnered with King County and other public and private funds, it is estimated that such investment would help build up to 67 homes of homeless and affordable housing serving 100 residents each year for at least 40 years.

Preserve the Housing and Essential Needs (HEN) Program
Key partners: WLIHA, SKCCH
Objective: Preserve, improve and sustain HEN assistance.
All Home Work Plan Strategies →
   1.1 – Advocate and align systems to prevent people from experiencing homelessness
Hold harmless HEN assistance (funded at $59 million in previous budgets), the Aged, Blind and Disabled (ABD) cash grant program, and SSI Facilitation Services. Improve the program by removing the current restriction on chemical dependency as primary disability; increasing ABD cash grant and/or; allowing ABD recipients to retain their HEN benefit for an extended period of time.

Support new local financing options through Real Estate Excise Tax for Housing (REET)
Lead: City of Seattle OH, WLIHA, Futurewise
Objective: Provide new local financing options to supplement existing tools to invest in affordable housing.
All Home Work Plan Strategies →
   1.2 - Advocate and support partners to preserve existing and create more affordable housing,
   2.5 - Increase access to permanent housing
2016 State Legislative Priorities

Add a new chapter to RCW 82.46 that would allow a city (planning under the Growth Management Act), via council action, to impose an additional Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) specifically for affordable housing. The additional .25% REET capacity, above and beyond the existing State cap, will allow local jurisdictions to make public investments in affordable housing. REET offers an opportunity to re-capture a portion of that value upon the transfer of property and reinvest it in critical affordable housing infrastructure.

**Fund the Washington Youth and Families Fund (WYFF)**

Key partner: Building Changes

**Objective:** Fund the Washington Youth and Family Fund to address homelessness at a systems level for youth and families.

**All Home Work Plan Strategies →**

1. **2.3 – Assess, divert, prioritize and match people with housing and supports,**
2. **2.4 – Right-size housing and supports to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness**

Over the past ten years $20 million dollars invested by Washington State has leveraged $38.75 million in private and philanthropic dollars for innovative strategies that address homelessness at a systems and youth/family level. The WYFF is a unique public-private partnership dedicated to making homelessness rare, brief and one-time by funding model strategies and innovative programs that address homelessness at the systems and family/youth level.

**Policy**

**Improve Data Collection and Informed Consent**

Lead: All Home, United Way, King County

**Objective:** Preserve McKinney funding ($39 million in WA State), by improving our statewide compliance with federal Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) standards.

**All Home Work Plan Strategies →**

1. **2.4 - Right-size housing and supports to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness**

Improve informed consent practices while improving participation rates, compliance with federal data quality requirements, and performance of emerging coordinated entry systems. This amendment would improve data collection and reinforce improved informed consent and accountability for those collecting data.

**Youth Consent**

Lead: All Home, United Way, King County

**Objective:** Allow youth under 18 to consent to participating in HMIS, providing greater capacity to understand the needs of youth and young adults in our system.

**All Home Work Plan Strategies →**

1. **2.4 - Right-size housing and supports to meet the needs of people experiencing homelessness**
2016 State Legislative Priorities

Amend legislation to address a recent Attorney General ruling to re-allow young people under 18 to consent to having their information included in the Homeless Management Information System (HMIS), mirroring RCW provisions allowing minors to consent to mental health treatment. With youth under 18 not having the ability to consent to participating in HMIS, our community has no capacity to understand the needs of youth and young adults in our system. Data included in HMIS with youth consent would provide information about which youth and young adults in child welfare are showing up in the homeless youth system. Inclusion of this data would also allow for better understanding of the effectiveness of under 18 interventions on preventing youth homelessness.

Certificate of Restoration
Lead: Partners for Our Children, SPAN
Objective: Reduce barriers to housing and employment for those exiting the criminal justice system through creation of a Certificate of Restoration.

All Home Work Plan Strategies →

1.1 - Advocate and align systems to prevent people from experiencing homelessness,
2.5 - Increase access to permanent housing,
2.6 – Create employment and education opportunities to support stability

The certificate would help reduce barriers to employment for adults and juveniles who have a criminal history. The legislation identifies the requirements necessary to apply for a certificate.

Source of Income Restrictions
Lead: HDC, WLIHA
Objective: Improve access to housing by preventing landlords from denying tenancy based solely on the grounds of the tenant relying on a subsidy or unearned income (such as Social Security Disability Insurance - SSDI) to pay all or a portion of their rent.

All Home Work Plan Strategies →

1.2 – Advocate and support partners to preserve existing and create more affordable housing,
2.5 – Increase access to permanent housing

Would still allow landlords to reject applications of tenants who do not have enough income/resources to meet the monthly rental payment, and to otherwise still deny tenancy on any other legal grounds.

Truth in Evictions Reporting Act
Lead: WLIHA
Objective: Improve access to housing by prohibiting consumer reporting agencies from including unlawful evictions in tenant screening reports.

All Home Work Plan Strategies →

2.5 – Increase access to permanent housing

Eviction court has many different outcomes. The tenant could have been wrongfully named, the tenant could have been a victim of their landlord’s foreclosure, or the tenant could have prevailed. But tenant
2016 State Legislative Priorities

reports list all eviction lawsuits as equal. No matter the outcome, tenants have a mark on their record. This mark makes accessing a rental home in the future much more difficult. This is particularly important as King County strives to meet state requirements to increase rental assistance dollars paid in the private market. The Fair Credit Reporting Act is amended to prohibit consumer reporting agencies from including eviction records in any consumer report, if: the eviction suit did not result in a judgment finding the tenant liable for unlawful detainer (eviction) or otherwise in unlawful possession of the premises; the tenant was restored to his or her tenancy; or the judgment reflects a residual amount of rent left owed after the defendant substantially prevailed in an affirmative defense, counterclaim, or set-off. The Residential Landlord Tenant Act is amended to prohibit consumer reporting agencies from including any information regarding a tenant’s prior involvement in such an eviction suit in a tenant screening report. A person injured by a violation of either of these provisions may bring a civil action to recover actual damages sustained, court costs, and reasonable attorney’s fees.

Fair Tenant Screening Act

Lead: WLIHA, Tenants Union, Solid Ground

Objective: Address the high costs of unnecessarily repeated tenant screenings by ensuring that if tenants can provide landlords access to an exhaustive and timely report, they cannot be charged for another report.

All Home Work Plan Strategies →
2.5 – Increase access to permanent housing

This is particularly important in keeping with the new requirement to increase rental assistance dollars paid in the private market. Additionally, evictions should be reportable on tenant screening reports only when a tenant is found guilty at the end of an eviction preceding.

All Home works closely with its partners to advance these priorities, including:
The 2016 Washington legislative session is a “short session” in an election year which is a great incentive for legislature to finish on time. With the biennial budget enacted last year, this year’s supplemental budget will likely be limited to appropriations necessary to meet the mandate by the State Supreme Court to adequately fund basic education.

1. Youth Consent

The Homeless Youth Act was passed last year to among other things, create the Office of Homeless Youth Programs (OHYP) to coordinate funding, policy, and practice efforts related to homeless youth and young adults by identifying service gaps and improving data collection so policies and programs are focused on the greatest needs. To implement data-driven programs and services, an amendment is needed to re-allow minors over 13 to share their information in Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). This data is used to provide information about which youth and young adults in child welfare are showing up in the homeless youth system. Inclusion of this data would also allow for better understanding of the effectiveness of under 18 interventions on prevention of youth homelessness.

2. Fair Tenant Screening Act

If tenants provide landlord access to an exhaustive and timely report, tenants should not be charged for another report. Renters will purchase a comprehensive online tenant screening report providing landlords the information they need to make the most informed decision. When renters provide access to this secure, online report, landlords will not be able to charge the tenant for additional reports. Landlords can however purchase another tenant screening report so long as they do not charge the tenant.

3. Source of Income Discrimination (SOID)

Eliminate discrimination against prospective renters solely due to their source of income. Currently, families receiving local housing vouchers, Housing Choice (Section 8) vouchers, seniors relying on social security income and Veterans using housing subsidies are all subject to denial of housing due solely on a landlord’s choice not to rent to people receiving housing or income subsidies. The legislation would prevent landlords from denying tenancy based solely on the grounds of the tenant relying on a subsidy or “public subsidy” (e.g. Housing Choice voucher, SSI, etc.) to pay all or a portion of their rent. Landlords could still reject tenants who do not have enough income/resources to meet the monthly rental payment and could still deny tenancy on legal grounds equally applied to all applicants.

4. Truth in Evictions Reporting Act

Eviction court has many different outcomes: the tenant could have been wrongfully named, the tenant could have been a victim of their landlord’s foreclosure, or the tenant could have won. But tenant reports list all eviction lawsuits as equal. No matter the outcome, tenants have a mark on their record. This mark makes accessing a rental home in the future much more difficult. This is particularly important as King County strives to meet state requirements to increase rental assistance dollars paid in the private market. Action is needed to prohibit consumer reporting agencies from including eviction records in any consumer report if the eviction suit did not result in a judgment finding the tenant liable for unlawful detainer or otherwise in unlawful possession of the premises; the tenant was
restored to tenancy; or the judgment reflects a residual amount of rent left owed after the defendant substantially prevailed in an affirmative defense, counterclaim, or set-off.

5. **Preserve the Housing and Essential Needs Program**

In 2011 the Disability Lifeline (DL) Program was dissolved. The Housing and Essential Needs (HEN) Program was created to provide a portion of the housing and essential needs assistance previously provided to people receiving cash assistance through DL. Since then, the program has provided rental and utility assistance statewide to over 13,000 disabled adults with incomes below $339 per month. HEN is an extremely important investment in stability for these households and an important part of King County’s efforts to end homelessness. Support efforts to protect funding the HEN program at its current level.

6. **Housing Trust Fund**

For every 100 families in King County, earning less than $23,400 a year for a family of three, only 30 affordable apartments are available. The State Housing Trust Fund (HTF) is a primary state source of equity for developing affordable housing across Washington State and an important source of leverage for housing programs in King County. The HTF is funded out of the capital budget. Last year, the legislature appropriated $75 million to the HTF for the biennium. If there is a supplemental Capital Budget, we support funding the HTF at its highest possible level. When the HTF is increased, the result is additional homeless and affordable housing units built for King County residents.

7. **Support Local Tools for Affordable Housing Production and Preservation.**

**Support Production:** Provide local governments with up to an additional .25 percent Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) capacity specifically for affordable housing via council action.

**Support Preservation:** Local jurisdictions would have the option to provide a targeted property tax exemption to the owners of existing properties who agree to restrict rents and income-eligibility for a portion of units within their properties for 15 years. The program would prevent displacement, provide resources for improvements to building health and quality and maintain affordable homes for residents with critical occupations like preschool teachers, healthcare workers and service industry employees.

These tools should be accessible to as many cities and counties as practicable statewide in order to allow for the production of housing. Working families should be able to afford a home and still have enough left over for basic necessities, like healthcare, food, and transportation costs. The average rent in King County is over $1,200 per month which could at best buy a 2-bedroom apartment in a few areas of the county. To afford this average rent households need to earn over $42,000 annually. Bank Tellers, janitors and home health aides are paid about $28,000 a year. Retail and wait staff about $25,000.

8. **Washington Youth & Families Fund**

The Washington Youth & Families Fund (WYFF) is a public-private partnership created by the legislature in 2004 to fund services for families that aim to keep them securely housed. Youth and young adults have been added as a population served by the fund to address the unique needs of youth not being met by the family or adult homelessness systems. Over the past ten years $17 million dollars invested by Washington State has leveraged $55.5 million in private dollars for innovative strategies that address homelessness at a systems and youth/family level. King County relies on these funds to make our homeless housing investments work. Last year the legislature appropriated $3 million to WYFF from existing Commerce resources. Private funds are available to match an additional $3 million state investment.
Item 8: Bridges and Roads Task Force

UPDATE

SCA Staff Contact
Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst, katie@soundcities.org, 206-433-7169

City Representatives on the Bridges & Roads Task Force
Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie; Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall; City Administrator Bob Harrison, Issaquah

Discussion Item
Since August 2015, the Bridges and Roads Task Force has been meeting to identify policy and fiscal strategies to maintain and preserve King County’s rural or unincorporated roads and bridges. The Task Force will next meet on November 12, 2015, the date of the November PIC meeting. At the November PIC meeting, SCA staff will provide an update on the short-listed Task Force recommendations, recognizing issues identified by PIC members and city staff.

Background
Background on the work of the King County Bridges and Roads Task Force can be found in the staff report provided at the September 2015 PIC meeting (see September 9,2015 PIC packet, page 68). More information on the Bridges and Roads Task Force can be found here.

Task Force members have been asked to make recommendations related to bridges and roads efficiencies, infrastructure, revenues and funding, and outreach. With help from SCA member cities’ staff, a list of recommendations and concerns was provided to the Bridges and Roads Task Force. Members continue working to narrow down over 130 recommendations to a short list (Attachment A), which will be included in the Task Force Final Report. The list provided to Task Force members does not specify who submitted the formal recommendation.

PIC members have indicated their support for identifying efficiencies and funding strategies for the future of regional road networks, including connector roads in unincorporated King County of regional significance to cities. However, PIC members have expressed concerns about cities and their residents being responsible for funding the roads and bridges in unincorporated King County, particularly when cities face their own challenges in funding transportation infrastructure. Further, PIC members have stated that if a group is convened to address countywide funding and coordination, it should include representatives from cities throughout the county.
Task Force Meeting #4
The Bridges and Roads Task Force held its fourth meeting on October 28, 2015. The meeting addressed questions about Road Services Division (RSD) funding options and refining the list of Task Force recommendations related to funding and efficiencies.

Dwight Dively, King County Budget Director, presented information in response to questions from Task Force members about potential funding options. Dively provided an overview of the 2015 State Transportation Package (Package), which allocates approximately $500,000 each in years one and two, then $1 million per year from the gas tax increase.

As a result of new rules in the Package, King County has the authority to implement a countywide Transportation Benefit District (TBD). If imposed by councilmanic vote, it would require crediting cities for the amount they have already approved through local TBDs and would require interlocal agreements with cities. Alternatively, the County could ask voters to approve a countywide TBD funding package which could include:

- Up to 0.2% sales tax increase (could raise up to $116 million annually);
- Vehicle license fee of up to $100 fee per vehicle (could raise up to $109 million annually);
- Additionally, TBD authority allows a lift of the 1% cap on property taxes if the County were to ask voters to approve a one-year excess levy which could be renewed annually by voters (could raise $4.2 million annually per one cent).

Beyond the new TBD authority, Dively discussed the advantages or disadvantages from a County standpoint for the following funding options in response to potential Task Force recommendations:

- An option to charge road users based on vehicle miles traveled, measured by license plate camera technology, odometer readings, or GPS data collection. It was concluded that this recommendation would need to be implemented on a regional or statewide basis to be effective.
- Transportation utility district fee. It was concluded that State legislative action would be required to provide authority for counties to implement.
- Motor Vehicle Excise Tax (MVET) reinstatement. It was determined that State legislative action would be required to allow local governments to collect an MVET.
- Impact fees. It was concluded the County would need legislative action from the State to propose an impact fee allowing the county to collect in cities for use in unincorporated areas. An impact fee for only the unincorporated area of King County would collect little revenue.

Related to potential funding recommendations, a majority of Task Force members indicated support for establishing a countywide TBD which would be used for regional roads (specific roads or jurisdictional owner have not yet been discussed or recommended); requesting legislative authority for the County to adopt a percentage of the MVET; and requesting that the Legislature lift the 1% cap on property taxes, which the County shall direct toward bridges and roads. A wide - and largely unvetted - range of other potential recommendations were considered by Task Force members without strong consensus including: a Real Estate Excise
Tax, transparency on diversions of the County Road Tax to other uses such as the Sheriff’s Office, Local Improvement Districts (LID), Road Improvement Districts (RID), crowd-funding, tribal contributions, lottery games, collection of donations at the gas pump, local option gas tax, and taxing auto parts.

In response to a potential recommendation to “re-visit and enforce the original Growth Management Act... which was supposed to distribute funds from metropolitan to rural areas,” city representatives to the Task Force requested additional information and background on the basis for this recommendation.

In regards to a potential recommendation to outlaw studded tires, members of the Task Force acknowledged that a ban would be unlikely to pass in the State Legislature.

There was strong consensus from the Task Force for King County to carefully examine which roads should be maintained by the County. Task Force members expressed there are some county roads that are regional in nature, and which may be the collective responsibility of residents throughout the county. There are other roads which are more local, and which should be maintained by the County, but only serve those residents of unincorporated King County. And there are other roads which the County should perhaps consider turning over to private ownership. Getting a handle on which roads should be maintained by the County, and at what level the roads should be maintained, is an important issue to the city representatives on the Task Force. Resolution of this issue may help to clarify the true scope of the County’s level of need.

**Task Force Timeline**

It is expected that the Task Force will submit a report with its recommendations to the King County Executive and King County Council in January 2016.

1. Wednesday, August 12: Charge of Task Force and Bridges and Roads 101 ([Presentation](#))
2. Wednesday, September 16: Roads Financial Situation and Action To-Date (Presentations: [Outside Assessment of Financial Need](#), [Primer on Roads Finances](#), [Road Services Business Reset](#))
3. Wednesday, October 14: Development of Task Force Recommendations
4. Wednesday, October 28: [Road Services Funding Options](#) (presentation) and Refinement of Recommendations ([Attachment A](#))
5. Thursday, November 12 – Mercer Island Community Center, 2:30 – 5:30pm
6. Wednesday, January 20 – Mercer Island Community Center, 3 – 6pm

**Next Steps**

The next meeting of the Bridges and Roads Task Force is scheduled for Thursday, November 12, 2015 where members will focus on finalizing the Task Force Report, including the final list of financial and outreach strategies. The Road Services Division is expected to provide a response to infrastructure recommendations from the Task Force. A final meeting will occur on January 20, 2016 where the Task Force will officially close-out after confirming implementation strategies for Task Force recommendations.
SCA staff will continue working with PIC members and jurisdictional staff to gather data in response to questions identified by Task Force members. Ongoing updates by SCA staff will be provided to members of the PIC.

Attachment
   A. Initial Short List of King County Bridges & Roads Task Force Recommendations
### Initial Short List of King County Bridges & Roads Task Force Recommendations – DRAFT v 10/23/15

**Key for the ID list below:** "E" = "Efficiencies"; "I" = "Infrastructure"; "R" = "Revenues & Funding"; "O" = "Outreach"; "KC" = "King County responsibility"; "SL" = "State or Legislative Role"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Explanation of recommendation</th>
<th>Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation</th>
<th>Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| E1 | Offer to let cities, locals or perhaps even groups of private citizens take over their own roads if they want; possibly even sell them the rights or charge something to indicate that the road has value | Create the appropriate legal guidelines then give or sell the roads to entities that want them and who can prove they will take care of them | Pro - Offloads maintenance costs  
Con - Could generate headaches if new hosts are incompetent | Group 1: Yes (long term and +)  
Group 2: Yes (2 votes) Significant social justice issues that arise. More votes for cities to do this.  
Group 3: Yes – mentioned support of this as far as homeowners/HA’s taking over roads and interlocal agreements with cities. Work with cities for to transferring maintenance responsibility of half streets and orphaned roads to cities.  
Group 3 specifically wants KC to look more thoroughly at what this would require and what would be involve. |
| E2 | Re-visit and enforce the original Growth Management Act (GMA) within the state of WA which was supposed to distribute funds from metro to rural areas | Allegedly the intent of the GMA has not been realized and larger cities have escaped payment for rural resources; Re-explore original intent and purpose to see if there is something there worth pursuing | Pro - The GMA may have already spelled out the funding solution(s)  
Con - May be politically challenging | Group 1: Yes (long term, +, more research)  
Group 2: Yes (7 votes + 3 for bullet #1) Concerned about big assumptions and funding landscape has changed. Big assumptions and goals.  
Group 2: Yes (4 votes) but Assumes this is the less expensive route? |
| E3 | Increase the amount of work that the county crews can perform "in-house" without having to go to bid with contractors. | This will allow the county to move forward with some smaller projects with their staff. | Saves time and money. Some of the smaller contractors may not like it. This would help reduce costs of stormwater and other required environmental components of the roads system, in particular. | Group 1: Yes (med term, +)  
Group 2: Yes (2 votes) but Assumes this is the less expensive route? |
| E4 | Update outdated state statutes for local roads, including at least the county road engineer laws to reflect current day technology and practices. | As I understand it, there are state laws that are outdated and don’t allow for electronic storage of records and/or require the roads department to have a separate storage from the rest of the county’s records. | Save some money, easier access for roads department and the public of records. Cannot think of any cons to updating state statute to allow for safe electronic storage of materials. | Group 1: Yes (long term, +)  
Group 2: Yes (2 votes) |
| E5 | Outlaw studded tires. | Studded tires increase wear and tear on pavement. | - This has been a sensitive topic at the state level. WSDOT has pursued legislation in the past with no success. | Group 1: Yes (+)  
Group 2: Yes (3 votes)  
Group 3: Yes – group expressed support for this |
| I1 | City annexation of county roads that are "islands" between two nearby jurisdictions. | *If the city refuses to annex these island roads then the city should be charged*  
- The County would need to be in control of the medall and communication on this so that angry | | Group 1: Yes (long term, +): Revisit the boundary line issue. There is no reason for the County to pay for roads between 2 jurisdictions. What... |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Explanation of recommendation</th>
<th>Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation</th>
<th>Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12  | Alternate version (or to add): Increase the number/miles of county bridges and roads maintained by city road departments. | User fee. What does it cost to maintain/repair these roads? Submit the bill to the City before conducting maintenance or repair if the city refuses to pay or annex. Close the road.—(Group 1 crossed this out)  
- There are 62 segments of KC owned roads that are entirely surrounded by cities because the original boundary lines for annexation weren't drawn properly.  
- Allows the County to focus its resources in the larger unincorporated areas.  
- Residents will force their city to act!  
- Education opportunity: Some residents are under the mistaken impression that they can stay rural by not annexing. The County should educate residents about the urban growth boundary. The real question is who manages the transition.  
- Will save the county money while only putting a minimal cost off to cities (since they'd likely each only be taking a couple of segments, as opposed to the county's responsibility for all of them now). Public would be happy because the roads would all be maintained to the same level in an area.  
- There is a significant Con with this: Cities are already struggling to maintain their own roads. This would require funding and the use of City standards before many Cities would consider this. Many cities aren't equipped to inspect and maintain bridges. | Pro  
- Could be a huge political win at the state level  
- Would likely get National contribution funding or big grant support  
Con  
- Complicated to get started  
- Would likely take a long time to see first results | Group 1: Yes - Explore legal challenges but need more information  
Group 2: No |
| 13  | Is it possible to create an in-state version of the Civilian Conservation Corps? | An in-state version of the CCC might provide a great avenue to train unskilled workers or the homeless to do great things.  
Alternate or to combine: Examine new policies for road vacations so that the county does not have to charge fair market value.  
Alternate or to combine: Examine new policies for road vacations so that the county does not have to charge fair market value.  
Alternate: Allow the county to consider “other public benefits” like reducing liability, reducing O&M costs, etc., instead of having to charge fair market value.  
Alternate: Provides more flexibility in criteria to review what public benefit is for roadway vacations.  
This would be an option, not required. So this should only have benefits.  
Alternate: Examine new policies for road vacations so that the county does not have to charge fair market value and can instead look at other public benefits for said road vacations. | Pro  
- Could be a huge political win at the state level  
- Would likely get National contribution funding or big grant support  
Con  
- Complicated to get started  
- Would likely take a long time to see first results | Group 1: Yes (+) - This is similar to another recommendation above, consolidate.  
Group 2: Yes (7 votes)  
Alternate:  
Group 1: NO  
Group 2: Yes (7 votes) |
| 14  | Suggest adding a fifth category on Land Use Policy recommendations. There are many instances where rigidity about UGA/rural boundaries unnecessarily increases cost, or diminishes the value of rural road infrastructure. Examples: the ongoing controversy surrounding the 1500 feet of rural road along the Guthrie Hill notch in Sammamish. Or Lake Alice Road coming out of Fall City. | Property Tax Efforts  
- Lift 1½ cap on property taxes through initiative or legislative  
- Need to be this legislative initiative to the Group 1: Yes (long term, +) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Explanation of recommendation</th>
<th>Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation</th>
<th>Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>process</td>
<td>implementation of the Growth Management Act</td>
<td>Group 2: Yes (4 votes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Addition (merged from another recommendation):</strong> State legislature should increase the tax revenue growth rate to 6% or the rate of inflation</td>
<td>Con: Political feasibility, Cost</td>
<td>For addition:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1: Yes?? - increase the cap, 6% is not realistic, maybe 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: Yes (3 votes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R2 | Increased or New Taxes/revised taxing system | • Charge a utility tax  
• Increase the local option gas tax (NOTE: this combines three similar recommendations about increasing the gas tax)  
• Determine a mechanism to appropriately tax or surcharge electric vehicles (since no gas tax is collected)  
• Consider a tax per mile driven  
• Tax auto parts differently  
• Create a more progressive tax system that doesn’t just focus on Roads/Transit, multi-pronged  
• Change State law to allow a higher unincorporated levy amount for roads. | • Charge a utility tax: Big energy users will pay a larger portion of taxes bringing in money. Is there the political support for this? Will there be tax exemptions for the big energy users therefore defeating the purpose of the tax.  
• Increase local option gas tax:  
  o Pro: People would accept it for better roads  
  o Con: Too much taxing already  
• Tax or surcharge for electric vehicles:  
  o Pro: EV car owners may NOT be price sensitive  
  o Strategic for the future: Get EV road usage charges in place now before it’s too late  
  o Charging EV owners feels a bit contrary to the whole ECO thing BUT this group may understand as they are typically wiser and more educated  
  o Consider a tax per mile driven  
  o This would capture electric car responsibility  
  o Deciding how to implement it.  
• Tax auto parts differently  
  o Auto-parts industries would dislike this  
  o Captures revenue being lost from gas tax and places it into a tidy and relevant category  
  o Might hurt lower income although tax should not be extravagantly high  
• More progressive tax system: Expanding on how funds can be used will bring us more support from elected officials, public, hidden allies. Right now we only need a simple majority to get it passed. Do we need that? That’s whole another conversation. | Charge a utility tax  
Group 1: NO (-)  
Group 2: Yes - 3 votes for a street utility tax (more limited concept)  
Group 3: Yes  
Increase the local option gas tax (combines two separate recommendations)  
Group 1: Maybe?? (0)  
Group 2: No  
Group 1: Yes (long term, +) more information  
Group 2: Yes (5 votes) to discuss further along with recommendation below  
Group 1: Yes (long term, +)  
Group 2: Yes (3 votes)  
Group 3: Yes – voiced support for a dedicated gas tax dedicated to counties and cities for roads.  
Tax or surcharge for electric vehicles  
Group 1: NO (-) since people are in the process of converting to electric—perhaps in 10 or 15 years (a virtue tax)  
Group 2: Yes (5 votes) MVET  
Consider a tax per mile driven  
Group 1: Yes (long term, +)  
Group 2: No  
Tax auto parts differently  
Group 1: NO (-)  
Group 2: Yes (1 votes)  
More progressive tax system  
Group 1: Yes (long term, +): Need more specific information  
Group 2: Yes (2 votes)  
Higher unincorporated levy for roads  
Group 1: Yes (+) Clarification needed, any higher property tax levy must be voted on  
Group 2: No
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Explanation of recommendation</th>
<th>Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation</th>
<th>Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>I strongly believe that the State should work with the Counties to adopt a percentage of MVET. This was done and was in existence until the first Tim Eyman initiative.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1: NO (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Invest in unincorporated business district and commercial areas to increase commercial tax revenue. Expanding the Transit Oriented Development idea to rural and unincorporated commercial districts, still protect natural lands and rural lands but create spaces that allow those who live in these communities with the resources and services that can be accessible by walking or biking. This will increase the “new construction” in unincorporated areas which will allow the County to collect 2% of taxes verses 1%.</td>
<td>Utilize ROW 35.81 to identify blighted areas in unincorporated commercial districts, create a community renewal plan for each community with projects that can efficiently relieve the use of the roads and bridges by incorporated residents passing through.</td>
<td>We need to design a growing transit community’s initiative to address the transit challenges faced by these rural and unincorporated communities. These places are transportation vehicle hubs without any resources to pay for the usage. This is an equity issue. Revitalizing these small business districts will increase the resources and allow for other transportation options.</td>
<td>Group 1: Yes (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Examine the current state policy for federal allocations and reallocate so that there is more of a fair balance between city/county and state DOT allocations (I believe the existing allocation is 33/66 in favor of WSDOT).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1: Maybe?? (0) Need more information, numbers don’t seem accurate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Utilize grant funding for some road drainage and flooding issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1: Yes (+) Yes, it is available and not already being utilized – Re-fund (more funding) the public works trust fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>Provide more variety of grant sources in addition to PSRC and TIB (traditional sources)</td>
<td>In addition to TIB, PSRC/FHWA</td>
<td>Pro Increase chances of getting grants</td>
<td>Group 1: Maybe?? (0) Redundant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>Use more federal funds to support existing county infrastructure/transportation system.</td>
<td>Refocus King County’s PSRC allocation on existing infrastructure, instead of capacity and expansion projects.</td>
<td>Pro More efficient use of resources on existing infrastructure instead of on new capacity or expansion “improvements” that may or may not provide real long-term transportation benefits to the system.</td>
<td>Group 1: Yes (+) More information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>Establish criteria and align federal funding to county transportation outcomes such as improved mobility for people and goods, access, transit ridership, health and safety, as well as reduced household costs, carbon emissions, and vehicle miles traveled.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 1 STOPPED HERE – DID NO REVIEW FURTHER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Create tolls for bridges and roads with retroactive rate structure or caps that make it lower costs for locals and higher for one time visitors (or a variation of this theme)</td>
<td>Cross a bridge five or fewer times per month and it’s $2 each trip; six or more trips reduces ALL fares—including previous trips to 50 cents per trip; max $cap per month of $15 or similar</td>
<td>Pro  • Good source of revenue  • Built in mechanism to ensure that locals don’t have to pay as much  Con  • Toll scheme is slightly complicated although very</td>
<td>Group 1: NO (-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Explanation of recommendation</td>
<td>Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation</td>
<td>Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R11 | Create a toll-tag or road usage tracker toll system and charge different usage rates for different areas | This is an in-car system that charges users based on the types of roads they use. There are endless variations of this idea. | Pro: You only pay if you are using certain roads  
Con: People would perceive they are being tracked (privacy concerns) | Group 1: Yes (+)  
Group 2: No |
| R12 | Find a user fee solution.                                                                 | Require incorporated county residents to purchase a permit in order to use unincorporated county roads (long-term stable funding source). |  
Pro: The Transportation Futures Task Force is evaluating this as a potential funding source.  
Con: Administrative complexity and management that could reduce the potential funding benefit. | Group 1: Yes (+)  
Group 2: No |
| R13 | Crowd-funding for road fixes (see also the efficiencies category)                   | Ask the public to contribute or match the cost of repairs                                        | Pro: The public picks the priorities  
Cons: Should result in less complaints | Group 1: NO (-)  
Group 2: Yes (1 vote) |

**Benefit/Local Improvement Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Explanation of recommendation</th>
<th>Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation</th>
<th>Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| R14 | Create a transportation benefit districts that charge money countywide, not just in rural and unincorporated areas. | With 50% of the trips being generated outside of rural and unincorporated areas, it makes sense that a part of the funding solution will include all county taxpayers. | Group 1: Yes (long term, +) Should this be on the County recommendation sheet? (ie does county have the authority to do this? Should this instead be on the county list?)  
Group 2: Yes (7 votes)  
Group 3: Yes | |

**Funding Coordination Among Local Agencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Explanation of recommendation</th>
<th>Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation</th>
<th>Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R15</td>
<td>One more around funding could be if the county and cities could pool together resources to go in for major capital projects (perhaps limited to maintenance or preservation projects?). The South Park bridge is a perfect example where there were jurisdictional issues and pooling together resources could have aided the project before we got to crisis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Group 2: Yes (1 vote)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R16 | Eliminate diversion of County Road Tax to other uses, such as Sheriff's Office. | Although the impact may not be that significant, it improves transparency. | Group 2: Yes (3 votes) to have a review of this funding approach. Also strong objection from at least 1 to discussing this. Very passionate and controversial discussion on the topic.  
Group 3: Yes – also expressed interest in this | |
| R17 | Build city support for county roads funding.  
Collaborate with other jurisdictions – including cities and counties. | Since they are the majority. To do this, cities would need to see a benefit to their citizens and a reduction of impacts on their own systems. Some proposed solutions will require legislative action, which may be more compelling if local agencies across the state are pursuing the request. | Group 2: Yes (7 votes)  
Group 2 (for second part of recommendation): Yes (5 votes) – to review | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Explanation of recommendation</th>
<th>Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation</th>
<th>Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Revenue Sources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>Find alternatives to funding roads beyond property taxes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R19 | Change the bonding formula so annexing cities have to pay outstanding debt left to County | The annexing city gets the benefit of the road improvements, they should have to pay for those improvements even if they happened. As result KC is paying for debt services on projects that are now outside the unincorporated area. Need a State legislative strategy. | The county may need to pay towards some of the bond but not all of it. Need to come up with an equitable formula so the county pays for some and annexing cities pay for some. A possible ratio could be based on how much the bond was for divided by the number of years that repair is to last. The number of years remaining on the investment should be reimbursed by the annexing city. | Group 1: Yes (+) – What would that be?  
Group 2: No  
Group 1: Yes (+) Need more information and to continue to explore the challenges.  
Group 2: Yes (2 votes)  
Group 3: Yes – group expressed support for this (debt transfer with annexation of infrastructure) |
| R20 | Create a lottery game that exclusively funds roads.                           |                                                                                                 |                                                                                  |                                                                            |
| R21 | Ask for road donations at the gas pump. "Would you like to contribute $1, $5 or $10 to help roads?" |                                                                                                 |                                                                                  |                                                                            |
| R22 | Study the ability to collect Impact Fees from new construction county-wide to provide new revenue | RCW 82.02.050  
Impact fees—Intent—Limitations.  
• Partnerships must be forged with Cities  
• More Revenue,  
• Collaborative county-wide effort  
Con  
• Cost of construction will rise. |                                                                                                 | Group 2: Yes?? (? Views for short list) |
| R23 | Create a three-part funding strategy focused at the local, cross-jurisdictional, and state levels. |                                                                                                 |                                                                                  |                                                                            |
| R24 | Research and peruse changes to Washington State Law for a more modern funding scheme for the roads system. | Washington State tax laws that affect the roads system were enacted at a time when Model Ts were common and it's time for them to be updated along with our roads and bridges. |                                                                                  | Group 2: Yes (4 votes) |
| O1  | Conduct a countywide campaign encouraging employees to use and employers to subsidize the use of alternative transportation | Implement the community mobility contract program in rural cities and communities heavily reliant on bridges and roads. |                                                                                  | Group 2: Yes (2 votes for short list) for this and recommendation below if there is new work to be done here |
| O2  | Utilize the Unions resources to reach out to their membership                  | • Ask for volunteers from the membership to volunteer phone banking, door knocking, calling elected officials, etc.  
• Bring in someone from the campaign to |                                                                                  | Group 2: Yes (5 votes) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Explanation of recommendation</th>
<th>Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation</th>
<th>Questions Identified by Task Force that need response for thorough analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| O3 | Create educational pieces that don’t focus on a specific group, county, city, etc. | educate Union stewards, leaders and staff who will then take the message to the membership.  
- Create educational pieces to be sent out to members  
- Work within the Coalition of Unions to reach out to other Unions and their memberships who are not directly involved in the Task Force  
- Political and educational trainings on the importance and significance of a specific campaign, initiative, etc.  
- Lobby days in Olympia  
- Use the Unions lobbyist to focus on specific initiatives, laws, etc.  
- Joint effort between King county and Union to bring in more support from the membership  
Reach out to community partners and get them on board. | Expanding the educational pieces to be relevant to people in the city, rural areas and everywhere in between. | Group 2: Yes (5 votes) |
| O4 | Engage PSRC to look at new federal funding models that focus on Fix-It-First, instead of capacity or road expansion projects. | Transportation 2040 is overly focused on capacity and expansion and fails to address maintenance, preservation and operations for the county’s existing transportation system.  
Pro  
- Saving money by preserving the system before it falls into disrepair that is more expensive in the long-run.  
Con/considerations  
- Fixing first is not as enticing politically. | Through this task force process, develop a template of identified problem statements, and solutions for use by counties statewide, particularly in discussions with state elected leaders in Olympia. | Group 2: Yes (7 votes) Another comment that this needs clarification to understand what this really is trying to do. |
| O5 | Through this task force process, develop a template of identified problem statements, and solutions for use by counties statewide, particularly in discussions with state elected leaders in Olympia. | There continues to be lack of dialogue in Olympia on the looming crisis for funding the existing transportation system. Task force could be a good launching pad to help change the conversation statewide. | Educate/Inform the public.  
Inform about role of the Task Force, value of County roads/bridges, and root causes of KC’s bridges and roads funding gap.  
The CSA’s (Alan Painter) should give community presentation on this task force and get feedback on what residents would like to see. Talk about the specific roads/bridges they specifically use, their need for repair, have them identify alternatives to road/bridge closures. | Group 2: Yes (7 votes) of a hybridized recommendation, namely: Use social media to educate and inform the public on the status of road needs, road updates etc. |
| O6 | Educate/Inform the public.  
Inform about role of the Task Force, value of County roads/bridges, and root causes of KC’s bridges and roads funding gap.  
The CSA’s (Alan Painter) should give community presentation on this task force and get feedback on what residents would like to see. Talk about the specific roads/bridges they specifically use, their need for repair, have them identify alternatives to road/bridge closures. | Through this task force process, develop a template of identified problem statements, and solutions for use by counties statewide, particularly in discussions with state elected leaders in Olympia. | Group 2: Yes (7 votes) Another comment that this needs clarification to understand what this really is trying to do. | Group 2: Yes (7 votes) Another comment that this needs clarification to understand what this really is trying to do. |
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Update

During the October 14, 2015 PIC meeting, there was a question about United Way of King County’s (UWKC) Strategic Plan, and the impact on funding for programs for seniors. This update provides a summary of the new Strategic Plan and the four priority areas UWKC has set for 2015-2020: early learning, family stability, homelessness, and youth. In focusing on these four priority areas and realigning resources to meet steep benchmarks for each, UWKC is discontinuing a number of investment areas starting July 1, 2016, including health and wellness programing and services specifically for older adults. UWKC has been working with impacted agencies to explain these changes and to explore future funding opportunities for programs serving older adults.

United Way of King County Strategic Plan

United Way of King County (UWKC), which makes roughly $32 million in grants annually, began its most recent strategic planning process in 2014 and adopted a new 2015-2020 Strategic Plan in June 2015 (Attachment A). The plan focuses on four priority areas, with goals identified for each:

- **Giving Kids an Equal Chance**: Parents become their child’s first, best teachers so kids start school prepared to learn
  - Year 1 Goal:
    - Help 5,000 parents be better able to provide a nurturing and educational home environment for their children
  - Five-Year Goal:
    - Eighty percent of kids are ready for Kindergarten. In 2015, just 40 percent of kids were considered ready.

- **Supporting Youth**: Teens and young adults who’ve dropped out of school are on the path to get their GEDs and learn job skills.
  - Year 1 Goal:
    - 1,605 youth formally engaged in getting their high-school equivalency and career skills.
  - Five-Year Goals:
    - Engage 50 percent of disconnected youth, 16- to 21-year-olds, in a program that leads to high school equivalency and career skills. In 2015,
there were 15,000 disconnected youth and about 10 percent receiving such help.
- Sixty percent of youth of color in the program complete 45 post-secondary credits.

- **Keeping Families Stable:** People have the tools to escape poverty, and kids have access to nutritious food every day.
  - **Year 1 Goals:**
    - 22,000 low income people access free tax preparation services securing $30 million in federal refunds, including $10 million in Earned Income Tax Credits.
    - 632,500 meals served to low-income kids during summer 2015; 3,000 students benefit from school-based Nutrition Hubs.
  - **Five-Year Goals:**
    - Help 50,000 people rise out of poverty.
    - Reduce the number of school-aged children in South King County who are food-insecure to 10 percent. In 2014, 20 percent were food-insecure.

- **Ending Homelessness:** Homelessness becomes rare, and if it does happen, it is brief and one-time so people rebound quickly.
  - **Year 1 Goal:** Help 2,373 formerly homeless people maintain their housing by providing supportive services.
  - **Five-Year Goals:**
    - Reduce the number of unsheltered people in the annual One Night Count by 50 percent. In the 2015 One Night Count, 3,882 people were counted as unsheltered.
    - Nine-five percent of people who have experienced homelessness do not return within two years. As of 2015, only 85 percent of people who had experienced homelessness had not returned within two years.
    - Reduce the number of youth of color who are homeless by 10 percentage points.

The focus areas and goals of the new UWKC Strategic Plan are intended to reinforce broader regional efforts, including the new All Home (formerly Committee to End Homelessness) Strategic Plan.

**UWKC Revenues and Investments**
To make progress in the identified priority areas, UWKC sets an additional goal of growing UWKC’s base of resources and supporters. To that end, UWKC aims to increase annual giving by $10 million and attract 10,000 new donors.

The shift to more focused investments and drive to attract new donors and new revenues, comes as part of a more than decade-long shift at UWKC and local United Way organizations across the nation. Under prior UWKC plans and previous years’ grant-making, UWKC funded a broad array of agencies and services year after year. Overtime, however, UWKC has shifted to
more focused outcomes and made grants competitive. More recently, UWKC has identified a core group of priorities and shifted funding to further those priorities.

The sharpening in focus has coincided with, and come in response to, shifting donor demands. While overall revenues for UWKC are not declining, the share of unrestricted revenues is. Donors are increasingly restricting how their donations can be used and, in response, UWKC is focusing efforts to address those areas for which revenues are both available and for which donors have prioritized, such as investments to address poverty and homelessness and improve outcomes for young people.

**Impact on Prior UWKC Investments**

The decline in unrestricted revenues, and shift to a narrower focus, has meant that UWKC is not renewing some grants that had been previously funded through unrestricted revenues, such as services for older adults and health and wellness programs. Impacted agencies, including Senior Services and the Black Diamond and Greater Maple Valley Community Centers, will see a discontinuation of their existing grants beginning July 1, 2016. In total, UWKC will be discontinuing grants totaling about $1.7 million in investments in programs for health and wellness programs and services for older adults (Attachment B). These changes were originally scheduled to take place one year earlier, on July 1, 2015, but were postponed by UWKC to allow for agency engagement and transition planning.

**Opportunities for Impacted Agencies**

A UWKC committee is currently developing a Fiscal Year 2017 Strategy and Investment Plan, which will be brought to the UWKC Board in January. This strategy and investment plan will outline how UWKC plans to meet the goals set for each of the four priority areas and will provide a high level description of the investments UWKC will be making toward those ends. UWKC anticipates that any associated requests for proposals will be released in late 2015 or 2016.

While UWKC will no longer be making broad funding grants for programs like senior center operations and adult day health, impacted agencies may apply for, and may be awarded, future grants from UWKC. In the area of funding for older adults, UWKC does intend to continue to make substantial investments through broader programs such as shelters, permanent supportive housing, and food banks, which serve clients of all ages including many older adults.

**Next Steps**

The UWKC Strategic Plan has been adopted after substantial outreach to affected agencies and other stakeholders. Outreach to impacted agencies began in early 2015 during the drafting of the Strategic Plan and is ongoing. More than 150 agency and community representatives attended three community conversations about the Strategic Plan held by UWKC earlier this year. Additionally, UWKC staff held three sessions with grantees during which the plan was detailed, and, in August, two deeper-dive discussions were held with impacted agencies. During those two sessions UWKC engaged agencies in brainstorming how their agencies could fit into the new strategic plan and receive future UWKC investments. These outreach activities are summarized in letter sent to UWKC grantees from UWKC Vice President Sara Levin (Attachment...
Given this extensive public process, asking UWKC to reconsider their change in focus is not likely to be successful at this date.

Senior Centers and other programs for older adults serve an important role of connecting older adults to vital community services that can help them stay healthy and independent. Compared with their peers, older adults who attend senior centers tend to be lower income and more in need of services, yet due to the services provided have higher levels of health, social interaction, and life satisfaction. SCA members may wish to consider ways to highlight the needs of older adults in their communities, and alternate sources of funding for these important programs.

UWKC, along with the City of Seattle and King County, is a sponsor of the Aging and Disability Services (ADS), the Area Agency on Aging for Seattle and King County, and has been involved in the crafting of the new Area Plan for 2016–2019. The Area Plan was approved by the ADS Advisory Council and was submitted to the State Unit on Aging on October 5, 2015. State approval is expected in early 2016. As noted in that report:

Over the past decade, our region has experienced a significant growth in the number of older adults and adults with disabilities. This growth, commonly referred to as the “age-wave,” is expected to increase dramatically as the baby boomer generation ages. Although this significant demographic shift poses many challenges, it also brings many new opportunities for partnerships, advocacy, creativity, leadership, education, healthy aging, and community engagement.

Mayor David Baker of Kenmore serves as SCA’s representative on the ADS Advisory Council, which, in addition to approving the Area Plan, works to identify the needs of older people and adults with disabilities, advises on services to meet those needs, and advocates for programs that promote the quality of life for those populations.

Attachments
A. United Way of King County Strategic Plan, 2015-2020
B. United Way of King County Funding Impacts
C. United Way of King County Letter to Impacted Grantees
OUR MISSION
United Way of King County brings caring people together to give, volunteer and take action to help people in need and solve our community’s toughest challenges.

It takes everyone pulling together to make our culture rich, our economy prosperous and our society humane. In a world of clashing ideas and fragmented attention, this isn’t easy. Fortunately there are still organizations with the trust to draw diverse people together, get agreement and get to work.

United Way is such an organization. With support of individual donors, volunteers, businesses, foundations, public funders and human service agencies, we are positioned to build a community where people have homes, students graduate and families are financially stable.

When people join with United Way they magnify the impact they have with their dollars and their ideals. They claim their stake in making our whole community stronger and fairer. They help individuals and families struggling today and invest in social changes to prevent problems tomorrow.

OUR VISION
Our vision is captured in our slogan, LIVE UNITED. We believe that as individuals, families and communities we are stronger if we support each other, especially in moments of vulnerability. We provide a way for people to connect and turn their generosity into large-scale good.

Seattle and King County are currently experiencing strong economic growth and low unemployment, yet many people are being left behind. Income disparities are widening and housing costs are high. Homelessness has increased dramatically. Poverty is shifting to the suburbs and growing, particularly among children and youth: 35% of low-income children enter kindergarten ready to learn, and high school graduation rates for low-income youth are less than 70%. The region has at least 15,000 youth who have dropped out of high school and aren’t working. All of these issues disproportionately affect people of color, including many of the region’s recent immigrants and refugees.

Reaching Higher
In the last decade United Way of King County has played a leading role in lifting thousands of people out of homelessness, preparing thousands of low-income children for success in school, and ensuring that thousands of vulnerable families could meet basic needs during the Great Recession and its aftermath. Yet acute problems remain, and we must get to even greater impact. Here’s how:

- **Be even more focused**, concentrating on issues that affect the most vulnerable and on which we can have measurable influence. Part of this will be taking account of how many problems disproportionately affect communities of color and, working closely with those affected, creating and funding solutions that enable greater equity.

- **Generate more resources.** In our increasingly wealthy region we have the opportunity to attract more support. To succeed we will need to communicate what we do more powerfully, deepen our connections to existing supporters, and create paths for new people to meet and engage with us outside the workplace. Digital channels will be key.

- **Exert more leverage.** We will continue to multiply our impact beyond those dollars we raise and invest. We will mobilize thousands of volunteers and their skills for a multitude of roles. We will rally peer funders around a common vision. We will help return more state and federal tax money to the community. With help from influential volunteers, we will effectively advocate for specific changes to public policy and systems that will benefit the most vulnerable.

The Change We Seek in the Community
Our aim is measurable change in key indicators of community well-being. This isn’t something we can deliver alone; it will take the coordinated efforts of many other players, including our nonprofit partners and fellow funders. But with our financial, volunteer and government resources coupled to our influence and leverage, we are positioned to play an important role in turning these ambitions into reality. Our goals:

- 80% of kids are ready for kindergarten
- 50% of disconnectedyouth are on the path to success
- 50,000 people rise out of poverty
- 50% reduction in the number of unsheltered people in the annual One Night Count

To achieve the above we will need to grow our base of resources and supporters, specifically:

- Progressively increase annual dollars given directly to United Way by $10 million
- Run a multi-year campaign during the plan period, resulting in one “breakthrough” year in which dedicated revenues would be $10 million higher
- Retain a high percentage of current donors and add a net 10,000 new donors
- Attract 10,000 people in their 20s and 30s as active and committed United Way Emerging Leaders
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Science tells us that brain development in a child’s early years is critical for a strong start in life—and a strong start in life often leads to better outcomes all the way through. Reams of research, including by Nobel Prize-winning economist James Heckman, show that money spent on early childhood yields some of the strongest returns on investment of any social program. This is therefore a bedrock prevention strategy for us. Our work will continue to focus on the most vulnerable young children living in poverty, including those with developmental delays.

PARENT SUPPORT. Helping parents succeed as their child’s first, best teachers will be central. Our signature parent-support effort will remain the Parent-Child Home Program, a highly successful evidence-based program for very low-income, socially isolated families. Those served include young single parents, immigrant and refugee families struggling in a new culture, and families experiencing homelessness. Since 2010 we have driven a five-fold expansion to 1,000 families and are having growing success in generating the external support (from public levies, school districts and other philanthropies) to keep the program strong.

BETTER CHILD CARE AND ATTENTION TO DEVELOPMENTAL DELAYS. Alongside our parent-support investments, we will make targeted grants to improve the availability and quality of child care and preschool for low-income working families. And we will put money into programs that succeed in detecting and treating developmental delays very early in a child’s life, when they are most easily overcome.

GAUGING SUCCESS. All of our efforts in this area are designed to move one big community-level metric: kindergarten readiness in King County. In concert with partners, our five-year goal is:

80% of kids are ready for kindergarten

(2015 = 40%)

YEAR 1 UNITED WAY GOAL: Help 5,000 parents be better able to provide a nurturing and educational home environment for their children.

GIVING KIDS AN EQUAL CHANCE
Parents become their child’s first, best teachers so kids start school prepared to learn.
OLDER YOUTH. Our signature initiative is **Reconnecting Youth**, designed to help young people who have dropped out of school earn their high-school equivalency and then gain the skills and credentials for a solid career. The program is another example of using United Way dollars to leverage other resources, as our investment lets the community fully tap an available stream of state dollars for this purpose.

SCHOOL-AGE YOUTH. We will continue working actively to keep youth in school and on a path to graduation. Our funding will target programs that foster social-emotional skills and the ability to persevere and make good choices.

GAUGING SUCCESS. By 2020 we seek to:

- Engage 50% of disconnected youth, 16 to 21-year-olds, in a program that leads to high-school equivalency and career skills. 
  
  \((2015 = 15,000 \text{ disconnected youth and about } 10\% \text{ getting such help})\)

- 60% of youth of color in the program complete 45 post-secondary credits.

**YEAR 1 UNITED WAY GOAL**: 1,605 youth formally engaged in getting their high-school equivalency and career skills.

For youth who didn’t get a strong start in the early years, we want to intervene at key points to help them get back on track. Otherwise human potential is lost and, as research shows, social costs rise for outlays like unemployment, welfare and criminal justice.
YEAR 1 UNITED WAY GOAL: 22,000 low-income people access free tax preparation services securing $30 million in federal refunds, including $10 million in Earned Income Tax Credits (EITC). The EITC can be worth thousands of dollars to an individual family and is widely seen as the nation’s most potent anti-poverty tool.

YEAR 1 UNITED WAY GOAL: 632,500 meals served to low-income kids during summer 2015; 3,000 students benefit from school-based Nutrition Hubs.

Providing a Place to Turn in Crisis.
Many events can hurtle an individual or family into crisis, from a job loss or illness, to the breakup of a relationship or an act of violence. United Way stands with people at times of such vulnerability by supporting the 2-1-1 help and information line, disaster relief agencies, and a variety of counseling and shelter services.

GAUGING SUCCESS.
We will measure our progress against two community-level indicators. As in our other work, we will need the coordinated efforts of other players too. By 2020 we seek to:

- Help 50,000 people rise out of poverty.
- Reduce the number of school-aged children in South King County who are food-insecure to 10% (2015 = 20%).

Keeping Families Stable.
People have the tools to escape poverty, and kids have access to nutritious food every day.

Increasing Financial Security.
Our signature effort will remain our Free Tax Preparation Campaign. It uses intensively trained United Way volunteers to help working families prepare their taxes for free and secure the credits and deductions they qualify for, notably the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The EITC can be worth thousands of dollars to an individual family and is widely seen as the nation’s most potent anti-poverty tool.

Making Sure People Have Enough to Eat.
Families who are struggling to get by often can’t keep food on the table or are settling for food that is cheap but nutritionally poor. To help, United Way has long supported food banks and other parts of the emergency food system. We will continue to do so. Because of the cascade of benefits it brings to child health, academic performance, family finances and more, our signature food effort in coming years will center on childhood nutrition.

We will expand our work to get all eligible kids school breakfast, lunch and after-school meals in the academic year, as well as summer meals when school is out. While these efforts will require United Way funding, they will also have a large multiplier effect by leveraging federal revenue streams that are underutilized compared to other communities and states.

GAUGING SUCCESS.
We will measure our progress against two community-level indicators. As in our other work, we will need the coordinated efforts of other players too. By 2020 we seek to:

- Help 50,000 people rise out of poverty.
- Reduce the number of school-aged children in South King County who are food-insecure to 10% (2015 = 20%).

Incorporating Childhood Nutrition.
Because of the cascade of benefits it brings to child health, academic performance, family finances and more, our signature food effort in coming years will center on childhood nutrition.

We will expand our work to get all eligible kids school breakfast, lunch and after-school meals in the academic year, as well as summer meals when school is out. While these efforts will require United Way funding, they will also have a large multiplier effect by leveraging federal revenue streams that are underutilized compared to other communities and states.

Reducing the number of school-aged children in South King County who are food-insecure to 10% (2015 = 20%).

Keeping Families Stable.
People have the tools to escape poverty, and kids have access to nutritious food every day.

Increasing Financial Security.
Our signature effort will remain our Free Tax Preparation Campaign. It uses intensively trained United Way volunteers to help working families prepare their taxes for free and secure the credits and deductions they qualify for, notably the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The EITC can be worth thousands of dollars to an individual family and is widely seen as the nation’s most potent anti-poverty tool.

Making Sure People Have Enough to Eat.
Families who are struggling to get by often can’t keep food on the table or are settling for food that is cheap but nutritionally poor. To help, United Way has long supported food banks and other parts of the emergency food system. We will continue to do so. Because of the cascade of benefits it brings to child health, academic performance, family finances and more, our signature food effort in coming years will center on childhood nutrition.

We will expand our work to get all eligible kids school breakfast, lunch and after-school meals in the academic year, as well as summer meals when school is out. While these efforts will require United Way funding, they will also have a large multiplier effect by leveraging federal revenue streams that are underutilized compared to other communities and states.

GAUGING SUCCESS.
We will measure our progress against two community-level indicators. As in our other work, we will need the coordinated efforts of other players too. By 2020 we seek to:

- Help 50,000 people rise out of poverty.
- Reduce the number of school-aged children in South King County who are food-insecure to 10% (2015 = 20%).

Incorporating Childhood Nutrition.
Because of the cascade of benefits it brings to child health, academic performance, family finances and more, our signature food effort in coming years will center on childhood nutrition.

We will expand our work to get all eligible kids school breakfast, lunch and after-school meals in the academic year, as well as summer meals when school is out. While these efforts will require United Way funding, they will also have a large multiplier effect by leveraging federal revenue streams that are underutilized compared to other communities and states.

Reducing the number of school-aged children in South King County who are food-insecure to 10% (2015 = 20%).

Keeping Families Stable.
People have the tools to escape poverty, and kids have access to nutritious food every day.

Increasing Financial Security.
Our signature effort will remain our Free Tax Preparation Campaign. It uses intensively trained United Way volunteers to help working families prepare their taxes for free and secure the credits and deductions they qualify for, notably the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). The EITC can be worth thousands of dollars to an individual family and is widely seen as the nation’s most potent anti-poverty tool.

Making Sure People Have Enough to Eat.
Families who are struggling to get by often can’t keep food on the table or are settling for food that is cheap but nutritionally poor. To help, United Way has long supported food banks and other parts of the emergency food system. We will continue to do so. Because of the cascade of benefits it brings to child health, academic performance, family finances and more, our signature food effort in coming years will center on childhood nutrition.

We will expand our work to get all eligible kids school breakfast, lunch and after-school meals in the academic year, as well as summer meals when school is out. While these efforts will require United Way funding, they will also have a large multiplier effect by leveraging federal revenue streams that are underutilized compared to other communities and states.

GAUGING SUCCESS.
We will measure our progress against two community-level indicators. As in our other work, we will need the coordinated efforts of other players too. By 2020 we seek to:

- Help 50,000 people rise out of poverty.
- Reduce the number of school-aged children in South King County who are food-insecure to 10% (2015 = 20%).
We will continue to advocate for preventing homelessness in the first place by stopping the discharge of people from hospitals, jails and foster care onto the streets. And in the case of foster youth, we will actively help identify and assist those young people most likely to end up homeless.

BRIEF AND ONE-TIME. When someone becomes homeless it is a personal and community crisis. Our signature effort, Crisis Response, will connect people to immediate services through outreach and emergency shelter, the first steps to getting people into housing. “Navigators” will work with people on the streets to find immediate solutions that fit their individual needs—from reconnecting with family, to the money for a security deposit or car repair, to a referral to an appropriate shelter. Backed by better data systems and closer coordination among providers, we will move people rapidly to housing and services matched to their specific needs, improving the odds that homelessness won’t recur and that it is brief and one-time.

CHRONIC AND YOUTH HOMELESSNESS. We will continue to help people who have slipped into chronic homelessness, drawing on the extensive network of housing and supportive services we and partners have established over the last decade. We will also continue our emphasis on youth homelessness, with a special focus on preventing homelessness among former foster youth.

GAUGING SUCCESS. Three community-level metrics will show our progress. Moving these metrics will require the coordinated efforts of other players as well. By 2020 we will:

- Reduce the number of unsheltered people in the annual One Night Count by 50% (2015 = 3,772)
- Reduce the number of youth of color who are homeless by 10 percentage points (2015 = 67%)
- Reduce the number of people who have experienced homelessness do not return within two years by 95% (2015 = 85%)
**Building the Brand**

**Key trends affecting our marketing and communications:**

- Our message can be too complicated or get lost in a growing din of communications.
- While most people in the community know our name, outside of workplaces where our presence is strong, there’s often little clarity about what we do.
- Our supporter base has been aging, though recent efforts to draw young Emerging Leaders to our cause show strong promise.
- Online—and especially social media—is now a principal way people across generations learn about and join social causes.

**2015-2020 strategy:**

- Develop messaging and events that explain with new clarity and immediacy why United Way matters and merits support.
- Engage donors and volunteers beyond the workplace through more intensive and effective use of social media and other online channels. Increase presence in the media through events and partnerships with businesses and nonprofits.
- Draw large numbers of Emerging Leaders into an active connection including volunteering, coming to events, engaging with us on social media, and giving.

**GAUGING SUCCESS.** Success in our outreach over the next five years can be gauged on three major metrics:

- Twice as many people can identify an issue that United Way works on (biennial Brand Equity survey, general public, from 14% to 28%).
- Donors see us as highly effective compared to other nonprofits (biennial Brand Equity survey, donors, from 53% to 80%).
- Attract 10,000 active Emerging Leaders, with one-third of these becoming donors.

---

**Financial Resources**

**Key trends affecting our fundraising:**

- Increased competition in the workplace, where our access once set us apart.
- Donors increasingly like to target their giving to specific programs, as opposed to making an unrestricted gift.
- Our major donor revenue is up, even as our workplace support has slipped. Overall our donor base is graying.
- We are having increasing success raising money from corporate sponsorships, grants and government funding.
- Our low operating expenses—partly thanks to our Gates Endowment—factor favorably into many donors’ support.

**2015-2020 strategy:**

- Make our connection with donors a relationship, not a transaction. Give special attention to new donors and loyal donors.
- Broaden beyond workplaces, meeting people where they live, socialize and play.
- Embrace the trend toward donors’ earmarking giving for particular programs, and present compelling opportunities to do so. This will include a new multimillion-dollar fundraising campaign with a likely focus on helping youth who have dropped out of high school finish their education and get on track to a career.
- Build on the strengths in the major donor program, attracting new contributors and securing large investments, including planned gifts.
- Do more to draw in resources from government funders, foundation grants, corporate grants and sponsorships. Give particular attention to new and rising companies, especially in tech.
- Explore a large-scale new event with fundraising focus.
GAUGING SUCCESS. Ultimately we want to see the growth in community wealth more fully expressed in our bottom line. Specifically over the next five years we seek to:

- Grow annual fundraising incrementally from a projected $38 million in FY 15 to $48 million in FY 20.
- Have one “breakthrough” year in which, on the strength of a specially targeted campaign, we raise an additional $10 million.

People

Key trends affecting our human resources:

- As the economy heats back up, competition for talent is intensifying. Our ability to attract people could be constrained by what we can pay.
- The skillsets needed in our employees are ever-evolving, especially in regard to technology.
- Volunteers continue to make major contributions of time and talent to us.
- Companies, running ever leaner, increasingly can’t give people or money for our Loaned Executive (seasonal fundraiser) program.

2015-2020 strategy:

- Foster a culture that is mission-based, inclusive, high-performing and flexible. As part of this, continuously invest in meaningful professional development at all levels.
- Continuously calibrate compensation to stay competitive with others in the nonprofit space.
- Maximize our use of AmeriCorps and VISTA volunteers, both to advance our mission and provide meaningful work experience for community-minded young adults.
- Continue to amplify our impact by engaging the time and expertise of volunteers as board members; advisors on grantmaking, fundraising, marketing and technology; and on-the-ground doers.

Technology and Systems

Key trends affecting our technology and systems:

- Disparate systems are not well integrated and provide a fragmented view of our constituents.
- The applications we use are largely for desktop use, while our workforce is increasingly mobile.
- Computer security breaches in the wider world are increasingly frequent, public and costly.

2015-2020 strategy:

- Unify systems so that it becomes easy to gather and utilize relevant info about constituents.
- Implement technologies that ensure agility, mobility and scalability.
- Identify, evaluate and mitigate IT security risks.

Seeing 2020

Seattle and King County have some of the most civically engaged people anywhere. United Way of King County provides a way for them to come together around difficult community issues and make undeniable progress. This plan reflects our best thinking about how, together, we can move forward over the next half-decade. We are excited by the vision and even more excited at the depth of commitment that this planning process made evident. Even if social and economic conditions go in markedly different directions than seen here—clearly possible—our community’s belief in United Way as a vital means to take care of each other gives us confidence that we will meet the challenge.

To the literally hundreds of people involved in the creation of this document, our heartfelt thanks.
Strategic Planning Taskforce Participants

Chair, Dan Brettler, CEO Car Toys/Wireless Advocates, United Way board member
Chris Alston, Foster Pepper PLLC
Jane Broom, Microsoft
Lewis Cheung, Lawn Hippo
Bob Felton, Director Emeritus, McKinsey and Company
Jon Fine, United Way of King County
Dan Fulton, former United Way of King County board chair
Linda Glenicki, King County Library System
Ashley Hulsey, United Way of King County
Christine Hynes, United Way of King County
Vu Le, Rainier Valley Corps
Sara Levin, United Way of King County
Karen Marcotte Solimano, Microsoft alumna, United Way board member
Steve McCracken, 206 inc., United Way board member
Margaret Meister, Symetra, United Way board member
Mimi Siegel, Kindering Center
Todd Zarfos, Boeing Commercial Airplanes, United Way board member
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>UWEC Impact Area</th>
<th>UWEC Allocation</th>
<th>City of Seattle General Fund Allocation</th>
<th>King County General Fund Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Local Agencies</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alzheimer’s Association Western &amp; Central Washington Chapter</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Counseling and Referral Service</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Community Services of Western Washington</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond Community Center</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal Community Services</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Life Care</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Life Care</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Maple Valley Community Center</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartbeat!</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interfaith Day Support Services</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Drop-in Center</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Family Services</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Housing Corporation</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Community Services Northwest</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Si Community Services</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Asian Empowerment Program</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phinney Neighborhood Association</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>祁者妇女协会</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities</td>
<td>$48,218</td>
<td>$38,151</td>
<td>$18,628</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**November 12, 2015**

**Item 9: United Way of King County Strategic Plan**

**Page 76 of 87**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>UWKC Impact Area</th>
<th>UWKC Allocation</th>
<th>Services Funded by Area Agency on Aging</th>
<th>City of Seattle General Fund Allocation</th>
<th>King County General Fund Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sea Mar Community Health Centers</td>
<td>People receive oral health care and/or treatment</td>
<td>$30,573</td>
<td>Community Living Connections</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Services of Seattle &amp; King County</td>
<td>Wellness Project</td>
<td>$300,007</td>
<td>Health Promotion</td>
<td>$25,525</td>
<td>$28,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Services of Seattle &amp; King County</td>
<td>Improve/maintain a high quality of life and decrease social isolation for older adults</td>
<td>$279,722</td>
<td>Senior Centers</td>
<td>$534,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Services of Seattle &amp; King County</td>
<td>Older adults maintain optimal physical, mental and emotional health as they age</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Community Living Connections, Nutrition/Meals</td>
<td>$90,278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Services of Seattle &amp; King County</td>
<td>Family/friend caregivers maintain/improve their physical, mental and emotional well-being</td>
<td>$86,204</td>
<td>Family Caregiver Support Programs</td>
<td>$90,278</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SightConnection</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities live independent/productive lives</td>
<td>$151,960</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park Area Redevelopment Committee</td>
<td>Improve/maintain a high quality of life and decrease social isolation for older adults</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Senior Center, Nutrition/Meals</td>
<td>$100,019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian Community Center of Washington</td>
<td>Improve/maintain a high quality of life and decrease social isolation for older adults</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Nutrition/Meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vashon Maury Senior Services</td>
<td>Improve/maintain a high quality of life and decrease social isolation for older adults</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$1,754,839</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,659,569.00</td>
<td><strong>$119,033</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment B to the November 12, 2015 PIC Agenda Item 9
Dear United Way Grantee –

I hope you are all enjoying the summer and are ready for the start of fall.

I want to thank the more than 150 agency and community representatives who attended one of United Way’s strategic plan discussions this summer. We held three strategic plan overview sessions in July and early August, and two deeper-dive discussions in mid-August. At the overview session, I shared United Way’s 2015-2020 strategic plan (online here) and answered your questions about our new strategic direction and potential impacts to your agencies. At the deep-dives, we focused on the investment areas we will no longer be funding starting July 1, 2016, and brainstormed opportunities for agencies funded in those areas to help us meet new emerging goals.

I’m excited about the opportunities ahead for United Way to increase our focus, leverage and resources to ensure that everyone in King County has a home, students graduate and families are financially stable. In each of these areas we have set ambitious community-level goals.

Continuing a focusing and narrowing that we began more than a decade ago, we will align our grantmaking tightly on ending homelessness so that people have homes; early learning and supporting youth so that students graduate; and alleviating poverty so that families are financially stable. We will discontinue or reshape agency investments that don’t align with this work.

Starting July 1, 2016 we will no longer fund the following investment areas (outcomes):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Investment Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2402</td>
<td>People receive oral health care and/or treatment</td>
<td>2416</td>
<td>Older adults maintain optimal physical, mental and emotional health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2404</td>
<td>People living with chronic illness maintain optimum health</td>
<td>2417</td>
<td>People with progressive illness and/or severe disabilities live as fully as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2405</td>
<td>People with physical, cognitive and/or developmental disabilities live independent/productive lives</td>
<td>2418</td>
<td>Family/friend caregivers maintain/improve their physical, mental and emotional well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2408</td>
<td>Improve/maintain a high quality of life and decrease social isolation for older adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My team and I are committed to working with agencies who receive funds for these investment areas to see whether some aspect of their work maps over to alleviating poverty or another area of continuing focus. Our Fiscal Year 2017 Strategy and Investment Plan, to be brought before the United Way Board in January, will establish the contours for new grants. Any associated RFPs will be released in late 2015 or early 2016.
We are also looking at other changes **starting July 1, 2017**. Later this year we will start working with agencies funded in the investment areas below to strategize our future course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Investment Area</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2303</td>
<td>Adult survivors of domestic violence enhance tools and awareness that support personal safety and/or personal goals</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>Children/youth who have experienced sexual abuse and/or assault make progress in recovering from the effects of the abuse/assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2304</td>
<td>Children/youth who are affected by domestic violence in the home develop/strengthen coping and/or interpersonal skills</td>
<td>2204</td>
<td>Youth/children strengthen skills/assets that support positive social development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2306</td>
<td>Batterers who receive treatment stop abusive behaviors</td>
<td>2212</td>
<td>Educationally at-risk youth/young adults make progress toward their educational goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2311</td>
<td>People strengthen attitudes and values that support ending interpersonal violence</td>
<td>2410</td>
<td>Children/youth/young adults with emotional/behavioral disturbances develop/strengthen coping skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

United Way will continue to provide a variety of ways that nonprofit agencies can partner with us, even if you no longer receive funding. Our Volunteer Center programs and opportunities are a great way to stay connected with us. Upcoming opportunities include Day of Caring, Martin Luther King Day, and board trainings. We also continue to expand our AmeriCorps/VISTA program, with applications open this fall for National Service projects.

Change is exciting and it’s hard. Our new strategic plan sets big, ambitious goals that we know we can’t achieve alone. Our partnerships with agencies, funders, community members and donors are incredibly important and are what help us collectively make a difference in people’s lives. We are excited about United Way’s new direction and the opportunity, by focusing, to have greater impact on our community’s toughest human service challenges. We also recognize that our relationships with some of you will change. We appreciate the good work all of our grantees do for vulnerable people, and as we implement our funding changes we want to be transparent and timely. Please feel free to reach out to me, Theresa Fujiwara or your United Way staff contact if you have any questions or want to share additional thoughts.

Thank you again for all you do.

Sara E. Levin

---

Sara E. Levin  
Vice President, Community Services  
United Way of King County  
[slevin@uwkc.org](mailto:slevin@uwkc.org)  
(206) 461-3643  
[Web | Blog | Facebook | Twitter](#)
Item 10:
Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County

UPDATE

SCA Staff Contact
Katie Kuciembia, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, Katie@soundcities.org, 206-433-7169

Update
Members will have an opportunity to update the PIC in regards to upcoming future ballot measures.

Background
The purpose of this item is to provide information for SCA member cities on upcoming ballot measures. This item will be an ongoing, monthly item on the PIC agenda.

Potential Future Ballot Measures – Other Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Low-income Housing Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Families and Education Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential Future Ballot Measures -- Countywide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Sound Transit</td>
<td>Sound Transit 3 (ST3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Veterans and Human Services Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>~2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Cultural Access/Affordable Housing/Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>AFIS Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Medic One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Future Ballot Measures – Special Purpose District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Tukwila School District Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Kent Fire Department Regional Fire Authority – Fire Benefit Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Highline School District Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Seattle School District Operation &amp; Capital Levies (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Tukwila Regional Fire Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Renton Regional Fire Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Kent School District Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoreline School District Operations Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shoreline School District Capital Levy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

SCA staff will update this document on a regular basis. Please share this information with your city, and provide information on upcoming elections in your city to Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, at Katie@soundcities.org.
**Item 11:** Potential Upcoming SCA Issues

**UPDATE**

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

**Update**

| SCA staff is seeking feedback on potential issues members would like SCA to consider in 2015. This list of potential issues will carry forward into 2016. |

**Background**

This will be an ongoing, monthly PIC item noting items that SCA members have asked to be brought to PIC.

**Issues for 2015/2016:**

- **Homelessness**
  - Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC
  - Discussion on steps being undertaken by cities to address homelessness during 9/9/2015 Pre-PIC workshop
  - Informational item recapping 9/9/2015 Pre-PIC workshop on the 10/14/2015 agenda
  - All Home and Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC) Legislative Priorities for 2016 are on the 11/12/2015 agenda

- **Sound Transit 3**
  - Discussed at 4/8/2015 PIC
  - Pre-PIC workshop on 10/14/2015 with Metro’s Long Range Plan
  - Sound Transit Board Workshop on 12/4/2015 to show evaluation results for all candidate projects. Staff will keep members apprised of Board discussion and next steps as ST3 is further developed

- **Metro Long Range Plan**
  - Pre-PIC workshop on 3/11/2015 and 10/14/2015
  - SCA staff is monitoring and serves as a member of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
  - Staff will keep members apprised of efforts on this front in 2016 as the Long Range Plan is developed
• Low Impact Development
  o Identified during the Executive Committee of the SCA Board, discussed at 9/9/2015 PIC meeting
  o Pre-PIC Low Impact Development Training scheduled for 11/12/2015

• Public Records Impacts of Body Cameras
  o Identified by Mayor Law of Renton and the Executive Committee of the SCA Board
  o SCA staff and Board leadership have an upcoming meeting with King County Sheriff and Prosecutor, and will report back to PIC

• PSRC Economic Development District Board (EDDB)
  o Identified by members of the EDDB
  o The EDDDB will be doing a significant update to the Regional Economic Strategy in 2016

• Funding for Services for Seniors
  o Identified at the 10/14/2015 PIC meeting
  o An update on the United Way Strategic Plan is on the 11/12/2015 PIC agenda

• City Human Services Funding
  o Identified at the 10/14/2015 PIC meeting
  o SCA staff welcomes feedback from PIC members as to what form they would like this issue to come back to the PIC in

• I-90 Center Roadway Closure and East Link Light Rail Construction
  o Identified at the 10/14/2015 PIC meeting
  o SCA staff working with staff from Mercer Island, Washington State Department of Transportation, and Sound Transit. Staff will continue to monitor and report back to PIC as appropriate

If you or your city have additional items to be added to this list, please contact Deanna Dawson, Deanna@soundcities.org.
**Item 12a:**
Farmers Market and Temporary Event Fees

*Informational Item*

**SCA Staff Contact**
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, elli@soundcities.org, 206-433-7167

**SCA Board of Health Members**
Environmental Health Fees Committee Chair, Auburn Councilmember Largo Wales; Kenmore Mayor David Baker (caucus chair); Federal Way Councilmember Susan Honda (alternate)

*Informational Item*

On October 15, 2015, the King County Board of Health adopted a revised fee structure for farmers markets and temporary events. This fee structure was discussed previously at the September 9, 2015 and October 14, 2015 PIC meetings. The feedback from the PIC at that time was that allowing greater flexibility for permittees, particularly vendors who attend multiple events and organizations that host multiple vendors, should be encouraged. PIC members also expressed concerns that the then proposed fee increases for single event permittees and farmers market coordinators were too high. PIC members stressed that the Environmental Health Services Division (EHS) of Public Health – Seattle & King County should find more efficiencies to bring down costs and lower fees for vendors and farmers markets and questioned whether a full cost-recovery model was appropriate for permittees that provide a public good, like farmers markets. SCA Board of Health Member Largo Wales conveyed that feedback to EHS and requested that the Division report back to the Board of Health on how it is will work with greater efficiency to reduce fees. EHS is scheduled to report back to the Board of Health December 17, 2015.

**Background**
Additional background information about fees charged by the Environmental Health Services Division (EHS) of Public Health – Seattle & King County was presented to the PIC in September 2015 and October 2015 (see September 9, 2015 PIC Packet, page 64, and October 14, 2015 PIC Packet, page 99). EHS oversees permitting of vendors selling prepared foods at farmers markets and temporary events as well as restaurants and other facilities/providers requiring an annual fee and inspection under the King County Board of Health code. Since last year, the Board of Health (BOH) has been working to update fees charged for farmers markets and temporary events, which were last adjusted in 2012. The BOH sets permit fees for EHS in accordance with a full cost-recovery model, as required by county policy. As a result, the community value of farmers markets or temporary events are not a factored into the fees charged. Instead, fees are based solely on the costs associated with EHS oversight.
New Fee Structure for Farmers Markets and Temporary Events
On October 15, 2015, the BOH voted to adopt a revised fee structure for farmers markets and temporary events. The fee structure, which was adopted in the form last described to the PIC, differs from the old permitting scheme in that (1) it is more closely based on the risk associated with the foods served, (2) allows vendors to apply for a single permit to cover multiple events or market locations, (3) gives event organizers the opportunity to handle all permitting for their vendors, and (4) bases farmers market coordinator fees on the size of the market. The new fees will take effect in 2016. Each of these changes is summarized below.

Risk-Based Permit Fees: Under the old permit structure, fees were based on whether or not the foods served fall under an itemized list of “limited” foods developed by EHS. The new permit structure breaks away from that model by basing permit fees on the risk associated with the ingredients and food preparation method used by the permittee, with three permit categories: low, medium, and high risk.

Multiple and Unlimited Event Permits: Under the former permit structure, temporary event vendors applied for a permit for each event they attended and farmers market vendors applied for a permit for each market location they attended. Under the new permitting structure, vendors attending multiple events or market locations can select either a single event or market permit for each event or market they attend or a multiple or unlimited permit. Multiple and unlimited permits would require that a “certified booth operator” attend all events. The two-year certification fee for a certified booth operator would be $95.

The following table shows how risk categories and multiple and unlimited permit options have been incorporated into the newly adopted permit structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$55*</td>
<td>$120</td>
<td>N/A—receive an unlimited instead</td>
<td>$236**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$55 or $281*</td>
<td>$290</td>
<td>$640**</td>
<td>$750**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>$281*</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$700**</td>
<td>$850**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Under the former fee structure, vendors were grouped into two categories: those serving limited types of foods ($55) and those serving anything else ($281). Some of those presently classified as limited food types would fall under the “low” category under the new structure and others would fall under the “medium” category. An earlier, but ultimately rejected, proposal would have retained the former fee categories and raised fees from $55 to $195 and $281 to $390.

** Requires a “certified booth operator” ($95 two-year certification).

Blanket Permit for Event Organizers: In addition to introducing new multiple and unlimited permits, a new “blanket permit” option will be available at a rate of $215 per hour for organizations wishing to assume the entire costs of permitting a temporary event, regardless of the number of vendors involved.
**Farmers Market Coordinator Fees Based on Vendor Count:** Each farmers market is required to have a “farmers market coordinator permit.” The farmers market coordinator assists in ensuring vendor compliance with the BOH code. Currently, the fee is $502 for each market coordinator, regardless of the size of the market. An earlier proposal from EHS would have increased this fee to $1,136 across the board, but markets urged EHS to base fees on market size. In response, the new fees for 2016 will be based on the number of permitted vendors hosted by the market in the prior year. Only those vendors permitted through EHS to serve prepared foods are counted in this vendor total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farmers Market Coordinator Fee Schedule</th>
<th>2012-2015 Fee</th>
<th>2016 Fee</th>
<th>Number of Markets Currently in Each Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small (1-5 permitted vendors)</td>
<td>$502*</td>
<td>$780</td>
<td>9 markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (6-15 permitted vendors)</td>
<td>$502*</td>
<td>$960</td>
<td>23 markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (16 or more permitted vendors)</td>
<td>$502*</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>12 markets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An earlier, but ultimately rejected, proposal would have retained a uniform fee structure and increased the fee to $1,136 for all markets.

**Board of Health Action and Next Steps**
Before adopting the revised fee structure, BOH members acknowledged that some permittees—particularly single event permittees that had fallen in the former $55 limited category and farmers market coordinators—would see steep increases. Environmental Health Fees Subcommittee Chair and Auburn City Councilmember Largo Wales conveyed the PIC’s feedback during the October 15 BOH meeting and spoke about the challenge of setting fees based on a full cost-recovery model. While noting that the new permit structure is responsive to the kind of permitting options stakeholders requested and that intensive stakeholder engagement was conducted, Councilmember Wales also noted that the high cost of permits remains an issue and that more work must be done to reduce fees. She asked EHS to find more efficiencies and report back to the BOH. King County Councilmember Kathy Lambert also requested EHS provide such a report, and King County Councilmember and BOH Chair Joe McDermott underscored that more monitoring of EHS and a report back to the BOH were necessary. EHS is now scheduled to report back to the BOH on December 17, 2015. SCA staff will keep PIC members apprised of the results of that report.