SCA Public Issues Committee
AGENDA
September 9, 2015 – 7:00 PM
Renton City Hall

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 – July 8, 2015 meeting**
   2 minutes
   Page 4

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

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

6. **Solid Waste Advisory Committee Appointments**
   **ACTION ITEM**
   5 minutes
   Page 62
   Hank Margeson, PIC Nominating Committee Chair
   (5 minutes)

7. **Farmers Market and Temporary Event Fees**
   **DISCUSSION ITEM**
   15 minutes
   Page 64
   Ellie Wilson-Jones, Policy Analyst
   (5 minute overview, 10 minute discussion)

8. **Bridges and Roads Task Force**
   **DISCUSSION ITEM**
   15 minutes
   Page 68
   Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst
   (5 minute overview, 10 minute discussion)

9. **Solid Waste Transfer Plan Review**
   **DISCUSSION ITEM**
   15 minutes
   Page 78
   Doreen Booth, Policy Analyst
   (5 minute overview, 10 minute discussion)
10. **E911 Oversight**  
   UPDATE  
   Page 102  
   Deanna Dawson  
   (5 minute update, 5 minute Q and A)

11. **Service Guidelines Task Force**  
   UPDATE  
   Page 166  
   Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst  
   (5 minute update, 5 minute Q and A)

12. **Best Starts for Kids Levy**  
   UPDATE  
   Page 172  
   Ellie Wilson-Jones, Policy Analyst  
   (5 minute update, 5 minute Q and A)

13. **Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County**  
   UPDATE  
   Page 176  
   Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst  
   (2 minute update, 3 minute comments)

14. **SCA Issues for 2015**  
   UPDATE  
   Page 178  
   Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst  
   (2 minute update, 3 minute comments)

15. **Upcoming Events**  
   a. SCA Public Issues Committee Meeting – Wednesday, October 14, 2015 – 7:00 PM – Renton City Hall  
   b. SCA Networking Dinner – Wednesday, October 28, 2015 – 5:30 PM – Renton Pavilion Event Center

16. **For the Good of the Order**

17. **Adjourn**
Did You Know?

Several SCA cities (including Auburn, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Kent, Lake Forest Park, Redmond, Shoreline, and Tukwila) issued proclamations recognizing August 26, 2015 as Women's Equality Day. Women’s Equality Day commemorates the granting of the right to vote to women. 2015 was the 95th anniversary of the 19th Amendment of the US Constitution being certified as law.

Did you also know that 5 cities in King County currently have a majority of women on their city councils – and that all of them are SCA member cities? Can you name all 5?

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 7:02 PM. 26 cities had representation ([Attachment A](#)). Guests present included: Bill Peloza, Auburn City Council; Don Gerend, Sammamish City Council; Benson Wong, Mercer Island City Council; Rachel Bianchi, City of Tukwila; Edie Gilliss, City of Seattle; Diane Carlson, King County Executive’s Office; Jeff Gaisford, King County; Michael Huddleston, King County Council staff.

2. **Public Comment**
Chair Talmas asked if any member of the public had any public comment. Seeing none, Chair Talmas closed the public comment portion of the meeting.

3. ** Approval of the June 10, 2015 Minutes**
Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, moved, seconded by Councilmember Ross Loudenback, North Bend, to approve the June 10, 2015 meeting minutes.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Chair’s Report**
Chair Talmas reported that the SCA leadership met with Executive Constantine on June 30, 2015, and discussed the Best Starts for Kids levy and legislative issues including the transportation package. Chair Talmas also reported that earlier in the day, at the Regional Policy Committee (RPC), the SCA caucus discussed issues relating to Public Service Answering Points (PSAP) situation which will be discussed later in this meeting’s agenda. There were a number of concerns raised about this issue, many of which come from the auditor’s report and findings.

5. **Executive Director’s Report**
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, reported on the July 1, 2015 SCA Networking Dinner, which included 11 legislators and over 130 attendees. Many of the legislators were former city elected officials and members of SCA and there was candid conversation about the legislative session to date and ways to be more effective in working with our legislators.

6. **Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Coordinating Board and King Conservation District Review Teams Appointments**
Redmond Council President Hank Margeson, PIC Nominating Committee Chair, reported that the PIC Nominating Committee met prior to the PIC meeting to approve the previous meeting
minutes, and discuss three nominations for recommendation of two members to the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Coordinating Board to the PIC.

**Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, moved, seconded by Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, to recommend to the SCA Board of Directors the appointment of Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, and Councilmember Doreen Marchione, Kirkland, as members to the Committee to End Homelessness Coordinating Board.**

Chair Margeson spoke to his motion. This was a unanimous decision by the PIC Nominating Committee that not only includes a new member for these issues in Mayor Backus, but it also keeps the legacy and continuity of expertise in Councilmember Marchione. This recommendation also provides geographic balance.

There was no further discussion. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Margeson also reported that SCA has appointing authority for three member seats on each of the three new review teams at the King Conservation District (KCD) to review grant applications for Urban Shorelines and Riparian Habitat; Urban Forestry; and Regional Food Grants. SCA called for nominations, first from members of the KCD Advisory Committee and then more broadly.

**Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, moved, seconded by Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, to recommend to the SCA Board of Directors the appointment of Black Diamond Councilmember Erika Morgan, Lake Forest Park Mayor Mary Jane Goss, and Snoqualmie Community Development Director Mark Hofman, as members to the Urban Shorelines and Riparian Habitat review team; and the appointment of Medina Mayor Patrick Boyd, Tukwila staff member Carol Lumb, and Beaux Arts Village Councilmember Cynthia Hudson, as members to the Urban Forestry review team; and the appointment of Burien Deputy Mayor Nancy Tosta, Issaquah Council President Paul Winterstein, and Auburn Councilmember Bill Peloza, as members to the Regional Food Grants review team.**

There was no further discussion. **The motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Talmas thanked the PIC Nominating Committee members.

7. **Best Starts for Kids Levy**

Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, gave the PIC an update on the Best Starts for Kids levy. She referred members to the materials included in the packet for general background on the item. She passed out handouts of a striker amendment (Attachment B) that was introduced at the County Council’s Budget and Fiscal Management (BFM) committee earlier that day, as well as a redlined version of the striker amendment (Attachment C).

Dawson noted that the BFM committee passed the striking amendment by a 4-1 vote, and moved the amended ordinance out of committee with no recommendation unanimously. The full Council will take up the ordinance on Monday.
Dawson highlighted the areas of particular interest to SCA members.

The striker increased (from $16 million to $19 million) the amount allocated to the youth and family homelessness prevention initiative. This is ½ of the first year’s proceeds from the levy. The extra $3 million comes from a deletion of the proposed $3 million that would have gone into research from the first year’s proceeds.

The striker calls out specifically that no less than $42.8 million would go to public health services such as maternity support services and the nurse family partnership.

The striker decreased the percentage (from 6% to 5%) that would go to evaluation and data collection, and increased (from 9% to 10%) the percentage going to Communities of Opportunity.

The striker has added detail on governance and oversight. Specifically, the striker amendment requires the executive to transmit a plan that details the duties and composition of the advisory boards to the Council by December 1, 2015. The striker specifically calls out cities for inclusion in the oversight committee, and requires that the stakeholders represent geographic diversity. Dawson noted that this process and timing are consistent with how other levies at the county (MIDD, Veterans and Human Services) have addressed governance and oversight. The striker requires the executive to transmit an implementation plan for the $19 million youth and family homelessness prevention plan to Council by February 1, 2016 for review and approval by ordinance. The striker requires that the Executive transmit an implementation plan as to the rest of the funds (except for $2 million of planning funds, and the public health funds) to Council by June 1, 2016. The implementation plans must include an annual reporting process to the Council, and the Regional Policy Committee (RPC).

Dawson noted that at the BFM hearing, the committee members and staff discussed a proposal by Kirkland to dedicate funding for construction of housing for youth and families. That proposal is not included in the current striker amendment. At the BFM hearing, Executive staff gave members some background on a number of new sources of funding for affordable housing that are now available to the County. These include the ability to bond against hotel/motel tax dollars (estimated to bring in $45-50 million between now and 2021), $75 million in new housing trust fund statewide, $2.5 million in a regional equitable development fund, significant additional affordable housing funding if ST3 passes, and the potential for the county to impose an additional 1/10th of 1% for affordable housing. It was noted that if the county did not access this latter new source of revenue, cities would have the ability to do so. Executive staff also noted that they will soon be transmitting to Council a proposed affordable housing strategy, which is separate and distinct from the Best Starts for Kids levy.

Dawson noted that based on conversations with Councilmembers this week, it appears that the County Council is attempting to be responsive to the issues raised by SCA and its member cities.

Dawson noted that the City of Black Diamond was not present at the meeting, but had written to express their support for placing the levy on the ballot.
Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, asked for further detail on the governance. Dawson clarified that there would be two separate oversight committees. The existing interim governance group would continue to oversee Communities of Opportunity. Dawson serves as SCA’s representative on this committee. A new oversight group, consistent with recommendations of the Youth Action Plan, would be convened to oversee the remainder of the levy. Larson noted that in a recent meeting with Executive Dow Constantine, Constantine had pledged his support for strong city representation and geographic balance on the committee.

Dawson noted that the striker amendment passed out of committee that day was still being reviewed by the Council, and may be subject to further refinement. The County Council would next discuss at their meeting on Monday July 12, 2015.

Chair Talmas reviewed the proposed motion contained in the PIC materials, and called for motion.

_Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, moved, seconded by Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, to recommend the following policy position to the SCA Board of Directors:_

_In order to support the healthy development of children and youth, families and communities across King County, the Sound Cities Association (SCA) urges the King County Council to place the Best Starts for Kids levy on the November 2015 ballot for consideration by the voters._

Discussion on the motion ensued.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, noted that Tukwila strongly supported the levy, and that her city would be sending a letter in support of the levy.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, complimented the process in bringing this item up for consideration. His council had concerns regarding governance, and the striker amendment introduced today alleviated those concerns. He was pleased to see the requirement for implementation plans, and for geographic diversity on the oversight committee.

Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, noted that her council had a robust discussion and voted to support the position 4-3. She felt confident that based on the striker language, her council would support by a larger margin. She appreciated that geographic equity in an oversight group was being addressed. She noted that one of her councilmember’s had concerns about whether universal access to screening would mean intrusive, required assessments even if not wanted by families. Her council also expressed interest in ensuring accountability, and ensuring that dollars are spent responsibly.

Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, noted that Auburn has supported the levy from the beginning. The funding for public health alone would be enough to warrant support, but the levy should be supported for other reasons as well. Spending dollars upfront on prevention is critical. Without this upfront investment, we will be spending exponentially more in the future. This is a forward thinking measure that will benefit all of King County.
Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, thanked Diane Carlson from the Executive’s office for presenting to her city council. Her council supports the County Council placing the levy on the ballot.

Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline, noted that he was an early supporter of the levy. The County has worked hard to put together a plan for youth that makes sense. It is necessary to spend more dollars upfront on youth. It is critical that the needs of children before age 3 are addressed. Eggen noted that he had attended meetings of the Youth Action Plan Task Force, and felt like the voices of cities were being respected by that process. Shoreline supports putting the levy out for a vote.

Deputy Mayor Dan Grausz, Mercer Island, noted that his council had discussed the levy earlier, and unanimously supported. He questioned the name of the levy, noting that from a public relations standpoint, “Best Starts for Kids” was confusing, especially as the levy was intended to address the needs of youth up to age 24. Grausz noted that Mercer Island has its own Youth and Family Services department, and that he hoped his city’s staff would be able to participate in the planning and implementation.

Councilmember Bill Boyce, Kent, noted that the Kent City Council unanimously supported the measure. He noted that Mike Heinisch, Director of Kent Youth and Family Services, was at his council meeting and expressed support. Boyce did express concern about the number of tax measures coming from the county, and the state. This may make funding city services in the future more challenging.

Councilmember Bob Keller, Sammamish, commented on the robust public process associated with the Best Starts for Kids levy and the Youth Action Plan. The number of public meetings and amount of education made it easier for his city to support. His council supported the measure 7-0.

Councilmember Ross Loudenback, North Bend asked whether the $392 million that would be raised by the levy included a 3% escalator. Dawson conferred with Diane Carlson, and confirmed that it did. Dawson noted that King County Councilmember Jane Hague had asked questions about the amount of the escalator at the BFM committee, and whether that matched financial projections. Staff responded that they would get this information. This information will be provided to PIC as it becomes available.

Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, echoed the comments of Mayor Backus, and noted that this was one of the wisest investments we could make in the future of the county. He noted that he has been visiting all 36 of SCA’s member cities. While he understood questions raised about geographic value to all of the County, he noted that as he has visited cities throughout the county, there are clearly areas that have higher needs than others. He supported funds going where they are most needed.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, noted that his council had discussed this matter the night before. As of last night, his council still had concerns and was not supportive. But the striker amendment has alleviated those concerns, and Redmond is supportive. Margeson noted
that this levy is not just about spending money on kids, but about achieving results. That requires a level of accountability. Margeson noted that like Grausz, he had concerns about the name of the levy, as it has funding for older youth and is not just about “starts.” He also expressed concerns about whether the oversight committee for this levy would coordinate with the oversight committees for the Veterans and Human Services and MIDD levies, as well as the Committee to End Homelessness. Dawson noted that having oversight through the RPC was one way to help with that coordination.

Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, noted that he serves on the Board of Health and had therefore been getting reports on this matter early on. He noted that Kenmore supports the proposal, but also has some concerns about how to evaluate programs already in place, and how to measure success.

Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac, noted that her city would benefit greatly from the levy and is very supportive. She noted the need to not just adopt this position, but to see the matter through to November. She noted that local government is where things are getting done. She noted the importance of King County successfully implementing local strategies. But she also wanted to ensure that there was coordination with efforts in Olympia. She encouraged coordination with Representative Ruth Kagi. Gregerson also noted the need for a continuum between early learning through higher education, and noted the link between supporting this and economic prosperity.

Chair Talmas thanked Diane Carlson for arranging for executive staff to present to the Woodinville city council the previous evening, and noted that there was broad support for the position at his council.

Mayor Backus thanked all the PIC members for taking the time to bring this matter to their councils and to discuss, and come prepared to take a vote.

Chair Talmas called for the vote.

*The motion passed unanimously.*

**8. Road to 70% Recycling**

Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, provided an overview of the staff report contained in the PIC materials. Booth provided background on the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan and on recent activities to update the plan. She noted that a cornerstone of the solid waste plan is the recycling rate goal. The draft 2013 plan had a 70% recycling goal by the year 2020. The plan also included actions cities and the county could take to get to the recycling rate, however, the actions were voluntary. Voluntary actions have not proven to increase recycling rates over the past 8 years; rates are relatively stagnant at ~ 53%. Booth also noted that 63% of the waste stream that goes to the landfill is readily recyclable and another 15%, potentially recyclable. 29% of the waste stream is food and organic matter including compostable paper. Booth outlined why the solid waste division focused on the recycling rate, ultimately to extend the life of the Cedar Hills Landfill. Landfilling waste locally is currently the cheapest and most
environmentally beneficial disposal option available. She noted that the longer we can keep Cedar Hills open, the longer we have that relatively inexpensive disposal ability.

Booth reviewed a series of questions SWAC members are interested in getting feedback on:
1. Is maximizing the life of the Cedar Hill Regional Landfill a priority for cities?
2. If it is, are cities willing to take actions to maximize that life? Actions could include banning food waste from the garbage; repurposing grant dollars; changing pick up frequency; requiring waste separation at multi-family and commercial buildings and adopting new commercial building codes related to waste disposal needs.
3. Do cities want to take collective action or first work on their own? If collective action, should the focus be on the largest recyclable portion of the waste stream, food? And or if on their own, do cities support a more rigorous requirement in 5 years if a city is not on track.

Chair Talmas opened the discussion and introduced Chris Eggen and Stacia Jenkins as SCA’s Solid Waste Advisory Committee members.

Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, noted that her city would be reluctant to support mandates and collective action; Lake Forest Park is on their way to reaching 70% goal.

Councilmember Marlla Mhoon, Covington, stated that she believed that Covington would support taking collective action; the council wants to make garbage, yard waste, and recycling mandatory services.

Deputy Mayor Dan Grausz, Mercer Island, questioned who was going to enforce food waste separation. Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, shared that in Seattle, waste haulers monitor food waste disposal in garbage cans. Grausz supported education to encourage and incentivize food waste recycling first and noted he wanted to see effort before penalty.

Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline, noted Shoreline has issues with prohibiting food waste in the garbage and requiring collection of yard waste, however, he also noted a that a set of rules could be written to be flexible enough to deal with residents who want to compost or have other needs. He suggested a program would need to be results-based and he envisioned a collective agreement between customers and haulers. Eggen also noted that no one has suggested that enforcement of food waste separation would provide for criminal or civil penalties. Although someone could be charged a fee for putting food waste into garbage, they would not be taken to court. Eggen also heard a concern that food waste could attract bears and other animals; he noted the proposal is to move food waste from the garbage can to the yard waste can, not to create a new waste stream.

Councilmember Stacia Jenkins, Normandy Park, said that we have a window now to reduce our waste tonnage and reduce costs in the long run for exporting waste out of state; the less waste, the less costs. Jenkins noted that a food waste program could be modeled after the successful yard waste program. Much of the success of that program was achieved through education, virtually no enforcement occurs now and the program has a 97% compliance rate.
Councilmember Bob Keller, Sammamish, noted Sammamish recently had a discussion about mandatory yard waste and after viewing the results of a citizen survey, decided not to make mandatory yard waste part of their next contract. Keller noted that education was the best option.

Councilmember Melissa Musser, Des Moines, was hesitant to support a collective, one size fits all, model. Musser shared that she is in the property management business and discussed the challenges with multi-family buildings, including limited waste and recycling facilities at buildings and the demographics of residents which can be a barrier to communicating waste and recycling disposal policies. Musser noted the challenges of communicating with residents who are non-English speakers. Musser also discussed the possibility of solutions being provided locally for waste after Cedar Hills closed and asked about the positive impacts on cities if private companies could address waste.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, stated that Issaquah had a long standing willingness to make policy changes in the solid waste arena, for example, polystyrene and plastic bag bans. Marts noted that the more communities adopt a given standard, the better it is for garbage companies to manage the waste stream.

Councilmember Mhoon noted caution related to mandatory yard waste collection and increased illegal dumping. She also noted that R&D Recycling in Fife accepts corrugated yard signs for recycling.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, agreed that maximizing the life of Cedar Hills is important. In response to an earlier comment on citizens’ desires to compost their own waste, Margeson noted that it is not required to set out a yard waste bin each week; if a citizen wants to compost their waste, they can. He noted that in the Redmond contract, there is no additional charge for yard waste. He also noted that while he supports collective action, Redmond is signing a 10 year contract with their hauler now. He suggested instead of requiring collective action now, SCA could support a set of principles related to increasing the recycling rate to 70% and he noted he thought 70% recycling was attainable. A principle Margeson did not support was resource recovery by hand at transfer stations. He noted that changing rates can lead to changing behavior and used increases in water rates and the decrease in water usage as an example. Margeson also suggested having haulers help find a solution to the problem of food waste.

Councilmember Lisa Jensen, Newcastle, shared that the Newcastle City Council is not interested in mandates. Jensen recommended education for councilmembers and citizens, as well as a menu of options for cities to choose from to increase recycling rates.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, noted that Tukwila does not support mandates, in part as the city has many self-haul waste users. She did note that it is a priority to extend the life of Cedar Hills and supported collective action if it were in the form of education. Kruller was also concerned about syncing up contracts and was cognizant of the challenges with Tukwila’s diverse community and school district. In response to a question about cities with mandated
collection, Booth noted that only 17 of the 37 cities in the system have mandatory waste collection.

Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, reminded members that SCA members had been asking for a waste-to-energy study for years but the Solid Waste Division has not yet undertaken such a study.

Council President Margeson asked where MSWMAC (Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee) was on the issue. Booth noted that SCA staff and SWAC members were working with MSWMAC’s representatives on a 70% Road to Recycling subcommittee. Booth also noted that generally MSWMAC supported collective efforts but found the required actions difficult for cities to implement. Deputy Mayor Eggen noted that most MSWMAC members are staff and are looking for policy direction from elected officials.

The discussion from PIC will be shared with MSWMAC, SWAC, and the Solid Waste Division. A future item on this topic for potential action will be brought back to PIC.

9. Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) Strategic Plan

Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, reported that the SCA Board of Directors adopted a policy position on June 17, 2015 endorsing the 2015-2019 CEH Strategic Plan. At the June 10, 2015 PIC meeting, the PIC voted 13-2-5 on the this policy position, resulting in a vote tally one vote shy of the supermajority of PIC members present necessary to advance the position to the Board for consideration. However, soon after the June 10 PIC meeting, several member cities that had abstained from the vote or that were unable to attend the meeting informed SCA staff and the Board about their support for the policy position. As a result, the Board felt comfortable moving forward with the policy position and ultimately sent an endorsement to the Committee to End Homelessness Governing Board prior to the plan’s adoption on June 30, 2015. Dawson noted that PIC members had been briefed about these developments via email as they occurred.

Because the CEH was scheduled to vote on the Strategic Plan on June 30, this timing necessitated action prior to the July 8, 2015 PIC meeting, by which point the issue would be moot. Additionally, the credibility of the SCA was at issue. While early iterations of the Strategic Plan were flawed, the final version of the Strategic Plan included extensive revisions made at the request of, and largely drafted by, SCA. As a result, this final Strategic Plan addressed member cities’ earlier criticisms. There was some concern that the compromises that had been negotiated to address SCA concerns and secure SCA’s endorsement, would be rolled back if SCA did not move to support the plan in its then present form.

Deputy Mayor Nancy Tosta, Burien, noted that Burien abstained from the June 10 PIC vote on the CEH policy position because of timing. She stated that her council did not have time to consider the final draft of the CEH Strategic Plan because they did not meet between the day the June PIC packet was sent out and the June 10 PIC meeting. She noted the challenges of her council fully discussing items that would be coming before PIC.
Dawson stated, by way of comparison, that the version of the Best Starts for Kids levy ordinance considered at tonight’s PIC meeting was introduced as a striker amendment this morning. While this did not allow for advance consideration by PIC members and their councils, the timing for the Best Starts for Kids levy ordinance nonetheless necessitated action tonight. She referred to discussions from some members earlier in the evening, who had gotten direction from their councils as to how to vote if certain issues were resolved. Dawson suggested the possibility of a future pre-PIC workshop on the subject of how cities address such situations and how they provide direction to their PIC members.

Chair Talmas stated that he had recommended the Board adopt the CEH policy position at the Board’s June 17 meeting because several cities that abstained from the June 10 PIC vote or that were not in attendance had subsequently expressed support for the policy position. Additionally, Chair Talmas said his recommendation that the Board act June 17 was driven by the necessity of acting prior to the Governing Board’s June 30 meeting. Chair Talmas stated that it would not have made sense to bring the policy position back to the PIC in July, after the Governing Board’s adoption of the Strategic Plan.

Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, stated that there was also discussion by the Board at its June 17, 2015 meeting of a potential amendment to the SCA bylaws to address the impact of abstentions, which currently have the impact of a “no” vote.

Councilmember Hank Margeson, Redmond, stated that his council gives him flexibility to assess changing circumstances and take a position for the city on issues before the PIC. For instance, on the Best Starts for Kids policy position considered earlier this meeting, Margeson stated that the night before it was unclear how Redmond would vote. If Redmond’s concerns were addressed he would vote in favor, and otherwise he would not. Margeson added that before going to get feedback on positions before the PIC, he first conducts research and forms a draft position and then asks his council to inform him if they do not support that position. With respect to CEH, Margeson said he told his council that all of their requests for the Strategic Plan had been addressed and he then had their support.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, stated that she thinks everyone operated in good faith in this instance but that the Board should only adopt policy positions without prior PIC approval as an exception. Dawson concurred.

Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, stated that he supports having a pre-PIC workshop as suggested by Dawson. He suggested listing future PIC agenda items on the SCA website, in advance of the full PIC packet being released.

Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, updated the PIC on actions by the CEH since the June 10 PIC meeting. After months of work by the various CEH committees, involvement by more than 500 stakeholders, and discussion at the first six PIC meetings of 2015, the CEH Governing Board voted unanimously on June 30 to adopt the 2015-2019 CEH Strategic Plan as well as a revised CEH Charter. With those two votes—to approve the Strategic Plan and to adopt a new charter—CEH will now transition to a new governance structure headed by a still-to-be formed Coordinating Board.
Under the new charter, the Coordinating Board replaces the Governing Board and Interagency Council. As has been discussed tonight, SCA will appoint two members to the Coordinating Board. King County and the cities of Seattle and Bellevue will also make appointments. The remaining members of the 25-30-member Coordinating Board will be selected by the existing CEH Executive Committee. SCA has not, in the past, been represented on the CEH Executive Committee. The Governing Board has added one spot, however, for SCA to take part in the Coordinating Board selection process. Councilmember Doreen Marchione, Kirkland, will represent SCA. Once this Executive Committee selects the members of the Coordinating Board, it will be dissolved.

While the Coordinating Board will serve as the policy-making body of CEH, the Funder Alignment Committee—an existing CEH committee—will continue as the body focused on aligning funding to accomplish those policy goals. SCA is not currently represented on the Funder Alignment Committee but has now been given three staff seats under the revised charter. A call for nominations for these seats will go out to members soon.

The CEH staff report in tonight’s packet highlights these governance changes. It also describes several strategies from the new Strategic Plan that are most closely tied to the work of cities. Cities may wish to implement some of these strategies locally.

Finally, while the CEH Strategic Plan has occupied discussion at every PIC meeting in 2015, SCA staff have heard from the SCA membership that there’s appetite for additional collaboration and a desire to get to work on implementation. Already, outside the plan there is a substantial amount of work now underway in member cities.

Wilson-Jones asked the PIC if members would like to bring back, at a future meeting, discussion of the efforts local cities are now taking to address homelessness. Such a discussion would provide an opportunity for members to share the successes their cities have achieved as well as the obstacles they are facing.

Wilson-Jones provided examples of ongoing work in the cities of Redmond and Auburn. Redmond has formed a taskforce on homelessness, and Auburn Mayor Nancy Backus is working to form a similar taskforce in her city. Additionally, Auburn is hosting two AmeriCorps positions currently to address homelessness and housing issues. Mayor Backus has also joined the Mayor’s Challenge to End Veteran Homelessness, as have Mayors Dave Hill of Algona, David Baker of Kenmore, and Dennis Law of Renton.

Dawson stated that there are two goals for having such a discussion. First, the discussion would help member cities to raise awareness, externally, about the work that is being done by member cities to address homelessness. Second, the discussion will allow member cities to generate ideas for addressing homelessness in their communities.

Kruller, who serves as the vice chair of the Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee (RLSJC), stated that the RLSJC will be focusing on homelessness at its December 2015 meeting and will be inviting speakers from the Committee to End Homelessness as well as SCA member cities and the city of Seattle.
Members agreed that they would like this item brought back to a future meeting as suggested by staff.

10. Service Guidelines Task Force
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that the sixth meeting of the Service Guidelines Task Force was held on June 16, 2015. The meeting included an introduction of draft principles and preliminary recommendations based on Task Force direction, as well as a short discussion about policies for financial partnerships with partner jurisdictions or private partners.

On June 16, King County Metro proposed changes to the Task Force schedule to account for further analysis of service types and other preliminary recommendations. As Kuciemba noted in previous PIC meetings, Service Guidelines Task Force members—and SCA members in particular—have expressed interest in seeing how new services types could affect service decisions. As a result of this request, Metro staff will be conducting a comprehensive analysis on several new and existing service types: Seattle core (existing), Non-Seattle core (existing), Demand Response (Dial-a-Ride Transit and community shuttles with variable routing), and Express (peak-only routes).

Kuciemba reported that also at the request of SCA members on the Task Force, Metro will be conducting analysis on an additional service type which is anticipated to reflect comments by Task Force members. The additional service type analyzed may include categorizing like-services, density of service area, or the intent of the service. Metro will begin presenting their analysis at a Technical Workshop in mid-August.

Kuciemba provided an overview of draft recommendations, which will continue to evolve with the additional analysis that Metro staff will be conducting over the summer. Highlights of these recommendations are:

- Modify service types and develop a minimum service standard for service types
- Create a point system that allows for scaling for social equity and geographic value.
- Enhance the planning process to include addressing origin and destination data, better identify the needs of transit users or potential users of, including youth, disabled and elderly populations.
- Enhance the alternative services program, create a new metric for measuring performance, consider modifications to increase van pool subsidy.
- Make changes to partnerships and land-use initiatives, including identifying new community partnerships to support low-income worker transit options.
- Support new funding to support the growth of transit services.
- Be more explicit about partnerships opportunities, which could include working with jurisdictions to create investments that improve service, attract transit riders and achieve land use goals that support transit services.
- Develop and implement a strategy which utilizes park-and-ride resources and adds capacity, while developing plans for future investment in new or expanded park-and-ride capacity.
Kuciemba closed by stating that the next meeting of the Task Force will be held on either August 12 or August 13, which will be a technical workshop to describe analysis on service types and outcomes from higher level recommended changes to the service guidelines. Both Task Force members and their staff will be encouraged to attend this meeting.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, questioned whether a new metric would be added to the draft recommendations related to the performance of park-and-rides. Kuciemba responded that Metro is assessing park-and-ride performance, access, and metrics through their long range planning efforts and in the two-year Access to Transit study, which was requested by SCA members of the Regional Transit Committee.

Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, who serves on the Task Force, stated that a framework for park-and-rides will be front and center because there needs to be a strategy to describe artificial densities.

Margeson expressed concerns that Metro will not consider ongoing investments in park-and-rides to transport riders which is difficult for those communities that rely on them for access to transit. Kuciemba responded that Metro has heard this feedback from SCA members in a number of different forums and it is resonating. As a result, Metro’s long range planning process is looking at how increased park-and-ride options could improve access to transit. It is to the credit of SCA members who have put the issue of park-and-rides front and center on Metro’s radar.

Larson concluded the discussion by stating that these issues are being evaluated because the need for access to transit is critical.

11. 2015 Legislative Session Update
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, started by thanking SeaTac Mayor/Representative Mia Gregerson for her hard work during the 2015 Legislative session. As of July 8, 2015, the Legislature is eleven days into its third session. Kuciemba acknowledged the considerable amount of time that SCA members spent in contacting their Legislators asking for support SCA priority legislation, including a late round of contacts for the Transportation Package which passed on July 1. The bipartisan votes for the gas tax increase and local transit authority could not have happened without SCA member’s consistent advocacy and support.

Kuciemba reported that the Legislature has not yet completed their work; however, there are reports that an end is in sight. By way of background, in the very early-morning hours of July 1, negotiations on a measure to suspend parts of Initiative 1351 (I-1351), the smaller class size initiative, broke down in the Senate. The failure to delay or suspend I-1351 means there is technically a $2 billion hole in the new state operating budget. However, Senate leadership has announced that agreement has been reached: I-1351 implementation will be delayed by four years and student passage of the high school assessment biology test will not be required for two years.

In summation, Kuciemba reported several significant issues that need to happen before the 2015 session ends:
• There must be finalized passage of I-1351 legislation and high school assessment legislation.
• The Senate needs to take a finalizing vote of the bond measure for the Capital Budget.
• The House needs to pass the Transportation Package bond bill and spending bill which has the project list.

Kuciemba reported that the 16 year, $16 billion Transportation Revenue bill is now in awaiting Governor Inslee’s signature. The Governor has already signed important bipartisan reform bills that help reduce costs and speed up completion of transportation projects. As noted above, the next step is final passage in the House of the spending bill with the project list and the bonding bill which will require a 60 percent majority to pass. Kuciemba noted that the difficult vote on the gas tax increase has been taken so there is every indication that the House will be able to pass both bills.

Kuciemba distributed a complete list of King County projects funded by the Transportation Package which was compiled by PSRC (Attachment D). While not a complete run through, she then went on to point out several of the projects that were included on the list, including:

Shoreline: SR 523 / 145th ST NE Corridor Project
Shoreline will receive $25 million for the SR 523 / 145th St Corridor Project in the Transportation Package. This project is to upgrade the corridor in advance of the Light Rail Station at 145th St and I-5, which requires significant upgrades to accommodate pedestrians, bikes, transit and vehicular movement.

Federal Way: I-5 Triangle Vicinity Project
The I-5 Federal Way project will receive $85 million for the next phase of modifications to the I-5 / SR 18 interchange. This project will relieve congestion particularly at the SR 18 / SR 161 intersection and improve access to SR 161 and the City’s industrially-zoned land.

Kirkland: I-405 and NE 132nd Interchange & Sidewalk Projects
Two projects in Kirkland are funded from the package, including a new $75 million interchange at I-405 and NE 132nd which is scheduled to be complete in 2021. Additionally, there is $1.1 million sidewalk project on NE 52nd street that connects Kirkland’s waterfront with the Cross Kirkland Corridor.

Kenmore: West Sammamish River Bridge & SR 522 West B (57th to 61st Avenues) Projects
Two projects in Kenmore are funded, including $8M towards construction of the West Sammamish River Bridge replacement. The bridge currently has a sufficiency rating of 6 out of 100. Design and geotechnical work is currently underway utilizing a $12M BRAC grant received last year. Additionally, there is $12M in the package to finish design and construct the City of Kenmore’s last segment of SR 522. To date over $75M has been invested in Kenmore’s SR 522 corridor.

Burien: SR 518 off-ramp to Des Moines Memorial Drive Project
The SR 518 Off-Ramp Project is critical to the City of Burien’s economic future. It will connect a planned 160-acre development site to key transportation corridors such as SR 509, I-5, and I-405, thereby accessing Sea-Tac Airport, Ports of Seattle and Tacoma, and downtown Seattle
and Bellevue. Burien, the Port, and multiple State agencies have already invested millions toward improving infrastructure in this area to support this future development.

Redmond: Access Ramp at SR 520 and 148th Avenue NE Project
The Access Ramp Project will provide a direct route from SR 520 to Overlake to support job growth and housing.

Kuciemb a noted that the Transportation Revenue bill provides Sound Transit the authority to ask voters for up to $15 billion in property, sales, and motor vehicle excise tax hike which would likely be on the ballot in November 2016. The package also states that cities or counties with overlapping boundaries of a transportation benefit district (TBD) may absorb and take on the powers of those districts. TBDs will now have authority to impose a vehicle fee of up to $40 if a $20 fee has been in effective for at least 24 months. After the $40 fee has been in place for two years additional councilmanic increases are authorized, but would be subject to referendum.

To conclude her overview of the Transportation Package, Kuciemb a reported that the package includes direct distribution of funds to cities and counties of $375 million split 50% cities/50% counties. Of the $187.5 million to cities, $87.5 million comes from gas tax revenues, $100 million from the Multimodal Account. Kuciemb a distributed a handout from legislative committee staff which shows estimated distribution to cities within King County over 16 years (Attachment E).

Kuciemb a moved on to cover other 2015 legislative priorities for SCA members, including the marijuana market reform legislation, HB 2136, which contains provisions that adjust the tax rates on medical and recreational marijuana and would share a portion of the marijuana excise tax with local governments. HB 2136 was signed by Governor Inslee on June 30, 2015.

A late piece of legislation, the Local Option for Affordable Housing & Mental Health Services bill, HB 2263, was passed allowing county or city governments to adopt a 1/10th of 1% sales tax to fund capital, operations and maintenance, as well as mental health facilities and services.

Kuciemb a reported that the 2015-2017 Operating Biennial Budget saw some good news and disappointing news. The good news is the full distribution of local liquor taxes at $50.1 million and the Fire Insurance Premium Tax has been retained at $9.3 million. The disappointing news is that the Public Works Trust Fund as we know it seems to have all but disappeared with $73 million being swept away. Projects currently funded will be funded to completion. Looking forward to 2016, there is an opportunity to reevaluate how public works infrastructure projects are funded and explore new programs or proposals with the legislature next session.

Kuciemb a noted that a robust 2015-2017 Capital Budget has been adopted and there are many projects that will benefit SCA member cities. Over the course of the 2015 session, SCA-supported legislation found considerable success, including oil train safety, flood control districts, affordable housing bonds, and increased funding for the Area Agency on Aging. SCA-supported legislation that will need to be revisited in 2016 includes work on the 1% property tax cap lift, paint stewardship, ongoing public health funding, and the Public Works Trust Fund.
Kuciemba concluded her legislative overview by stating that the last possible day of the third session is July 27, 2015. However, it is anticipated that the Senate could meet as early as July 9 and the House on July 10.

Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, questioned whether a city that prohibits the siting of a marijuana business would be prohibited from receiving a local distribution of revenue. Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, responded in the affirmative.

Deputy Mayor Dan Grausz, Mercer Island, stated that he had attended the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) meeting prior in the day where the agency presented a different tone about the passage of the Transportation Package. Grausz stated that the PSCAA is very concerned about how to continue improving the air quality in the Puget Sound region now that the Governor is prohibited from implementing low-carbon fuel standards. PSCAA is reportedly talking to attorneys about what authority they may have to work with cities and counties on ways to improve clean air standards at a local level. Grausz announced that there are potentially two carbon tax initiatives that may make way their way to the November 2016 ballot, which would compete against each other and a likely ST3 proposal.

Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline, inquired whether the bonding bill for the Transportation Package is expected to be dealt with this session. Dawson responded that the bond bill is anticipated to be passed this session. Eggen followed by asking how long the Governor is prevented from implementing low-carbon fuel standards. Kuciemba responded that the Governor agreed not to implement low-carbon fuel standards by rule until at least 2023. Dawson noted that the Legislature could pass low-carbon fuel standards through legislation. Dawson also recommended that SCA members contact their legislator to encourage passage of the bonding bill for the Transportation Package.

Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, stated that the Legislature did not prohibit all legislation related to clean air. Rather, Nixon confirmed that the Governor cannot implement low-carbon fuel standards by rule. Nixon felt that PSCAA is overreacting to the prohibitions in the Transportation Package.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, questioned the likelihood that the Washington State Supreme Court will weigh-in on the four-year delay in implementing I-1351 through the ongoing McCleary litigation. Dawson responded that had the legislature not delayed implementation and had instead left a $2 billion hole in the budget, this would be more likely to result in action by the Court than the legislature taking action to address the shortfall. She encouraged Marts to consult with his city’s lobbyist.

12. Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County
Chair Talmas stated that at the January 14, 2015 PIC meeting, members were asked to provide information on upcoming levies or ballot measures in their cities or the county. He invited members to provide feedback on whether other items should be added to the list. This will be a recurring item on the PIC agenda. Members can also provide feedback directly to SCA staff.
Katie Kuciembba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, asked SCA members if there were additional ballot measures to be added to the list included in the PIC packet. Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, stated that King County is working on several updates to the measures on the list and will send an updated list next week.

Councilmember Toby Nixon, Kirkland, stated that Kirkland will likely be placing a Metropolitan Park District measure on the November ballot which will be $0.75/$1,000. The City Council is expected to take action on whether to place the measure on the ballot at their July 21, 2015 meeting.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, stated that the Tukwila School District is in the formative stages of developing a school bond levy, which may be placed on the ballot in 2016.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, is hearing that the Lake Washington School District is looking to place a new schools bond measure on the ballot in 2016.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, stated that the Issaquah School District is developing a $450-500 million bond that is expected on the ballot in April 2016.

13. SCA Issues for 2015
Chair Talmas stated that at the January 14, 2015 PIC meeting, members were asked to provide issues the PIC should consider this year. He invited members to provide feedback on whether other items should be added to the list. This will be a recurring item on the PIC agenda. Members can also bring items directly to SCA staff.

Katie Kuciembba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, began by stating that there have been several updates to the 2015 issues, including the Committee to End Homelessness and Best Starts for Kids to reflect the July 8 PIC agenda. Kuciembba went on to suggest that a future PIC agenda topic could be King County Metro’s Long Range Plan effort which could be timed around the Regional Transit Committee workshop in September 2015. Kuciembba encouraged jurisdictional staff to attend the Long Range Plan Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meetings to in mid-July.

Chair Talmas recommended that a possible issue to add to the SCA Issues for 2015 list is the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Oversight Committee work plan proposed by the King County Executive’s Office.

By way of background, Kuciembba stated that there was an overview of the King County Auditor’s Office report on 911 services at the July 8, 2015 meeting of the Regional Policy Committee (RPC). The report recommended governance changes and some delay of the County’s Next Generation 911 (NG911) work. In response to a King County Council proviso, the Executive’s Office has formally submitted a work plan and proposed list of representatives to serve on the PSAP Oversight Committee. Kuciembba distributed a list of the proposed representatives to PIC members, which includes one SCA representative (Attachment F).
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, provided an overview on the role of PSAPs in King County.

Chair Talmas stated that SCA members of the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) have requested that the PSAP Oversight Committee work plan be brought to RPC in September. Chair Talmas expressed concern with the issues raised in the Auditor’s 911 Report and proposed that PIC discuss the work plan prior to the September RPC meeting so that SCA members can weigh in on the committee membership, if so desired.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, provided emphasis on the recommendation from the Auditor’s report that a new governance structure should exist. Margeson is looking to have direction from PIC members regarding the implementation of NG911 and PSAP Oversight Committee membership.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, stated the work on PSAP is a very important issue that some SCA cities have a stake in. Marts would like more discussion through SCA.

Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives for King County Executive Constantine, confirmed that the King County Council passed the proviso directing the Executive to identify the governance structure for the Oversight Committee. The governance body will be asked to make strategic recommendations on behalf of PSAPs. Carlson stated that the Executive’s Office agrees with the assessments identified in the Auditor’s 911 report. She reported that the County Council is expected to take this up next week; therefore, Carlson encouraged PIC members to talk to the Council about their recommendations for the Oversight Committee membership as soon as possible.

Dawson encouraged PIC members to provide their input to the County Council as soon as possible in the case that the Oversight Committee is not referred to RPC.

Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, stated that he sits on the local as well as the Washington State E911 committee for the Association of Washington Cities so he would be tracking these issues very closely.

14. Informational Items
Chair Talmas reported that there is one informational item: an update on the work of the Regional Water Quality Committee (RWQC).

15. Upcoming Events
The next Public Issues Committee Meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 12, 2015, at 7:00 PM at Renton City Hall.

16. For the Good of the Order
Mayor Mia Gregerson, SeaTac, shared that Ralph Shape, a former SeaTac City Councilmember, had passed away.
Councilmember Marlla Mhoon, Covington, announced that organizations such as Forterra and Washington Wildlife and Recreation hold events that some SCA members attend and SCA may want to consider hosting a table at a future Washington Wildlife and Recreation event.

17. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 9:14 PM.
<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>Black Diamond</td>
<td>Janie Edelman</td>
<td>Tamie Deady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>Tris Samberg</td>
<td>Andy Rheaume</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>Marilla Mhoon</td>
<td>Margaret Harto/Jeff Wagner</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 Kuciemba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellie Wilson-Jones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doreen Booth</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.
STRIKING AMENDMENT TO PROPOSED ORDINANCE 2015-0177, VERSION 1

On page 1, beginning on line 13, strike everything through page 13, line 168, and insert:

"STATEMENT OF FACTS:

1. Approximately twenty-five thousand children are born in King County every year. County residents under age eighteen comprise twenty-one percent of the county's population. Nearly half of people under age eighteen in King County are people of color.

2. Eighty-five percent of the human brain is developed by age three. According to early childhood development experts, basic skills necessary to be ready to learn in school and be successful as an adult, such as self-esteem, motivation, coordination, prioritization, management of incoming information, attention and distraction control, are developed by age five before children go to school.

3. A second significant time of brain development is adolescence. According to the National Institute of Mental Health, the parts of the brain responsible for controlling impulses and planning ahead, which are the
hallmarks of successful adult behavior, mature during adolescence.

Adolescence is also the critical period when young people learn to form
safe and healthy relationships, and when many patterns of health-
promoting or potentially health-damaging behaviors are established.

4. Although King County as a whole is a thriving, prosperous region,
there is evidence that some of our children and youth are in danger of
being left behind. The percentage of children five and under living in
poverty is as low as four and seven-tenths percent in some regions of the
county and as high as twenty-six percent in other regions. Infant mortality
is four times higher in some areas of King County than others.

Approximately one-third of pregnant women do not receive the
recommended levels of prenatal care. One in five adolescents is
overweight or obese and only twenty-four percent of adolescents receive
the recommended levels of physical activity. Twenty-six percent of
adolescents report having depressive feelings and twenty-nine percent
report using alcohol or other illicit drugs. Over six thousand King County
students are homeless; in some school districts as many as one in ten are
homeless.

5. All too often the children and youth who are being left behind and are
not receiving services before a crisis occurs are children and youth of
color. Young people of color make up at least fifty to sixty percent of
youth and young adults experiencing homelessness despite only twenty-
nine percent of King County's general population being people of color.
6. One of the areas where the disparities in those who do not receive appropriate services before a crisis occurs is the juvenile justice system. African-American youth make up approximately fifty percent of those in detention in King County, or five times their rate of representation in the general population. According to a report from the National Conference of State Legislatures as many as seventy percent of youth in the juvenile justice system nationally are affected with a mental disorder, and one in five suffer from a mental illness so severe as to impair their ability to function as a young person and grow into a responsible adult. King County is committed to preventing crises before they occur and ending disproportionality in the juvenile justice system.

7. The county actively engages in equity and social justice efforts to eliminate racial disparities in the juvenile justice system and the council will consider this goal when deliberating on future policies and plans related to the proposed Best Starts for Kids levy.

8. Investment in prevention and early intervention can prevent long-term harm of children as they grow up. According to the National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, extensive research on the biology of stress now shows that healthy development can be derailed by excessive or prolonged activation of stress response systems in the body and the brain, with damaging effects on learning, behavior and health across the lifespan.
9. Prevention and early intervention are also the most effective and least expensive ways to address serious future problems such as chronic disease, mental illness, substance abuse and incarceration. Science tells us that lifelong problems can be prevented: by investing heavily in children before age five; by making strategic investments at critical points in a young person's development before age twenty-four; and by taking actions to ensure that all children and youth have opportunities to live in safe, thriving, health-promoting home, school and community environments.

10. Studies have shown that the return on investment in early childhood development, ensuring that children have a strong start in life, is from three to seventeen dollars for every dollar invested. Similarly, the Institute of Medicine and National Research Council's -2009 Preventing Mental, Emotional, and Behavioral Disorders Among Young People report notes that cost-benefit ratios for early treatment and prevention programs for addictions and mental illness programs range from 1:2 to 1:10. This means a one-dollar investment yields two to ten dollars savings in health costs, criminal and juvenile justice costs, educational costs and lost productivity.

11. Studies show that prevention has positive economic impacts for business. For example, a healthier workforce can reduce the extent to which health insurance costs and employee absenteeism affects a company's competitive edge. In the United States, full-time employees with chronic disease miss an estimated four hundred fifty million...
additional work days per year, compared to healthy employees, contributing to a cost of one hundred fifty-three billion dollars in lost productivity every year.

12. Many of the county's current funding sources, as well as other public budgets, are dedicated to responding to crises and negative outcomes, particularly negative outcomes for adults, such as severe mental illness, homelessness and chronic illness, and for youth who have already dropped out of school or who have been involved in the juvenile justice system. While these are required or necessary expenditures, little funding is available to invest in prevention. For example, seventy-five percent of the county's general fund supports the law and justice system. The veterans and human services levy, because it is focused on services for people who are in crisis, funds services primarily for adults. Only sixteen percent of its total funding is available to support people under age twenty-four and only eleven percent of the total levy funds prevention-oriented services.

13. In 2014, the shortfall of funding for the department of public health - Seattle & King County reached a critical point, threatening the loss of proven prevention and early intervention programs for mothers and families, such as the Nurse Family Partnership home visiting program and maternity support services.

14. While the proposed Best Starts for Kids levy would allow the department of public health – Seattle & King County to continue providing parent-child health services, such as the Nurse Family
Partnership home visiting program and maternity support services, the levy would not stabilize King County's broader public health services. The public health fund remains at risk, as long-term public health funding sources have not been identified.

15. The majority of funding for this proposed Best Starts for Kids levy is intended to go to community partners to provide services in the community. As the levy is being implemented, the county's goal is to ensure that diverse communities, such as traditionally isolated immigrant and refugee communities, and small organizations are able to access funds in order to provide culturally appropriate services in King County. The county intends to collaborate with these organizations and help evaluate innovative new programs or services so that promising practices become proven practices.

16. Services for children and youth will improve as agencies and organizations working with children and youth have opportunities for training, building organizational and system capacity and sufficient resources to administer programs and services.

17. In 2010, the county enacted Ordinance 16857, establishing the King County Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan includes as one of its goals Health and Human Potential: Provide opportunities for all communities and individuals to realize their full potential.

18. In 2010, the county enacted Ordinance 16948, transforming its work on equity and social justice from an initiative to an integrated effort that
applies the King County Strategic Plan's principle of "fair and just"

intentionally in all the county does in order to achieve equitable
opportunities for all people and communities.

19. In 2012, the council adopted Motion 13768, establishing the Health &
Human Services Transformation Plan. The Transformation Plan
establishes as its vision that, by 2020, the people of King County will
experience significant gains in health and well-being because our
community worked collectively to make the shift from a costly, crisis-
oriented response to health and social problems, to one that focuses on
prevention, embraces recovery and eliminates disparities.

20. In 2014, the county enacted Ordinance 17738, establishing the youth
action plan task force and providing policy direction regarding the
development of a youth action plan.

21. In 2014, as part of the implementation of the King County Strategic
Plan, the equity and social justice ordinance, the health and human
services transformation plan and as part of the development of the youth
action plan, King County staff began examining how the county could
balance its investment portfolio towards more preventive approaches that
lead to improved outcomes that allow individuals and communities to
achieve their full potential. The resulting Best Starts for Kids levy
proposal is guided by and represents a further implementation of the
county's adopted policy direction.
22. In addition to building on adopted county policy, in developing the Best Starts for Kids levy proposal, King County staff consulted with experts at the University of Washington Institute for Learning & Brain Sciences and with several groups and coalitions, including the Best Starts for Kids Advisory Group, the Youth Action Plan Task Force, the Transformation Plan Advising Partners Group, the King County Alliance for Human Services, the Youth Development Executive Directors Coalition and several early learning coalitions. County staff also reviewed and consulted with jurisdictions and organizations from around the United States and the world regarding best and promising practices.

23. It is the intent of the council and the executive that the strategies supported by the proposed Best Starts for Kids levy will achieve a variety of individual and community outcomes. Individual outcomes will include outcomes such as the following: increasing the percentage of pregnant women who receive early and adequate prenatal care; increasing technical assistance to child care providers; reducing psychiatric hospitalizations for youth; decreasing the percentage of youth using alcohol or drugs; increasing the percentage of youth who feel they have an adult in their community they feel they can talk to; and decreasing the percentage of school-aged youth in south King County who are at an unhealthy weight.

Community outcomes will include outcomes such as the following: decreasing inequities in outcomes for youth in King County; decreasing suspensions and expulsions, from child care through high school;
decreasing disparities in health and well-being outcomes between different areas within King County; decreasing domestic violence; decreasing funds spent on crisis services, such as incarceration and involuntary commitment; increasing the number of family and youth who are prevented from entering homelessness; and improved quality of life index in Communities of Opportunity.

24. It is the intent of the council and the executive that the youth and family homelessness prevention initiative will provide flexible, client-centered outcomes by providing funding to community agencies to help prevent homelessness among youth and their families.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. Definitions. The definitions in this section apply throughout this ordinance unless the context clearly require otherwise.

A. "Communities of opportunity" means the program launched by The Seattle Foundation and King County in 2014 and memorialized in Contract #5692351, including any successor contract, to support communities in improving the health, social, racial and economic outcomes of the residents of those communities, and to do so by partnering with those communities to shape and own solutions. In the event the formal relationship described in this subsection A. between The Seattle Foundation and King County ceases to be in effect at any point during the life of the levy, the term "communities of opportunity" shall mean a strategy that is designed to improve the health, social, racial, and economic outcomes of specific communities that is administered by the county and developed in partnership with those communities.
B. "Communities of opportunity interim governance group" means the group and any successor group, which shall include one appointee of the executive and one appointee of the council, respectively, specified by ordinance and charged with advising on strategic direction and operations for communities of opportunity. Current interim governance group members include community partners and representatives from local government, from The Seattle Foundation and from King County. If the proposed levy passes, the group will be reconstituted in accordance with section 7.B. of this ordinance.

C. "Levy" means the levy of regular property taxes for the specific purposes and term provided in this ordinance and authorized by the electorate in accordance with state law.

D. "Levy proceeds" means the principal amount of funds raised by the levy and any interest earnings on the funds.

E. "Limit factor", for purposes of calculating the levy limitations in RCW 84.55.010, means one hundred three percent.

F. "Strategy" means a program, service, activity, initiative or capital facility intended to achieve the goals of this ordinance.

G. "Youth" means a person through twenty-four years of age.

H. "Youth and family homelessness prevention initiative" means an initiative intended to prevent and divert youth and their families from becoming homeless.

SECTION 3. Levy submittal. To provide necessary funds for the purposes identified in section 5 of this ordinance, the county council shall submit to the qualified electors of the county a proposition authorizing a regular property tax levy in excess of the levy limitation contained in chapter 84.55 RCW for six consecutive years,
commencing in 2016, at a rate not to exceed fourteen cents per thousand dollars of
assessed value and authorizing a limit factor of one hundred three percent for each of the
five succeeding years, which are 2017 through 2021. In accordance with RCW
84.55.050, this levy shall be a regular property tax levy, which is subject to the statutory
rate limit of RCW 84.52.043.

SECTION 4. Deposit of levy proceeds. The levy proceeds shall be deposited in
a special revenue fund, which fund shall be created by ordinance.

SECTION 5. Eligible expenditures.

A. Out of the first year’s levy proceeds:

1. Nineteen million dollars shall be used to fund and administer a youth and
family homelessness prevention initiative; and

2. Such sums as are necessary to fund the costs and charges incurred by the
county that are attributable to the election.

B. The remaining levy proceeds shall be used to fund and administer the
provision of a wide range of initiatives to:

1. Improve health and well-being outcomes of youth, as well as the families
and the communities in which they live, including, but not limited to, by ensuring
adequate services and supports for pregnant women and newborns; access to safe and
healthy food; and developmental screening for youth;

2. Prevent and intervene early on negative outcomes, including, but not limited
to, chronic disease, mental illness, substance abuse, homelessness, domestic violence and
incarceration;

3. Reduce inequities in outcomes for youth in the county; and
4. Strengthen, improve, better coordinate, integrate and encourage innovation in health and human services systems and the agencies, organizations and groups addressing the needs of youth, their families and their communities.

C. Of the eligible expenditures described in subsection B. of this section:

1. Fifty percent shall be used to fund and administer strategies focused on youth under five years old and their caregivers, pregnant women and for individuals or families concerning pregnancy. Of these funds, not less than $42.8 million shall be used to provide health services, such as maternity support services and nurse family partnership home visiting program services, that are currently delivered through the county’s public health centers;

2. Thirty-five percent shall be used to fund and administer strategies focused on youth ages five through twenty-four years old;

3. Ten percent shall be used to fund and administer communities of opportunity; and

4. Five percent shall be used to fund and administer evaluation and data collection activities and activities designed to improve the delivery of services and programs for youth and their communities.

SECTION 6. Call for special election. In accordance with RCW 29A.04.321, the King County council hereby calls for a special election to be held in conjunction with the general election on November 3, 2015, to consider a proposition authorizing a regular property tax levy for the purposes described in this ordinance. The King County director of elections shall cause notice to be given of this ordinance in accordance with the state constitution and general law and to submit to the qualified electors of the county, at the
said special county election, the proposition hereinafter set forth. The clerk of the council
shall certify that proposition to the King County director of elections in substantially the
following form:

PROPOSITION ___; The King County Council has passed Ordinance
____ concerning funding to improve health and well-being for youth,
families and communities. If approved, this proposition would provide
funding for prevention and early intervention to achieve positive outcomes
related to: healthy pregnancy; parental and newborn support; healthy
child and youth development; the health and well-being of communities;
and crisis prevention and early intervention for youth, including for
domestic violence and homelessness. The measure would authorize an
additional regular property tax of $0.14 per $1,000 of assessed valuation
for collection beginning in 2016 and authorize maximum annual increases
of 3% in the succeeding 5 years.

SECTION 7. Youth advisory board and communities of opportunity interim
governance group.

A. If the levy is approved by the voters, a youth advisory board shall be
established by ordinance to serve as the advisory board for the portion of the levy
proceeds described in sections 5.C.1., 2. and 4. of this ordinance. The executive shall
transmit to the council by December 1, 2015, a plan relating to the youth advisory board
and a proposed ordinance that identifies the duties and composition of the youth advisory
board. The advisory plan shall be consistent with the recommendations contained in the
county’s youth action plan, Motion 14378. The youth advisory board shall be comprised
of a wide array of King County residents and stakeholders with geographically and
culturally diverse perspectives, including, but not limited to: cities; school districts;
nonprofits and other entities that focus on youth and families in King County;
pediatricians; child development specialists; and representatives of youth and families
receiving services.

B. The communities of opportunity interim governance group shall serve as the
advisory board for levy proceeds described in section 5.C.3. of this ordinance. The
executive shall transmit to the council by December 1, 2015, a plan relating to the
communities of opportunity interim governance group and a proposed ordinance that
identifies the composition and duties of the interim governance group with respect to the
levy proceeds described in section 5.C.3. of this ordinance.

SECTION 8. Implementation plans.

A. The executive shall transmit to the council an implementation plan that
identifies the strategies to be funded and outcomes to be achieved with the use of levy
proceeds described in section 5.A.1. of this ordinance. This implementation plan relating
to the youth and family homelessness prevention initiative shall, to the maximum extent
possible, be developed in collaboration with the youth advisory board and shall be
transmitted to the council by February 1, 2016, for council review and approval by
ordinance.

B. The executive shall transmit to the council an implementation plan that
identifies the strategies to be funded and outcomes to be achieved with the use of levy
proceeds described in section 5.C. of this ordinance. The implementation plan shall be
developed in collaboration with the youth advisory board and the communities of
opportunity interim governance group, as applicable. The implementation plan shall, to the maximum extent possible, take into consideration any recommendations of the county's steering committee to address juvenile justice disproportionality that was formed in 2015. The implementation plan shall be transmitted to the council by June 1, 2016, for council review and approval by ordinance.

C. Except for planning funds, which shall be approved by ordinance and not exceed $2 million, and funds for public health services described in section 5.C.1., no levy proceeds may be expended for the purposes described in sections 5.A.1 and 5.C. of this ordinance until the date on which the applicable implementation plan is approved by ordinance.

D. The implementation plans described in subsections A. and B. of this section shall each include a proposal for an annual reporting process to the council, including the regional policy committee or a successor committee.

SECTION 9. Ratification. Certification of the proposition by the clerk of the county council to the director of elections in accordance with law before the election on November 3, 2015, and any other act consistent with the authority and before the effective date of this ordinance are hereby ratified and confirmed.

SECTION 10. Severability. If any provision of this ordinance or its application to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance or the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected."

EFFECT: This amendment makes the following changes to the proposed ordinance as transmitted by the Executive:

- Eligible Expenditures:
Strikes the $3 million neuroscience research initiative and adds those funds to the Youth and Family Homelessness Prevention Initiative (YFHPI), bringing that fund to a total of $19 million.

Specifies that the $19 million for the YFHPI and the costs of the election will both come out of the first year of levy proceeds.

Requires at least $42.8 million of the "Early Childhood Allocation" (aimed at children under the age of 5, their caregivers, and pregnant women) to be used over the life of the levy to provide parent and child health services (i.e. MSS/WIC and Nurse Family Partnership).

Reduces the data collection and evaluation allocation to 5% (from 6%); increases the Communities of Opportunity allocation to 10% (from 9%).

- Advisory Boards:
  - Youth Advisory Board: Requires the establishment of the youth advisory board by ordinance. Executive is required to submit advisory plan that identifies the duties and composition of the youth advisory board by December 1, 2015. Requires the composition of the board to include "geographically and culturally diverse perspectives".
  - Interim Governance Group: Requires the Executive to transmit an advisory plan that identifies the duties of the interim governance group under the levy by December 1, 2015.

- Implementation Plans:
  - New section that requires the Executive to transmit two implementation plans—one for the YFHPI and one for all other areas of the levy.
YFHP1 implementation plan must identify the strategies to be funded and outcomes to be achieved with levy proceeds, developed (to the maximum extent possible) in consultation with the youth advisory board by **February 1, 2016**.

The Executive is required to transmit an implementation plan for the 50/35/10/5 percent allocations that identifies the strategies to be funded and outcomes to be achieved with levy proceeds, developed in consultation with the youth advisory board and the communities of opportunity interim governance group by **June 1, 2016**. Also requires the implementation plan to reflect recommendations of the county's steering committee to address juvenile justice disproportionality.

Restricts expenditure of levy funds until Council approves the implementation plan, with the exception of $2 million which may be spent for planning purposes and with the exception of funds spent on public health.

Requires both implementation plans to include a proposal for an annual reporting process.

- Makes other technical changes.
STATEMENT OF FACTS:

1. Approximately twenty-five thousand children are born in King County every year. County residents under age eighteen comprise twenty-one percent of the county's population. Nearly half of people under age eighteen in King County are people of color.

2. Eighty-five percent of the human brain is developed by age three. According to early childhood development experts, basic skills necessary to be ready to learn in school and be successful as an adult, such as self-esteem, motivation, coordination, prioritization, management of incoming information, attention and distraction control, are developed by age five before children go to school.

3. A second significant time of brain development is adolescence. According to the National Institute of Mental Health, the parts of the brain responsible for controlling impulses and planning ahead, which are the hallmarks of successful adult behavior, mature during adolescence. Adolescence is also the critical period when young people learn to form safe and healthy relationships, and when many patterns of health-promoting or potentially health-damaging behaviors are established.

4. Although King County as a whole is a thriving, prosperous region, there is evidence that some of our children and youth are in danger of being left behind. The percentage of children five and under living in poverty is as low as four and seven-tenths percent in some regions of the county and as high as twenty-six percent in other regions. Infant mortality
is four times higher in some areas of King County than others.

Approximately one-third of pregnant women do not receive the recommended levels of prenatal care. One in five adolescents is overweight or obese and only twenty-four percent of adolescents receive the recommended levels of physical activity. Twenty-six percent of adolescents report having depressive feelings and twenty-nine percent report using alcohol or other illicit drugs. Over six thousand King County students are homeless; in some school districts as many as one in ten are homeless.

5. All too often the children and youth who are being left behind and are not receiving services before a crisis occurs are children and youth of color. Young people of color make up at least fifty to sixty percent of youth and young adults experiencing homelessness despite only twenty-nine percent of King County's general population being people of color.

6. One of the areas where the disparities in those who do not receive appropriate services before a crisis occurs is the juvenile justice system. African–American youth make up approximately fifty percent of those in detention in King County, or five times their rate of representation in the general population. According to a report from the National Conference of State Legislatures as many as seventy percent of youth in the juvenile justice system nationally are affected with a mental disorder, and one in five suffer from a mental illness so severe as to impair their ability to function as a young person and grow into a responsible adult. King
County is committed to preventing crises before they occur and ending disproportionality in the juvenile justice system.

7. The county actively engages in equity and social justice efforts to eliminate racial disparities in the juvenile justice system and the council will consider this goal when deliberating on future policies and plans related to the proposed Best Starts for Kids levy.

8. Investment in prevention and early intervention can prevent long-term harm of children as they grow up. According to the National Scientific Council on the Developing Child, extensive research on the biology of stress now shows that healthy development can be derailed by excessive or prolonged activation of stress response systems in the body and the brain, with damaging effects on learning, behavior and health across the lifespan.

9. Prevention and early intervention are also the most effective and least expensive ways to address serious future problems such as chronic disease, mental illness, substance abuse and incarceration. Science tells us that lifelong problems can be prevented: by investing heavily in children before age five; by making strategic investments at critical points in a young person's development before age twenty-four; and by taking actions to ensure that all children and youth have opportunities to live in safe, thriving, health-promoting home, school and community environments.

10. Studies have shown that the return on investment in early childhood development, ensuring that children have a strong start in life, is from
three to seventeen dollars for every dollar invested. Similarly, the Institute of Medicine and National Research Council's 2009 Preventing Mental, Emotional, and Behavioral Disorders Among Young People report notes that cost-benefit ratios for early treatment and prevention programs for addictions and mental illness programs range from 1:2 to 1:10. This means a one-dollar investment yields two to ten dollars savings in health costs, criminal and juvenile justice costs, educational costs and lost productivity.

Studies show that prevention has positive economic impacts for business. For example, a healthier workforce can reduce the extent to which health insurance costs and employee absenteeism affects a company's competitive edge. In the United States, full-time employees with chronic disease miss an estimated four hundred fifty million additional work days per year, compared to healthy employees, contributing to a cost of one hundred fifty-three billion dollars in lost productivity every year.

Many of the county's current funding sources, as well as other public budgets, are dedicated to responding to crises and negative outcomes, particularly negative outcomes for adults, such as severe mental illness, homelessness, and chronic illness, and for youth who have already dropped out of school or who have been involved in the juvenile justice system. While these are required or necessary expenditures, little funding is available to invest in prevention. For example, seventy-five percent of
the county's general fund supports the law and justice system. The veterans and human services levy, because it is focused on services for people who are in crisis, funds services primarily for adults. Only sixteen percent of its total funding is available to support people under age twenty-four and only eleven percent of the total levy funds prevention-oriented services.

In 2014, the shortfall of funding for the department of public health - Seattle & King County reached a critical point, threatening the loss of proven prevention and early intervention programs for mothers and families, such as the Nurse Family Partnership home visiting program and maternity support services.

While the proposed Best Starts for Kids levy would allow the department of public health – Seattle & King County to continue providing parent-child health services, such as the Nurse Family Partnership home visiting program and maternity support services, the levy would not stabilize King County's broader public health services. The public health fund remains at risk, as long-term public health funding sources have not been identified.

The majority of funding for this proposed Best Starts for Kids levy is intended to go to community partners to provide services in the community. As the levy is being implemented, the county's goal is to ensure that diverse communities, such as traditionally isolated immigrant and refugee communities, and small organizations are able to access funds.
in order to provide culturally appropriate services in King County. The county intends to collaborate with these organizations and help evaluate innovative new programs or services so that promising practices become proven practices.

4416. Services for children and youth will improve as agencies and organizations working with children and youth have opportunities for training, building organizational and system capacity and sufficient resources to administer programs and services.

4517. In 2010, the county enacted Ordinance 16857, establishing the King County Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan includes as one of its goals Health and Human Potential: Provide opportunities for all communities and individuals to realize their full potential.

4618. In 2010, the county enacted Ordinance 16948, transforming its work on equity and social justice from an initiative to an integrated effort that applies the King County Strategic Plan's principle of "fair and just" intentionally in all the county does in order to achieve equitable opportunities for all people and communities.

4719. In 2012, the council adopted Motion 13768, establishing the Health & Human Services Transformation Plan. The Transformation Plan establishes as its vision that, by 2020, the people of King County will experience significant gains in health and well-being because our community worked collectively to make the shift from a costly, crisis-
oriented response to health and social problems, to one that focuses on prevention, embraces recovery and eliminates disparities.

In 2014, the county enacted Ordinance 17738, establishing the youth action plan task force and providing policy direction regarding the development of a youth action plan. The youth action plan task force members helped shape this Best Starts for Kids Levy proposal.

In 2014, as part of the implementation of the King County Strategic Plan, the equity and social justice ordinance, the health and human services transformation plan and as part of the development of the youth action plan, King County staff began examining how the county could balance its investment portfolio towards more preventive approaches that lead to improved outcomes that allow individuals and communities to achieve their full potential. The resulting Best Starts for Kids Levy proposal is guided by and represents a further implementation of the county's adopted policy direction.

In addition to building on adopted county policy, in developing the Best Starts for Kids Levy proposal, King County staff consulted with experts at the University of Washington Institute for Learning & Brain Sciences; and with several groups and coalitions, including the Best Starts for Kids Advisory Group, the Youth Action Plan Task Force, the Transformation Plan Advising Partners Group, the King County Alliance for Human Services, the Youth Development Executive Directors Coalition and several early learning coalitions.
County staff also reviewed and consulted with jurisdictions and organizations from around the United States and the world regarding best and promising practices.

23. It is the intent of the council and the executive that the strategies supported by the proposed Best Starts for Kids levy will achieve a variety of individual and community outcomes. Individual outcomes will include outcomes such as the following: increasing the percentage of pregnant women who receive early and adequate prenatal care; increasing technical assistance to child care providers; reducing psychiatric hospitalizations for youth; decreasing the percentage of youth using alcohol or drugs; increasing the percentage of youth who feel they have an adult in their community they feel they can talk to; and decreasing the percentage of school-aged youth in south King County who are at an unhealthy weight.

Community outcomes will include outcomes such as the following: decreasing inequities in outcomes for youth in King County; decreasing suspensions and expulsions, from child care through high school; decreasing disparities in health and well-being outcomes between different areas within King County; decreasing domestic violence; decreasing funds spent on crisis services, such as incarceration and involuntary commitment; increasing the number of family and youth who are prevented from entering homelessness; and improved quality of life index in Communities of Opportunity.
24. It is the intent of the council and the executive that the youth and family homelessness prevention initiative will provide flexible, client-centered outcomes by providing funding to community agencies to help prevent homelessness among youth and their families.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. Definitions. The definitions in this section apply throughout this ordinance unless the context clearly require otherwise.

A. "Communities of opportunity" means an initiative launched by The Seattle Foundation and King County to improve in 2014 and memorialized in Contract #5692351, including any successor contract, to support communities in improving the health, social, racial and economic outcomes by focusing on place of the residents of those communities, and to do so by partnering with those communities to shape and own solutions. In the event the formal relationship described in this subsection A. between The Seattle Foundation and King County ceases to be in effect at any point during the life of the levy, the term "communities of opportunity" shall mean a strategy that is designed to improve the health, social, racial, and economic outcomes of specific communities that is administered by the county and developed in partnership with those communities.

B. "Communities of opportunity interim governance group" means the group and any successor group, which shall include one appointee of the executive and one appointee of the council, respectively, specified by ordinance and charged with overseeing strategic direction and operations for communities of opportunity. Current Interim Governance Group interim governance group members include...
community partners, and representatives from local government, The Seattle Foundation and from King County. If the proposed levy passes, the group will be reconstituted in accordance with section 7.B. of this ordinance.

C. "Levy" means the levy of regular property taxes for the specific purposes and term provided in this ordinance and authorized by the electorate in accordance with state law.

D. "Levy proceeds" means the principal amount of funds raised by the levy and any interest earnings on the funds.

E. "Limit factor" for purposes of calculating the levy limitations in RCW 84.55.010 means one hundred three percent.

F. "Initiative Strategy" means a program, service, activity, initiative or capital investment facility intended to achieve the goals of this ordinance.

G. "Youth" means a person through twenty-four years of age.

H. "Youth and family homelessness prevention initiative" means an initiative intended to prevent and divert youth and their families from becoming homelessness. The funding will be flexible, client-centered, outcomes focused, and provide funding for community agencies to assist clients.

SECTION 3. Levy submittal. To provide necessary funds for the purposes identified in section 5 of this ordinance, the county council shall submit to the qualified electors of the county a proposition authorizing a regular property tax levy in excess of the levy limitation contained in chapter 84.55 RCW for six consecutive years, commencing in 2016, at a rate not to exceed fourteen cents per thousand dollars of assessed value and authorizing a limit factor of one hundred three percent for each of the
five succeeding years, which are 2017 through 2021. In accordance with RCW 84.55.050, this levy shall be a regular property tax levy, which is subject to the statutory rate limit of RCW 84.52.043.

SECTION 4. Deposit of levy proceeds. The levy proceeds shall be deposited in a special revenue fund, which fund shall be created by ordinance.

SECTION 5. Eligible expenditures.

A. Of the levy proceeds, sixteen million dollars shall be used to fund and administer a youth and family homelessness prevention initiative and three million dollars shall be used to fund research to improve outcomes for children and youth in King County. Out of the first year's levy proceeds:

1. Nineteen million dollars shall be used to fund and administer a youth and family homelessness prevention initiative; and

2. Such sums as are necessary to fund the costs and charges incurred by the county that are attributable to the election.

B. The remaining levy proceeds shall be used to pay the following:

1. Costs associated with fund and administer the provision of a wide range of services, programs, research, activities and capital facilities that are oriented to prevention and early intervention and intended to do any or all of the following initiatives to:

   a. Improve health and well-being outcomes of children and youth,

as well as the families and the communities in which they live, including, but not limited to, by ensuring adequate services and supports for pregnant women and newborns;

access to safe and healthy food; and developmental screening for children and youth;
b. prevent

Prevent and intervene early on negative outcomes, including, but not limited to, chronic disease, mental illness, substance abuse, homelessness, domestic violence and incarceration;

e. reduce

3. Reduce inequities in outcomes for children and youth in the county; and

d. strengthen

4. Strengthen, improve, better coordinate, integrate and encourage innovation in health and human services systems; and the agencies, organizations and groups addressing the needs of children youth, their families and their communities.

2. Costs and charges incurred by the county and associated with or attributable to administering the levy and election as shall be delineated in an implementation plan.

C. Of the eligible expenditures described in subsection B. of this section:

1. Fifty percent shall be spent on strategies focused on children youth under five years old, and their caregivers and, pregnant women and for individuals or families concerning pregnancy. Of these funds, not less than $42.8 million shall be used to provide health services, such as maternity support services and nurse family partnership home visiting program services, that are currently delivered through the county’s public health centers;

2. thirty

Thirty-five percent shall be spent on strategies focused on children and youth ages five through twenty-four years old;

3. nine

Ten percent shall be spent on communities of opportunity; and
4. **SixFive** percent shall be spent on used to fund and administer evaluation; and
data collection and improving activities and activities designed to improve the delivery of
services and programs for children, youth and their communities.

**SECTION 6. Call for special election.** In accordance with RCW 29A.04.321,
the King County council hereby calls for a special election to be held in conjunction with
the general election on November 3, 2015, to consider a proposition authorizing a
regular property tax levy for the purposes described in this ordinance. The King County
director of elections shall cause notice to be given of this ordinance in accordance with
the state constitution and general law and to submit to the qualified electors of the county,
at the said special county election, the proposition hereinafter set forth. The clerk of the
council shall certify that proposition to the King County director of elections in
substantially the following form:

PROPOSITION___; The King County Council has passed Ordinance
_____ concerning funding to improve health and well-being for
children, youth, families and youth communities. If approved, this
proposition would provide funding for prevention and early intervention to
achieve positive outcomes related to: healthy pregnancy; parental and
newborn support; healthy child and youth development; the health and
well-being of communities; and crisis prevention and early intervention
for children and youth, including for domestic violence and homelessness.
The measure would authorize an additional regular property tax of $0.14
per $1,000 of assessed valuation for collection beginning in 2016 and
authorize maximum annual increases of 3% in the succeeding 5 years.
SECTION 7. **Children and youth** advisory board and communities of opportunity interim governance group—contingent alternative advisory board.

A. If the levy is approved by the voters, two advisory boards shall be established.

1. Except as provided in subsection B. of this section, if a children and youth advisory board is established in accordance with the recommendation of the youth action plan task force, the board shall be established by ordinance to serve as the advisory board for the portion of the levy proceeds described in sections 5.C.1., 2. and 4. of this ordinance; and The executive shall transmit to the council by December 1, 2015, a plan relating to the youth advisory board and a proposed ordinance that identifies the duties and composition of the youth advisory board. The advisory plan shall be consistent with the recommendations contained in the county's youth action plan, Motion 14378. The youth advisory board shall be comprised of a wide array of King County residents and stakeholders with geographically and culturally diverse perspectives, including, but not limited to: cities; school districts; nonprofits and other entities that focus on youth and families in King County; pediatricians; child development specialists; and representatives of youth and families receiving services.

2B. The communities of opportunity interim governance group shall serve as the advisory board for levy proceeds described in section 5.C. of this ordinance. The executive shall transmit to the council by December 1, 2015, a plan relating to the communities of opportunity interim governance group and a proposed ordinance that identifies the composition and duties of the interim governance group with respect to the levy proceeds described in section 5.C. of this ordinance.

SECTION 8. Implementation plans.
A. The executive shall transmit to the council an implementation plan that identifies the strategies to be funded and outcomes to be achieved with the use of levy proceeds described in section 5.A.1. of this ordinance. This implementation plan relating to the youth and family homelessness prevention initiative shall, to the maximum extent possible, be developed in collaboration with the youth advisory board and shall be transmitted to the council by February 1, 2016, for council review and approval by ordinance.

B. The executive shall transmit to the council an implementation plan that identifies the strategies to be funded and outcomes to be achieved with the use of levy proceeds described in section 5.C. of this ordinance. The implementation plan shall be developed in collaboration with the youth advisory board and the communities of opportunity interim governance group, as applicable. The implementation plan shall, to the maximum extent possible, take into consideration any recommendations of the county's steering committee to address juvenile justice disproportionality that was formed in 2015. The implementation plan shall be transmitted to the council by June 1, 2016, for council review and approval by ordinance.

C. Except for planning funds, which shall be approved by ordinance and not exceed $2 million, and funds for public health services described in section 5.C.1., no levy proceeds may be expended for the purposes described in sections 5.A.1 and 5.C. of
this ordinance until the date on which the applicable implementation plan is approved by
ordinance.

D. The implementation plans described in subsections A. and B. of this section
shall each include a proposal for an annual reporting process to the council, including the
regional policy committee or a successor committee.

SECTION 9. Ratification. Certification of the proposition by the
clerk of the county council to the director of elections in accordance with law before the
election on November 3, 2015, and any other act consistent with the authority and before
the effective date of this ordinance are hereby ratified and confirmed.

SECTION 9.10. Severability. If any provision of this ordinance or its application
to
any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the ordinance or the
application of the provision to other persons or circumstances is not affected."

## 2015 Transportation Package: Investments in the Central Puget Sound Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King County</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2015 Senate (in millions)</th>
<th>2015 House (in millions)</th>
<th>Compromise Bill (in millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Federal Way - Triangle Vicinity</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$85.0</td>
<td>$85.0</td>
<td>$85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5/Ship Canal Noise Wall</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
<td>$3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90/WB Shoulder Hardening between Bellevue and Issaquah</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$71.8</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90 EB Eastgate to W. Lake Sammamish Pkwy.</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$51.9</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90/ Front Street Interchange Justification Report</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
<td>$2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-90/ SR 18 Interchange</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$211.4</td>
<td>$150.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405 Renton to Lynnwood - Corridor Widening*</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$1,239.8</td>
<td>$1,225.2</td>
<td>$1,225.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-405 /132nd Street Interchange</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$75.0</td>
<td>$75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 520/NE 124th Avenue NE Full Interchange</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$40.9</td>
<td>$40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 520/148th Avenue NE Overlake Access Ramp</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$63.6</td>
<td>$68.0</td>
<td>$68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 520 Seattle Corridor Improvements - West End</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$1,570.0</td>
<td>$1,642.5</td>
<td>$1,642.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 518 Des Moines Interchange Improvement</td>
<td>State Highway</td>
<td>$12.3</td>
<td>$10.4</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Ferry Terminal Replacement</td>
<td>Ferry Incl. in WSF Investment</td>
<td>$96.1</td>
<td>$96.1</td>
<td>$96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapidrider Expansion Burien-Delridge</td>
<td>Transit (KCM)</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed and Reliability Improvements Route 40 - Northgate - Downtown</td>
<td>Transit (KCM)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed and Reliability Improvements Route 48N - University Link Station to Local Heights</td>
<td>Transit (KCM)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed and Reliability Improvements - 67th to Fremont</td>
<td>Transit (KCM)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed and Reliability Improvements Routes 43 &amp; 44 - Ballard to University District</td>
<td>Transit (KCM)</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trolley Expansion/Electrification, Madison Route</td>
<td>Transit (KCM)</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeshare Expansion</td>
<td>Transit (KCM)</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
<td>$5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northgate Transit Center Pedestrian Bridge</td>
<td>Transit (KCM)</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLK Way/Rainier Avenue Interchange Improvements</td>
<td>Transit (KCM)</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 522 Complete Improvements - Kenmore</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$8.5</td>
<td>$12.0</td>
<td>$12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 516/Jenkins Creek to 185th Avenue Widening</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
<td>$13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 523/NE 145th</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
<td>$25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish Bridge Corridor</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyon Creek Culvert</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah - Fall City Road</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lander Street</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities District Improvements</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28th/24th Street (Sea-Tac)</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington Connector</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$24.0</td>
<td>$24.0</td>
<td>$24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228th &amp; Union Pacific Grade Separation</td>
<td>Local Arterial</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
<td>$15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 520 Regional Bike Path &amp; Trail</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Safety</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
<td>$2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountains to Sound Greenway</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Safety</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1.8</td>
<td>$14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steel Lake Park to Downtown Trail</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Safety</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willburton Reconnection Project</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Safety</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE 52nd Street Boulevard - Cross-Kirkland Corridor</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Safety</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pacific - Interurban Trail</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Safety</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 520 Trail Grade Separation @ 40th</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Safety</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$10.7</td>
<td>$10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke-Gilman Trail Improvements Phase II</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Safety</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
<td>$16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Waterfront Loop Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Bike/Ped Safety</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Portions of noted projects to be funded through future toll revenue generated in the corridor

$3,198.1 $3,658.1 $3,689.1
### Estimated State Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Tax Increase: 5c/2016/4.3c/2017/2.5c/2018</td>
<td>$5,644</td>
<td>$5,786</td>
<td>$5,644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel Tax Increase: 7c/2015/4.5c/2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$6,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Weight Fee on Trucks $&gt; 30,000 Lbs (15%)</td>
<td>$156</td>
<td>$159</td>
<td>$159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Truck Weight Fee (increases of $15.50 - $35.50 +$10 in 2022)</td>
<td>$665</td>
<td>$665</td>
<td>$691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passenger Vehicle Weight Fee Increases of $15.50 - $35.50 +$10 in 2022</td>
<td>$1,896</td>
<td>$1,872</td>
<td>$1,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling Loss Deduction Relief</td>
<td>$44</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Proposed Fee Increases (2087 fee revenue into 5987)</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$93</td>
<td>$93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License Plate Replacement: ESSB 5785 (enacted)</td>
<td>$235</td>
<td>$205</td>
<td>$205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittent Use Trailer Revenue: SHB 1902</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale of WSDOT Property Revenue</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$80</td>
<td>$85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015 Fee Revenue (SHB 2600 &amp; ESSB 6150) (enacted)</td>
<td>$1,291</td>
<td>$1,135</td>
<td>$1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Sales Tax Transfers: SB 6302</td>
<td>$945</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers State Sales Tax + STX Tax Policy Change</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESS Fund Transfers: SB 6099</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Design Savings</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,293</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Current Law Fund Balance Transfer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$11,410</td>
<td>$11,509</td>
<td>$11,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Authorization/Proceeds</td>
<td>$3,728</td>
<td>$3,647</td>
<td>$4,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$15,138</td>
<td>$15,156</td>
<td>$16,286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Local Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Countywide:Novel Vehic. Tax from $20 - $40 ($20 - $50 in House Package)</td>
<td>$40 after 2 years</td>
<td>$50 after 2 years</td>
<td>$40 after 2 years, $50 w/ vote after 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Transit: 3% Sales Tax Increase</td>
<td>3%(\uparrow)</td>
<td>3%(\uparrow)</td>
<td>3%(\uparrow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kittitas Transit Passenger-Only Ferry District</td>
<td>3%(\uparrow) Sales Tax &amp; Parking Taxes</td>
<td>3%(\uparrow) Sales Tax &amp; Parking Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sound Transit Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Tax Increase</th>
<th>10c/10,000 Assessed Value</th>
<th>25c/$5,000 Assessed Value</th>
<th>25c/$5,000 Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MVET Increase</td>
<td>3%(\uparrow)</td>
<td>8%(\uparrow)</td>
<td>8%(\uparrow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Car Tax Increase</td>
<td>(\uparrow) per MVET</td>
<td>(\uparrow) per MVET</td>
<td>(\uparrow) per MVET</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Estimated State Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highway Preservation (&quot;A&quot;)</td>
<td>$1,225</td>
<td>$1,510</td>
<td>$1,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>$193</td>
<td>$100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciproc (&quot;D&quot;)</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$61</td>
<td>$52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Operations</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Projects (&quot;I&quot;)</td>
<td>$8,174</td>
<td>$8,431</td>
<td>$8,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Capital: 4th Olympic Class Ferry Vessel &amp; Terminal Construction (&quot;W&quot;)</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>$266</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Operating Account Backfill</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Account Backfill</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Scale Improvements (&quot;Y&quot;)</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCC Rail Capital (&quot;Y&quot;)</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$47</td>
<td>$47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Rail Projects (FRAP) (&quot;Y&quot;)</td>
<td>$14</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Rail Projects (&quot;Y&quot;)</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Patrol Account Backfill &amp; Compensation</td>
<td>$240</td>
<td>$163</td>
<td>$220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB)</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Improvement Board (TIB)</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road Administration Board (CRAB)</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$54</td>
<td>$70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities and Counties Direct Distribution</td>
<td>$375</td>
<td>$483</td>
<td>$375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Needs Transit Grants</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$250</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Mobility Grant Program</td>
<td>$90</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Mobility Grant Program</td>
<td>$140</td>
<td>$220</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanpool Grant Program</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Park &amp; Ride Grant Program</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Projects</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$105</td>
<td>$113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Mitigation (&quot;AWV&quot;)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Coordination Grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrian Grant Program</td>
<td>$50</td>
<td>$75</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike-Ped Projects</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School Grant Program</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>$96</td>
<td>$56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Streets Grant Program</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Retrafi (&quot;W4&quot;)</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Passage &amp; Coverters</td>
<td>$280</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Bank Capitalization</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Fuel - Commercial Vehicles (&quot;1396&quot;)</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute Trip Reduction (&quot;1821&quot;)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric Vehicle Tax Credit (&quot;2087&quot;)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Licensing</td>
<td>$22</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship Grants</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORV Fuel Tax Refunds</td>
<td>$100</td>
<td>$102</td>
<td>$106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>$2,495</td>
<td>$1,601</td>
<td>$2,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design-Build Oversight Panel</td>
<td>$1,031</td>
<td>$431</td>
<td>$641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Spending</strong></td>
<td>$15,139</td>
<td>$15,098</td>
<td>$16,087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mostly flex funds. Eligible expenditures include: Streets, Roads, Transit, Bicycle/Pedestrian, Safe Routes to Schools, Complete Streets, any other qualified transportation purpose.
Estimated Direct Distributions to Cities and Counties

TOTAL FY2016-FY2031 Direct Distributions: $375,000,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>% of Total County Distribution</th>
<th>% of Total City Distribution</th>
<th>Total County Distribution</th>
<th>Total City Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KING</td>
<td>9.151%</td>
<td>1.031%</td>
<td>$17,158,693</td>
<td>$67,453,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alguna</td>
<td>0.069%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$129,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaux Arts Village</td>
<td>0.007%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>2.909%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,454,117</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Diamond</td>
<td>0.097%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$182,359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>1.031%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,932,988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>0.043%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$97,980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clyde Hill</td>
<td>0.068%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$127,974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>0.412%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$772,137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>0.681%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,276,734</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duvall</td>
<td>0.153%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$286,573</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>2.050%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,844,114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunts Point</td>
<td>0.012%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,380</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>0.679%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,272,279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>0.480%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$899,498</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>2.558%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,796,211</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>1.520%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,850,242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Forest Park</td>
<td>0.292%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$548,009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>0.527%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$987,318</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>0.070%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$131,406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>0.524%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$981,698</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>0.236%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$442,224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>0.147%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$276,556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>0.134%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$251,916</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond</td>
<td>1.243%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,330,361</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>2.090%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,918,904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sammamish</td>
<td>1.037%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,944,672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>0.628%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,177,998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>14.037%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,318,679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>1.235%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,316,165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skykomish</td>
<td>0.022%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$41,330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sno Qualmie</td>
<td>0.246%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$462,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>0.434%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$813,435</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>0.246%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$460,997</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow Point</td>
<td>0.058%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$108,748</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16-year totals

Net to Counties $187,500,000
Net to Cities $187,500,000

Estimated distributions are based on an average of the previous four years of actual fuel tax distributions.
Committee Membership

Committee membership was specified in the P1 proviso. Two additional members are being recommended by the Executive. One position to allow for both a fire and police representative to serve on the Committee and a second position providing for an elected law enforcement official.

Members will be selected to provide a balanced representation of providers and customers of small and large PSAPs including consideration of geographic representation. Representatives will be identified through consultation with stakeholders and will be recruited by the Executive’s office. The final membership will be transmitted separately and confirmed by the King County Council through the passage of a companion motion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Representation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designated by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Chair</td>
<td>Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair Regional Coordination</td>
<td>Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Law Safety Justice Committee</td>
<td>Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive or designee</td>
<td>Executive per Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Elected Official</td>
<td>Appointed by Seattle Mayor per Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official other jurisdiction</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official other jurisdiction</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official other jurisdiction</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA Representative</td>
<td>Appointed by SCA per Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police or Fire Representative</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Recommended additional positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Representative</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-voting Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation Consultant</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Selected by Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 6
Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Appointments

Action Item

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

SCA PIC Nominating Committee Representatives
Chair Hank Margeson, Redmond Council President; Leanne Guier, Mayor of Pacific; Ross Loudenback, North Bend City Councilmember; Ed Prince, Renton Council President.

Potential Action
To recommend to the SCA Board of Directors the appointment of members to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee for terms ending September 30, 2017, as recommended by the PIC Nominating Committee.

Background
The PIC Nominating Committee is scheduled to meet on September 3, 2015, to consider and recommend nominees for the two upcoming SWAC vacancies.

Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC)
SCA has two seats on the SWAC. Both seats will be vacant as of the end of 2015 due to the retirement of Council President Chris Eggen, Shoreline and of Councilmember Stacia Jenkins, Normandy Park. The appointments are to fill 2 years of 3 year terms, expiring September 30, 2017. SCA is appointing members now in order to have them confirmed by January as it takes a number of months to have the SWAC appointments go through the King County confirmation process.

SCA received four nominations to fill the vacancies. Applicants were Deputy Mayor Penny Sweet, Kirkland; and Mayor David Baker, Kenmore; from North King County and Mayor Dave Hill, Algona; and Councilmember Largo Wales, Auburn; from South King County.

About SWAC
The Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) is a citizens’ advisory body that provides input on solid waste management issues and decisions affecting county residents and the services they receive. SWAC is established under state law. The committee includes those who receive solid waste services, public interest groups, labor, recycling businesses, solid waste collection companies and local elected officials. SWAC reviews and advises on policy issues, including the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan and the annual budget.
Item 7
Farmers Market and Temporary Event Fees

DISCUSSION ITEM

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

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

Discussion Item
The Public Issues Committee previously discussed proposed permit fee increases for the Environmental Health Services Division (EHS) of Public Health – Seattle & King County during the September 2014 and February 2015 meetings. At that time, PIC members provided feedback that proposed increases for farmers markets and temporary events were too high. The Board of Health ultimately held off on raising fees for such vendors and instead directed EHS staff to work with stakeholders to develop a new rate structure. A new rate structure based on risk and number of events attended has been proposed by EHS staff, in consultation with stakeholders and the Environmental Health Fees Committee of the Board of Health, and will be brought forward to the Board of Health for a briefing in September and possible action in October. In advance of that Board of Health briefing, SCA’s Board of Health members are seeking feedback from the PIC.

Background
The Environmental Health Services Division (EHS) of Public Health – Seattle & King County focuses on prevention of disease through planning healthy built environments, ensuring proper sanitation, proper disposal of waste and toxics, management of disease-carrying pests, effective disaster response, and, most relevantly for this discussion, safe food. EHS permit fees apply to restaurants, pet stores, wastewater facilities, pools, and other facilities/providers requiring an annual fee and inspection under the Board of Health code, including vendors selling prepared foods at farmers markets and at temporary events. Permits are not required for vendors selling whole produce or offering produce samples.

The King County Council and Board of Health have shared responsibility for the financial oversight of EHS. While the Board of Health sets permit fees for EHS, the King County Council adopts EHS’s operating budget. Fees are based on a full cost-recovery model in accordance with both King County Council (Motion 14110) and Board of Health (Resolution 08-07) policies. As a result, factors such as the benefits of healthy foods offered at farmers markets or the community value of such markets or temporary events are not a factored into the fees charged. Under state law, fees may not exceed the cost of providing the service.
EHS permit fees are a function of the hourly rate for a permit type multiplied by the average amount of time spent on each permit type. The hourly rate for permits consists of direct program costs (inspections, processing permits, education, communication, etc.) and overhead costs (program and department administration, capital costs, King County Administration).

Following a 2013 Performance Audit by the King County Auditor’s Office, EHS hired a consultant to conduct a rate and time study to determine the actual costs for overseeing each permit type, including how much staff time was spent for a given permit type and what the hourly staff and overhead costs of that time was. At that time, EHS permit fees had not been increased since 2012. In May 2014, the Board of Health also created an Environmental Health Fees Committee. The committee, which is chaired by SCA Board of Health Member Largo Wales, Auburn Councilmember, was charged with reviewing the existing fee structure and evaluating EHS staff proposals for revised rates.

The Public Issues Committee (PIC) discussed various EHS rate proposals at the September 2014 PIC meeting (see September 10, 2014 PIC Packet, page 144), and the SCA Board of Directors then sent a letter to the King County Council on October 28, 2014 expressing concerns about an EHS proposal to raise the cost of inspections for farmers markets and vendors at community festivals. Subsequently, the King County Council adopted the biennial budget with provisos related to the EHS division and farmers market and temporary event fees. The purposes of the provisos were to lower fees for farmers markets and temporary event permits in 2015, to look at longer term options to lower food program rates and fees and to ensure the auditor’s recommendations were addressed (Ordinance 17941, Section 98, Proviso 1). In February 2015, the PIC received an update about a revised EHS rate proposal, and received information about the impact to farmers markets and temporary event permit fees in particular. The PIC was also briefed about the Council provisos and EHS reports delivered to the Council in response to those provisos (see February 11, 2015 PIC Packet, page 43).

The Board of Health voted on February 19, 2015 to adopt a revised hourly rate for many EHS permit types, including a new $215 hourly rate for food permits. However, as a result of SCA and other stakeholder input, farmers market and temporary event permit fees were not adjusted at that time, and the 2014 rates were retained. Had the initial EHS-developed fees been adopted, various fees for farmers markets and temporary events would have increased by 42 percent to 264 percent, increases the Board of Health determined to be too precipitous.

**Fee Redesign for Farmers Markets and Temporary Events**

Instead of raising fees for farmers markets and temporary events, the Board of Health directed EHS staff to work with stakeholders to develop a new rate proposal that better balanced concerns about sharp fee increases with the need to effectively monitor permittees and ensure food safety.

In the summer of 2015, EHS held several stakeholder meetings to gather input from vendors. During a meeting in Tukwila, attended by SCA Board of Health Member Largo Wales and SCA staff, vendors were engaged in honing a new permit structure that would allow permittees to apply for a single event permit, as had been traditionally offered, as well as a multiple event permit or unlimited event permit. Vendors voiced support for the proposal and provided input
about educational and inspection requirements and offered suggestions for how EHS should handle poor performance (e.g. violations detected during an inspection or vending at an event without providing notice to the EHS) by those holding multiple or unlimited event permits.

Informed by those discussions, EHS staff developed a new structure for permitting farmers market and temporary events. The current rate structure has just two permit options: one single event permit for those serving “limited” foods specified by EHS ($55) and another single event permit for those serving any other type of food ($281). By contrast, the new proposed rate structure would break the permit types down into three categories based on the risk level associated with the food type and preparation method: low (no food handling; packaged food made under permit), medium (moderate food handling; potentially hazardous foods with moderate handling, reheated foods, and/or hot holding), and high (complex food handling; food involving raw animal products or cooling steps). While the new rate structure greatly impacts those formerly selling “limited” foods now classified as medium risk, such as hot dogs, EHS staff say the proposed low, medium, and high structure is better aligned to the actual risk associated with a given food and the true cost of permitting such vendors.

Additionally, the new proposed rate structure would allow vendors to apply for a single, multiple (up to five), or unlimited event permit. The unlimited permit would only be offered to those vendors who had first received two satisfactory inspections with a multiple event permit, with the exception of low risk vendors who could apply directly for an 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, and a $160 would also be charged for any multiple or unlimited event permittees who failed an initial inspection and required an additional inspection. Vendors at the Tukwila meeting voiced support for reinspection fees and even proposed more punitive outcomes, such as the immediate loss of one’s multiple or unlimited event permit.

EHS anticipates that offering multiple and unlimited event permits will provide service efficiencies in the way of fewer permit applications and plan reviews. While single event permittees are inspected at every event under both the current and proposed structure, multiple and unlimited event permittees would be inspected just twice with the potential for additional random inspections. As a result of these service efficiencies, the proposed permit fees are much lower for multiple and unlimited event permittees then would be required under the current structure for some vendors attending several events.

EHS also proposes offering a “blanket permit” for organizations wishing to assume the entire costs of an event, regardless of the number of vendors. This option, which was proposed at the request of stakeholders, and non-profits in particular, would be offered at a rate of $215 per staff hour for all services provided (e.g. plan review, inspections, etc.).

Current Fees, Previously Proposed Fees, and New Proposed Fees for Farmers Market and Temporary Event Vendors
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>$55</td>
<td>$195</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>$390*</td>
<td>$320</td>
<td>$640**</td>
<td>$750**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>$281*</td>
<td>$390*</td>
<td>$350</td>
<td>$700**</td>
<td>$825**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Under the current and previously proposed 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 proposal and others would fall under the “medium” category.

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

While those vendors who serve foods formerly qualifying for a $55 permit would see a significant increase in fees ($120 if classified as low risk and $320 if classified as medium risk), those vending a low risk food at a minimum of seven events would see a reduction in their permitting fees ($55 single event permit x 7 events = $385 under the current rate structure vs. $236 unlimited event permit + $95 for a certified booth operator = $331 under the new proposed rate structure). EHS staff have, however, recognized that vendors attending fewer events and serving only those foods currently qualifying for the $55 limited permit would be severely impacted and are currently revisiting their model to find additional service efficiencies in hopes of bringing forward a new, reduced, proposal for single event permit fees.

EHS also issues permits to farmers market coordinators. A revised fee structure has not yet been developed for those permits but is anticipated soon.

**Next Steps**

The Board of Health is scheduled to be briefed about the proposed fee redesign at its September 17, 2015 meeting with potential action scheduled for October 15, 2015. In preparation for the September Board of Health meeting, the SCA Board of Health members are seeking input from the PIC. No action by the PIC is anticipated given the Board of Health’s timeline for adoption of revised fees.
Item 8
Bridges & Roads Task Force

DISCUSSION ITEM

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 Manager Bob Harrison, Issaquah

Discussion Item
The issue of funding for rural or unincorporated roads in King County was identified by the Public Issues Committee at the April 2015 meeting. Since that time, the King County Executive, in collaboration with Councilmember Lambert, convened the Bridges and Roads Task Force to identify policy and fiscal strategies to maintain and preserve King County’s rural or unincorporated roads and bridges. The Task Force is not charged with assessing the needs of cities infrastructure. SCA staff is seeking feedback from PIC members and your designated staff to provide informational resources to city representatives of the Task Force SCA staff would like your feedback on questions and issues that should be considered by Task Force members.

Background
King County maintains approximately 1,500 miles of roads and over 180 bridges in rural or unincorporated areas outside of cites. As a result of the County not revisiting the funding system for nearly 30 years, King County bridges and roads are in increasingly poor condition.

The King County road system revenue is projected to be an average of $90 million per year over the next 10-year period. This is far short of the $350 million that the King County Road Services Division states is necessary to fully address the backlog of needs, embark on a asset management program, address the division’s future maintenance facility needs, and systematically accomplish the road capacity, mobility and non-motorized needs of the County. More information on the County’s Road Services Division Strategic Plan can be found here.

It is concerning that King County has deferred maintenance of the road and bridge system to such poor conditions. While there are connector roads in unincorporated King County of regional significance to cities, it should not be lost on the County that cities have had their own challenges in funding their roads and bridges. This includes regionally significant roads within cities, and in many cities, roads that cities are now responsible for due to annexations that had not been well-maintained when they were in unincorporated King County.
Cities see the value of working collaboratively to identify efficiencies and funding strategies for the future of regional road networks; however, not all rural roads are a regional priority. The financing of rural and unincorporated roads and bridges should not come on the backs of local jurisdictions and their residents who have implemented financing tools to preserve their own aging infrastructure.

**Establishment of the Bridges and Roads Task Force**
The King County Executive, in collaboration with Councilmember Lambert, convened the Bridges and Roads Task Force to “recommend financially sustainable and equitable strategies to deliver an unincorporated road system that supports people’s transportation needs, regional economic development and quality of life.”

The Bridges and Roads Task Force will review the current financial picture of the bridges and roads network, as well as the policy parameters under which the Roads Services Division operates from. The Task Force scope of work will include review and recommendations for the following:

- **Greater Efficiencies** – review and evaluate strategies including facilities management, collaboration with other departments, partnerships with outside agencies, technology and fleet improvements, staffing adjustments, and environmental regulation compliance.
- **Less Infrastructure** – review strategies to decrease the County’s roads infrastructure including opportunities associated with annexations, closing unsafe infrastructure, and transferring road ownership.
- **Increased Revenue** – review and evaluate various funding sources including, but not limited to, tolling, Local Transportation Benefit District funding, legislative solutions, opportunities through the Puget Sound Regional Council, or other taxes or fees.

More information on the Bridges and Roads Task Force can be found [here](#). The Bridges and Roads Task Force Work Plan can be found in [Attachment A](#).

**Bridges & Roads Task Force Membership**
Membership of the Task Force includes 21 regional leaders including subject matter experts, users, neighbors and public policy leaders throughout King County. Membership includes a mix of elected officials, agriculture/business leaders, emergency management professionals, neighborhood/community representatives, recreational advocates, environmental groups, planning organization leadership, and a Transportation Concurrency Expert Review panelist. A full list of members on the task force can be found in [here](#).

SCA was not asked to have a formal role in the make-up of the Task Force. Staff will closely monitor the evolving work and recommendations so that cities can proactively understand the direction of the Task Force – and the impact Task Force recommendations may have on cities.
Timeline
The Bridges and Roads Task Force held its first meeting on August 12, 2015. A final recommendation from the Task Force is due to be complete by November 30, 2015, with a subsequent meeting held in January to consider and recommend any potential legislative approaches.

All Task Force meetings are scheduled from 3pm – 6pm as follows:
1. Wednesday, August 12 – Mercer Island Community Center
2. Wednesday, September 16 – King Street Center, 8th Floor Conference Center
3. Wednesday, October 14 – Mercer Island Community Center
4. Wednesday, October 28 – Mercer Island Community Center
5. Thursday, November 12 – Mercer Island Community Center
6. Wednesday, January 20 – Mercer Island Community Center

Bridges and Roads Task Force Meeting #1
The first meeting of the Task Force included a welcome by Councilmember Kathy Lambert, Task Force member introductions, an overview of the charge/charter, and a presentation of King County Roads system.

A “Bridges and Roads 101” presentation provided background on the county road assets, infrastructure and revenue challenges, and consequences if additional funding resources cannot be identified. The presentation included information stating that significant traffic originates from cities and other counties. The 101-style presentation can be found [here](#) (note: large file).

The meeting also included a summary of member interviews presented by Bob Wheeler from Triangle Associates. The individual interviews generated requests for additional information or discussion from King County, including: a complete list of funding sources, 2015 Transportation Package impacts, road and bridge tiered service levels, GMA policy background and implementation, traffic concurrency, and design standards between the county and cities. Task Force members identified potential concerns to be the difference between urban and rural perspectives, cross-jurisdictional disputes, and equity concerns. Potential solutions identified during the individual interviews included maintaining less infrastructure, identifying alternative funding sources, leveraging more state resources, finding collaborative solutions, and building city support for county roads funding.

At the conclusion of the Bridges and Roads Task Force meeting, members were encouraged to express questions or comments, which included the following:
- King County stated that half of the trips on the high volume roads in King County come from cities and other counties. Are there traffic counts demonstrating who travels on state highways? City arterials?
- A comment that other counties and/or cities must be faced with similar revenue constraints and aging road/bridge networks. What have other jurisdictions done to increase revenue, reduce infrastructure ownership or find greater efficiencies?
A question was asked of whether there is a relative measure that can be used to evaluate which roads should be funded as a priority based on traffic counts. What is the value of improving infrastructure on major arterials versus minor roadways? While the cost might be the same, the value is different.

A question about how the County might transfer roads to other jurisdictions, such as Washington State Department of Transportation?

An inquiry about how local jurisdictions are contributing to the road and bridge network.

Interest in understanding the utilization of staffing resources.

**Next Steps**
The next meeting of the Bridges and Roads Task Force is scheduled for Wednesday, September 16, 2015 where there will be an overview of King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget Director Dwight Dively will present the financial situation, analysis of need, and potential revenue options.

SCA staff propose working with PIC members and jurisdictional staff to gather data in response to questions identified by Task Force members and to reflect efforts made by cities, such as:

- What strategies does your jurisdiction employ to increase revenue or find greater efficiencies in preservation and maintenance of road networks?
- Does your jurisdiction keep traffic counts of travelers coming from outside of the city traveling on the city arterials?
- What major regional road networks connect your jurisdiction with rural or unincorporated portions of King County?
- What is the percentage of general fund dollars your jurisdiction allocated for the financing of preservation and maintenance of roads and bridges?
- The Task Force is considering a State legislative strategy. What concerns do you have in the County proposing a Legislative approach to the financing of rural roads and bridges?

SCA staff will monitor and attend Task Force meetings and provide briefings to members of the Public Issues Committee (PIC).

**Attachment**

A. **Bridges and Roads Task Force Work Plan**
Bridges and Roads Task Force WORKPLAN

**Purpose:** The Bridges and Roads Task Force will be comprised of a diverse set of stakeholders working to identify policy and fiscal strategies to sustainably maintain and preserve King County’s roads.

**Desired Outcome:** The Bridges and Roads Task Force will develop a recommendation for sustainable solutions that recognize the regional significance of the county road network. The task force will seek further efficiency gains, review the impact/benefit of existing policies, and review the existing environment for other opportunities.

It will consider the current framework provided by Strategic Plan for Road Services (SPRS) and will provide short and long term strategies and funding alternatives, necessary to maintain and preserve the county road network.

**Background:** The survival of King County’s 1,500 mile rural and unincorporated road network and 183 bridges is threatened by an obsolete and inadequate funding structure.

The state has not provided counties with financing tools that complement the state’s Growth Management Act (GMA). The GMA, which King County has successfully implemented, promotes compact urban development inside cities by reducing development in rural areas. As a result, the burden of funding the county’s extensive road network falls on 13 percent of the county’s total population.

More than one million trips per day are taken on the unincorporated road network in King County. In addition to the unincorporated residents of the county, roughly 250,000 people use the county road system daily to move freight and goods, get their products from farm to market, and commute to their jobs, schools, and recreational opportunities. On several of the county’s major arterials, over 50 percent of the daily commuters are from other cities or counties.

King County has put a plan in place to address the future of its road network, with a focus on public safety. Its Strategic Plan guides investments in the rural road network and provides a framework to restore the network to a steady state of good repair. Unfortunately, due to a lack of adequate resources, the County is currently forced to use SPRS as a tool to prioritize and guide the selection of Bridges and Roads for closure.

The Bridges and Roads Task Force will provide a constituency, momentum, and policy recommendations to assist regional leaders in sustainably addressing this challenge.

**Scope:** The Bridges and Roads Task Force will review the current financial picture for our County Bridges and Roads network, as well as policy parameters under which RSD currently operates. The Task Force will review options for improving service delivery including our Roads Services Division’s (RSD) work on achieving greater efficiencies, exploring ways to decrease our infrastructure, and to procure additional revenue.

**Greater Efficiencies**
The Task Force will review various strategies RSD is undertaking to increase efficiencies, including facilities management, collaboration with other departments, partnerships with outside agencies, technology and fleet improvements, staffing adjustments, and environmental regulation compliance strategy.

**Less Infrastructure**
The Task Force will review various strategies RSD is undertaking to decrease the County’s roads infrastructure including opportunities associated with annexations, closing unsafe infrastructure, and transferring road ownership.

**Increased Revenue**

The Task Force will review and evaluate various funding sources including or not limited to tolling, Local Transportation Benefit District funding, legislative solutions, opportunities through the Puget Sound Regional Council, and other taxes or fees.

**Meeting Schedule:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting #1</th>
<th>August 12, 3-6pm</th>
<th>Overview and Introductions, “Roads 101”, Financial overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #2</td>
<td>September 16, 3-6pm</td>
<td>Financial situation – review and analysis of need and revenue options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #3</td>
<td>October 14, 3-6pm</td>
<td>Financial and infrastructure TF recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #4</td>
<td>October 28, 3-6pm</td>
<td>Financial and efficiencies TF recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #5</td>
<td>November 12, 3-6pm</td>
<td>Strategy development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting #6</td>
<td>January 20, 3-6pm</td>
<td>Implementation strategies and Task Force close out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Meeting Location:** Mercer Island Community Center for all meetings except #2 which will be held at King Street Center in Seattle

**Project Coordination Team (to date):**

Chris Arkills, Executive’s Office  
Stephanie Pure, KC DOT (KC DOT lead)  
Bill Greene, KC DOT  
Shelley DeWyse, PSB  
Brenda Bauer, RSD  
Jay Osborne, RSD  
Susan West, RSD  
John Resha, Council Staff

**Project Coordination Team Meeting Schedule:** One week before each Task Force meeting and the day after.

**Timeline: Proposed Task Deliverables:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confirm timeline</td>
<td>6/12/15</td>
<td>KC DOT</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procure consultant for third party verification of numbers</td>
<td>6/17/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet membership list with Councilmembers</td>
<td>6/19/15</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm meeting location(s)</td>
<td>6/19/15</td>
<td>KC DOT</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procure independent facilitator</td>
<td>6/22/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruit individuals to serve</td>
<td>6/26/15</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft letter to Council re: Task Force</td>
<td>6/26/15</td>
<td>KCDOT/RSD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final and send letter to Council</td>
<td>7/1/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit third party verification of the roads financial situation</td>
<td>7/1/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete interviews of Task Force Members</td>
<td>8/11/15</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail out Meeting #1 Materials</td>
<td>8/6/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft letter &amp; mail to Task Force</td>
<td>8/5/15</td>
<td>KCDOT/RSD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create Task Force webpage, update RSD Twitter</td>
<td>8/5/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft and send out Public announcement</td>
<td>8/5/15</td>
<td>KCDOT/PIO/RSD</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Assignee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compile notebook for Task Force Members</td>
<td>8/10/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail out Meeting #2 Materials</td>
<td>9/9/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail out Meeting #3 Materials</td>
<td>10/7/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop outline of draft recommendations</td>
<td>10/7/15</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail out Meeting #4 Materials</td>
<td>10/14/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail out Meeting #5 Materials</td>
<td>11/5/15</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft and support preparation of summary report</td>
<td>11/5/15</td>
<td>RSD/Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final summary report/Task Force recommendations</td>
<td>11/18/15</td>
<td>RSD/Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail out Meeting #6 Materials</td>
<td>1/13/16</td>
<td>RSD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Budget:** The budget for the Task Force is $50,000.

### Roles and Responsibilities

This section outlines the roles and responsibilities of the facilitator/mediator, RSD/DOT staff and Task Force members.

#### Responsibilities of the Facilitator/Mediator

The facilitator/mediator will be responsible for the following list of tasks. This task list may be updated in the future.

**Lay the Process Foundation**

- Conduct initial communication with Task Force members.
- Help with preparation of initial materials for Task Force members.
- Prepare and review materials and agendas for Task Force meetings.

**Build the Framework of Consensus**

- Facilitate Task Force meetings.
- Conduct ongoing communication with Task Force members.
- Facilitate sub-committee meetings as needed.
- Communicate and meet with Project Coordination Team.

**Finalize the Recommendations**

- Prepare final recommendations and summary report for regional, local and unincorporated areas.
- Participate in and prepare for briefings and updates of County Executive, County Council, and other stakeholders.

#### Responsibilities of RSD/DOT Staff

RSD/DOT staff will be responsible for the following list of tasks. This task list may be updated in the future.

**Lay the Process Foundation**

- Set up Task Force meetings and framework.
- Prepare initial materials for Task Force members.
- Prepare materials and agendas for Task Force meetings.

**Build the Framework of Consensus**

- Handle meeting logistics and materials preparation for all meetings.
- Respond to requests for information.
Finalize the Recommendations

- Prepare final recommendations and summary report for regional, local and unincorporated areas.
- Participate in and prepare for briefings and updates of County Executive, County Council and other stakeholders.

Responsibilities of Task Force Members

Task Force Members will be engaged in the following list of activities. This list may be updated in the future.

Lay the Process Foundation

- Participate in initial interviews with Facilitator and:
  - Express opinions, perspectives, and interests.
  - Identify possible solutions that might be proposed during the meetings.

Build the Framework of Consensus

- Attend Task Force meetings between August and January. Meetings are expected to be three hours each.
- Communicate as needed with Facilitator between meetings.
- Keep an open mind about possible solutions that could reflect a consensus among Task Force members.
- Work together to identify a consensus set of recommendations to the Facilitator and Metro.

Finalize the Recommendations

- Review and provide comments on recommendations.

Responsibilities of Project Coordination Team

The Project Coordination Team will consist of members of DOT and Road Services staff, the Facilitator, County Council central staff, and County Executive staff, and will be engaged in the following list of activities. This list may be updated in the future.

Lay the Process Foundation

- Prepare agendas and review materials for Task Force meetings.

Build the Framework of Consensus

- Attend Task Force meetings. Meetings are expected to be three hours each.
- Prepare agendas and review materials for Task Force meetings.

Finalize the Recommendations

- Review final recommendations and summary report for regional, local and unincorporated areas.
- Participate in and prepare for briefings and updates of County Executive, County Council and other stakeholders.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Force Member</th>
<th>Organization/Neighborhood</th>
<th>More info</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Accepted?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cecilia Mena</td>
<td>PTE Local 17</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Business/Labor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep. Luis Moscoso</td>
<td>Washington State Legislature</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>City/Elected</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sen. Joe Fain</td>
<td>Washington State Legislature</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>City/Elected</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake Trask</td>
<td>Statewide Policy Director, Washington Bikes</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Anderson</td>
<td>Member, Boundary Review Board</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryce Yadon</td>
<td>Futurewise, State Policy Director</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duana Kolouskova</td>
<td>Member, Transportation Concurrency Expert Review Panel</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Business/Labor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Gonzales</td>
<td>Teamsters 174</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Business/Labor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Larson</td>
<td>Mayor, City of Snoqualmie</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>City/Elected</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Miller</td>
<td>Former King County Councilmember and State Representative</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hank Lipe</td>
<td>Emergency Management Expert</td>
<td>More info</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh Brown</td>
<td>Executive Director, Puget Sound Regional Council</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Irwin</td>
<td>Member, King County Agriculture Commission</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Business/Labor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Keller</td>
<td>Proprietor, Keller Dairy</td>
<td>Of file</td>
<td>Business/Labor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Paananen</td>
<td>Seattle Area Manager, Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Eberle,</td>
<td>President Four Creeks Unincorporated Council</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Harrison</td>
<td>City Manager, City of Issaquah</td>
<td>More info</td>
<td>City/Elected</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Ockerlander</td>
<td>Councilmember, City of Duvall</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>City/Elected</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley Glennon</td>
<td>President, Fall City Community Association</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Neighborhood representative, resident</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andra Kranzler</td>
<td>Skyway Solutions</td>
<td>More Info</td>
<td>Neighborhood representative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Bloomer</td>
<td>King County Fire District 28/Enumclaw Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety, Resident</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 9
Solid Waste Transfer Plan Review

Discussion Item

SCA Staff Contact
Doreen Booth, Policy Analyst, doreen@soundcities.org, 206-495-3525

The Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) is scheduled to make a recommendation in September on the Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Final Report. This report will ultimately be incorporated into the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. MSWAC members have differing opinions as to whether the Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Final Report should or should not include the Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station as a potential future option and if preliminary siting of such a station should be done concurrently with the testing of demand management strategies.

Earlier this week, Solid Waste Division (SWD) staff, in consultation with MSWAC leadership, determined that MSWAC action on the Final Report is not advisable at this point. As the SWD noted, they have received ample feedback and have a clear perspective on the very diverse perspectives of the cities. The SWD is proposing instead to address the transfer station system during discussions on the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan update, with many of the questions raised by MSWAC representatives expected to be answered during the update process. This staff report was written prior to the SWD determination and includes information about the options MSWAC was considering. This is important as MSWAC representatives may still move ahead in September with a motion on the Final Report. Discussion at the PIC could help elected officials and MSWAC members have a fuller grasp of the varying perspectives of cities as to future of a Northeast Transfer Station.

Summary

The Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Final Report (Final Report) has been completed and transmitted to the King County Council. The two solid waste advisory boards, the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) and the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) have been reviewing the Final Report. The recommendations of the Final Report are:

1) Do not build a new Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station (NERTS) at this time, but keep it as an option for a future potential facility.
2) Develop and test the following demand management strategies:
i) Conduct a pilot program to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of using demand management strategies, including web cameras to inform customers of station activity in real time.

ii) Work with private industry customers and stakeholders to develop a low-cost bulky item collection pilot in target regions of the county by May 2016.

iii) Research point of sale (IT system) needs to support differential pricing for transactions at the transfer stations and identify implementation needs by May 2016. Implement necessary technology changes by September 2017.

iv) In 2017, begin a 12-month pilot to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of extended hours and incentive pricing. Following the pilot, transmit a report and recommendation to Council in March 2019.

3) Identify the steps needed to achieve 70 percent recycling rates.

4) Continue Comp Plan process with city partners and other stakeholders to address key policy issues and produce a draft Comp Plan for review in early 2017.

At the August 14, 2015 MSWAC meeting, MSWAC representatives discussed a possible future recommendation of the Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Final Report to the King County Council. The four recommendations from the Final Report (see above) were brought to MSWAC for discussion as potential motion language. Concerns were raised about demand management strategies, the timing and ramifications of those strategies on northeast King County customers and traffic impacts associated with not building a new Northeast Transfer Station.

Kirkland representatives proposed an alternate motion that would have preliminary siting of a Northeast Transfer Station and related environmental review occurring concurrent with demand management strategy testing and would move such testing up to 2016. Kirkland’s motion would begin to put a contingency plan into development in the event that the demand management strategies failed to address transactional capacity and a new Northeast Transfer Station was needed. A Lake Forest Park representative supported concurrent siting and testing but also made a motion that King County considers the impacts of the regional transfer system decision on the regional transportation network.

In order to allow cities the opportunity to review the three motions brought forward and to propose alternative motions, potential action on a recommendation was scheduled for the September 11, 2015 MSWAC meeting.

Subsequent to the August MSWAC meeting, a Federal Way representative submitted a motion that proposed that neither MSWAC nor the King County Council take action on the Final Report but instead, suggested that the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan update process would be a more appropriate venue to set policies related to transfer station siting. More recently, Bellevue has circulated a motion that proposes action on the Final Report be deferred by the King County Council until concerns raised by cities in comments on the Draft Report have been addressed. The motion states that the Northeast Transfer Station should be retained in the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan and proposes that a siting process for such a station begin in 2016.
MSWAC is currently scheduled to take action on the Final Report at their September 11, 2015 meeting. At the time of this report, the MSWAC representatives were considering four competing motions (MSWAC’s, and those put forward by Kirkland, Federal Way, Bellevue) on the Final Report. A fifth motion (put forward by Lake Forest Park) was incorporated into three of the options. All of the motions being considered can be found in Attachment A.

MSWAC representatives have not coalesced around one option; there is not a clear path forward for cities, especially as there are many unanswered questions about demand management strategy implementation and the likelihood of success and the ramifications of the strategies.

As of September 2, 2015, the SWD is proposing that MSWAC not make a recommendation to the King County Council on the Final Report, but instead, refocus MSWAC efforts on the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan update currently under development. Currently, a MSWAC recommendation would likely be divisive and provide limited value to the SWD and to the King County Council as the SWD moves forward with long range comprehensive solid waste management planning. The SWD feels that it is appropriate instead to expedite long range planning efforts currently underway and more thoroughly vet the Final Report conclusions in light of that planning. This would also allow for a deeper conversation about the costs of the various options to ratepayers and to solid waste customers.

**Background**
On April 17, 2013, SCA adopted a policy position, “…requesting the Metropolitan Solid Waste Advisory Committee (MSWAC) and the King County Solid Waste Division review and recommend any appropriate updates to the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan.” In July 2013, the King County Council amended Ordinance 17619, limiting expenditures for the Factoria Transfer Station until a review of the 2006 Solid Waste Transfer and Waste Management Plan was completed. The King County Council accepted the Transfer Plan Review Final Report (Part 1) on June 10, 2014 and at that time directed the Solid Waste Division (SWD) staff to undertake additional review of the transfer station system, focusing on strategies to manage transactions at transfer stations, as well as other operational and capital strategies such as increased use of underutilized transfer stations, as well as considering the effect of a potential closure of the Renton Transfer Station on self-haul customers.

A Transfer Plan Part 2 Draft Report was transmitted to the King County Council on March 31, 2015 and a Final Report was transmitted on June 30, 2015.

Discussion at the PIC could help elected officials and MSWAC members have a better understanding of the varying perspectives of cities as to the future of a Northeast Transfer Station.

**Draft Transfer Plan Part 2**
There are competing viewpoints among cities as to the future of the transfer plan system in Northeast King County. Seventeen cities commented on the Transfer Plan Part 2 Draft Report,
either individually (11 cities), in a joint letter (10 cities), or through both the joint letter and
individually. The SWD has prepared a summary of all the comments received, which is found in
Attachment B to this staff report. The complete text of the comments can be found beginning
on page 554 of the Plan.

It should be noted that the Draft and Final versions of the Report are very similar, resulting in
some cities feeling their comments were not adequately addressed through the process.

The majority of cities that commented on the Draft Transfer Plan Part 2 Report (Bellevue, Beaux
Arts Village, Clyde Hill, Bothell, Hunts Point, Lake Forest Park, Medina, Newcastle, Renton,
Yarrow Point, Kirkland, North Bend, Sammamish) wanted to retain a Northeast Recycling and
Transfer Station (NERTS or Northeast Transfer Station) in the Plan as a future potential option.
Redmond commented that they did not want to retain a Northeast Transfer Station in the Plan
as they agreed with the Draft Transfer Plan 2 Report that demonstrated adequate capacity for
forecasted solid waste tonnage in the transfer plan system through 2040 with the institution of
demand management strategies and capital improvements at individual transfer stations.
Woodinville representatives at MSWAC have agreed with Redmond’s position. In the Final
Report, in response to comments received, the SWD has retained the Northeast Transfer
Station as a potential future option.

A King County Auditor’s Management Letter dated July 29, 2015 supported the conclusion in
the draft Transfer Plan Part 2 Report by the SWD that there are cost-effective alternatives to
building a new $100 million transfer station in northeast King County. Normandy Park’s MSWAC
representative asked a question about the Auditor’s report at MSWAC, asking if the Auditor
was only considering the best outcome for King County and not considering the impacts to
cities. The SWD responded that the Auditor’s report only evaluated the process and analysis
and did not delve into policy, or consider whether the demand management strategies would
be acceptable to cities and other stakeholders. This is a potential issue for cities to be aware of.

The majority of the comments from cities directly relate to a Northeast Transfer Station. Below
are summaries of some of the comments that were submitted by multiple cities.

- Concerns about the mitigation strategies proposed to address transactional capacity at
  stations, noting that some strategies are untested (i.e. peak pricing) and others lack
  regional support (i.e. mandatory garbage collection)
  (Kirkland, North Bend, Renton, Sammamish, Bellevue, Beaux Arts Village, Bothell, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point,
  Lake Forest Park, Medina, Newcastle, Yarrow Point)

- Lack of consistency with King County requirements for regional equity with no new
  Northeast Transfer Station – concern this will lead to undue impacts on parts of the
  County that have transfer stations (i.e. Factoria)
  (Kirkland, North Bend, Renton, Bellevue, Beaux Arts Village, Bothell, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Lake Forest
  Park, Medina, Newcastle, Yarrow Point)
Concerns about disproportionate impacts, that there will be a transfer station system across the county with inconsistent policies, services and rates
(Federal Way, North Bend, Sammamish, Renton, Kirkland, Bellevue, Beaux Arts Village, Bothell, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Lake Forest Park, Medina, Newcastle, Yarrow Point)

Proposed strategies do not adequately address small business owners and large institutional customers
(Kirkland, Bellevue, Beaux Arts Village, Bothell, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Lake Forest Park, Medina, Newcastle, Yarrow Point)

Other concerns raised included:

The 70% recycling level is unrealistic and there is no contingency plan for not meeting the rate
(Kirkland, Bellevue, Beaux Arts Village, Bothell, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Lake Forest Park, Medina, Newcastle, Yarrow Point)

Concern that outreach on the proposed policy and operational changes was inadequate
(Kirkland, Bellevue, Beaux Arts Village, Bothell, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Lake Forest Park, Medina, Newcastle, Yarrow Point, North Bend)

Concern about significant environmental impacts on Factoria and a need for additional environmental review
(Kirkland, Bellevue, Beaux Arts Village, Bothell, Clyde Hill, Hunts Point, Lake Forest Park, Medina, Newcastle, Yarrow Point)

With regards to this last concern, the Bellevue motion asks that an analysis regarding compliance with the Factoria Conditional Use Permit (CUP) be prepared. Attachment C, is a letter dated May 6, 2015 from Bellevue to King County regarding demand management strategies at Factoria requiring a new CUP and an Environmental Impact Statement. The SWD is aware that demand management strategies that would result in changes to the Factoria Conditional Use Permit would require a new or revised permit and associated environmental review.

The four motions being considered by MSWAC are:

The Bellevue motion is the most aggressive of the four options in terms of a new Northeast Transfer Station; a siting process for the facility is proposed to begin in 2016 and is not contingent on any demand management strategy testing; the motion states that siting is necessary “… in order to ensure the timely closure of Houghton Transfer Station, regional equity, environmental protections, system efficiency, and minimal impacts to local and regional traffic.” The motion is the only one that asks the SWD to prepare an analysis of the concerns raised by stakeholders on the Draft Report.
The **Kirkland motion** takes into account the demand management strategy testing and proposes that preliminary siting take place as a contingency in 2016, concurrent with strategy testing. Kirkland’s MSWAC representative has, however, stated Kirkland’s support for the Bellevue motion and likely will not be putting the Kirkland motion on the table.

The **Federal Way motion** proposes that no action be taken on the Final Report and instead, that the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan update move forward and that the Final Report inform the Comprehensive Plan update. In some respects, this would allow the transfer station siting process to be slowed down and potentially benefit, from work being done in other long range planning at the SWD.

Both the Bellevue and Federal Way motions incorporate Lake Forest Park’s traffic concerns, with the Bellevue motion stating, that analysis of comments should address “… increased traffic congestion, including a comprehensive study of impacts to the regional transportation network from the proposed demand management strategies.” The Federal Way motion includes transportation impacts as an item to be addressed in an Environmental Impact Statement on the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan update.

The original **MSWAC motion**, the Final Report recommendations, proposes that a Northeast Transfer Station be retained as a future potential facility and then focuses on the testing of demand management strategies. The motion also includes identifying steps needed to achieve a 70% recycling goal; Kirkland’s motion also retained that item. Neither the Bellevue nor Federal Way motions include a reference to the 70% recycling goal. The original motion does not address the concerns related to the demand management strategies, nor does it put into place a timeline for considering a Northeast Transfer Station.

**Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Action**
At the August 21, 2015 SWAC meeting, SCA’s SWAC representatives (Shoreline Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen and Normandy Park Councilmember Stacia Jenkins), knowing there were efforts being made at MSWAC to build a consensus on the Final Report, made a motion to delay a SWAC vote until September. The motion failed. The SWAC approved the following motion with SCA’s representatives abstaining:

> SWAC recommends Executive and Council approval of the Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Final Report, provided that: (1) building a NE recycling and transfer station has the same priority as demand management strategies in the Solid Waste Comprehensive Management Plan update; (2) the county immediately begins the process of identifying alternative sites for a NE station, and secures a site if feasible; and (3) alternative sites for a NE station are analyzed in the same EIS, and at the same level of detail, as demand management strategies.

**Next Steps**
As is noted previously, the SWD has now proposed that MSWAC not take action on the Final Report and instead focus on updating the Solid Waste Comprehensive Management Plan, using
the Transfer Plan reports to inform that process. If MSWAC does not take action on the Final Report, representatives may want to provide information to the King County Council laying out the reasons for not taking action and suggesting the King County Council accept the Final Report and support using it to inform the Plan update.

Attachments

A. *Proposed Motions*
   - MSWAC’s original motion - Final Report Recommendation
   - Kirkland motion
   - Lake Forest Park motion
   - Federal Way motion
   - Bellevue motion

B. *Comment Summary List excerpted from the Transfer Plan Part 2 Final Report*

C. *Bellevue Letter dated May 6, 2015, Factoria CUP*
Initial DRAFT Motion

Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee
Transfer Plan Report Motion
August 14, 2015

I move that MSWMAC support King County approval of the 2015 Transfer Plan Review Final Report and its recommendations, including:

- Do not build a new Northeast Transfer Station, but keep it as an option for a future potential facility.

- Develop and test the following demand management strategies:
  a. Conduct a pilot program to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of using demand management strategies, including web cameras to inform customers of station activity in real time.
  b. Work with private industry customers and stakeholders to develop a low-cost bulky item collection pilot in target regions of the county by May 2016.
  c. Research point of sale (IT system) needs to support differential pricing for transactions at the transfer stations and identify implementation needs by May 2016. Implement necessary technology changes by September 2017.
  d. In 2017, begin a 12-month pilot to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of extended hours and incentive pricing. Following the pilot, transmit a report and recommendation to Council in March 2019.

- Identify the steps needed to achieve 70 percent recycling rates.

- Continue Comp Plan process with city partners and other stakeholders to address key policy issues and produce a draft Comp Plan for review in early 2017.

- Upon adoption of the Comp Plan, the system’s infrastructure should be reassessed to ensure it fully supports the adopted strategies and goals of the system.
Kirkland –DRAFT Substitute Motion

Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee
August 14, 2015

I move that MSWMAC support King County approval of the 2015 Transfer Plan Review Final Report and its recommendations, including:

- Do not design and build a new Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station now, but take steps to keep it as a viable, timely option for the future if needed.

- As a contingency, immediately begin identifying preliminary siting criteria and a siting process for a new Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station to run concurrently with the testing of demand management strategies. Identify alternative sites and prepare an Environmental Impact Statement for each potential site.

- The Houghton Transfer Station should close no later than 2023, which is seven years later than the 2016 closure originally planned in 2006, and approximately four years later than shown in the timeline in the Draft 2013 Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan update.

- Develop and test the following demand management strategies:
  
  e. Conduct a pilot program to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of using demand management strategies, including web cameras to inform customers of station activity in real time.

  f. Work with private industry customers and stakeholders to develop a low-cost bulky item collection pilot in target regions of the county by May 2016.

  g. Research point of sale (IT system) needs to support differential pricing for transactions at the transfer stations and identify implementation needs by May 2016. Implement necessary technology changes by September 2017.

  h. In 2016, begin a 12-month pilot to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of extended hours and incentive pricing. Following the pilot, transmit a report and recommendation to Council in March 2018.

- Identify the steps needed to achieve 70 percent recycling rates.
• Continue Comp Plan process with city partners and other stakeholders to address key policy issues and produce a draft Comp Plan for review in early 2017.

• Upon adoption of the Comp Plan, the system’s infrastructure should be reassessed to ensure it fully supports the adopted strategies and goals of the system.
Lake Forest Park - Draft Motion
August 14, 2015

I move that MSWMAC support requesting that King County consider the impacts of the regional transfer system decision on the regional transportation network.
Federal Way - Draft Motion  
August 18, 2015

MSWMAC does not request KC Council approval or action on the Transfer Plan Final Report. While the Transfer Plan Final Report is valuable in that it provides additional analysis related to transfer station siting issues, an update of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan would allow for a more appropriate regional process to set policies related to transfer station siting.

Therefore, MSWMAC requests the following:

· KCSWD should immediately resume the process for updating the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, rather than waiting for 2017.

· KCSWD should make use of the data in the Final Report to update the transfer station element in the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, as was originally intended.

· In anticipation that an EIS will be an integral part of initiating an update of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, the scope of the EIS should address the following elements as related to transfer station siting, with analysis conducted at the same priority and level of detail:

  ✓ Transportation impacts
  ✓ Demand management strategies, and
  ✓ Identifying alternative sites for a potential replacement transfer station for the NE county.
Note: This motion was developed after speaking with several City representatives who expressed interest in developing a joint motion for MSWMAC to consider.

**DRAFT MOTION (endorsed by: Bellevue, _______, _______, _______)
Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC)
Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Final Report Motion
August 27, 2015**

We understand that the King County Council has requested that MSWMAC provide feedback on the King County Solid Waste Division Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Final Report. MSWMAC has reviewed and discussed the report, including the fact that the data and analyses presented in the Final Report appear largely unchanged from the Draft Report and that many cities had expressed concerns regarding the strategies presented in the Draft Report, and therefore:

MSWMAC moves that the King County Council defer action on the King County Solid Waste Division Transfer Plan Review Part 2 Final Report and urges King County consideration of the following:

- Retain a new northeast transfer station in the King County Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan and begin the siting process for the new facility in 2016 in order to ensure regional equity, environmental protections, system efficiency, and minimal impacts to local and regional traffic.

- Prepare an analysis demonstrating how the Final Report addresses the critical concerns and issues raised by stakeholder comments on the Draft Report, in particular the following:
  
  - Regional equity,
  - Viability of new policies and untested demand management strategies, including information regarding how and when these would be implemented in cities and unincorporated King County, and
  - Disproportionate impacts to northeast King County:
    - Decreased service opportunities,
    - Increased rates and/or fees, or rates and/or fees that disproportionately impact users of a particular transfer station,
    - Increased traffic congestion, including a comprehensive study of impacts to the regional transportation network from the proposed demand management strategies, and
    - Negative environmental impacts.

- Prepare an analysis regarding compliance with the Conditional Use Permit for the Factoria Transfer Station.
Appendix J: Responsiveness Summary

Comments were received from the following interested parties. To see the comments in their entirety see Appendix K.

Cities
City of Auburn
City of Bellevue – City Manager
City of Bellevue – Land Use
City of Bothell
City of Burien
City of Federal Way
City of Kirkland – City Manager
City of Kirkland – Staff
City of Newcastle
City of North Bend
City of Redmond
City of Renton
City of Sammamish

Joint City Letter
Beaux Arts
City of Bellevue
City of Bothell
City of Clyde Hill
Town of Hunts Point
City of Lake Forest Park
City of Medina
City of Newcastle
City of Renton
City of Yarrow Point

SWAC
Chair Jean Garber

Individuals
Anonymous
Bill Boyd
John Brekke
Marie-Anne Harkness
Eleanor Parks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>King County Solid Waste Division Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public outreach on potential operational and policy changes was inadequate.</td>
<td>• City of Bellevue&lt;br&gt;• Joint City letter&lt;br&gt;• City of Kirkland&lt;br&gt;• City of North Bend</td>
<td>The division recognizes stakeholders would have liked increased opportunities for collaboration; however, the timelines associated with Council Motion 14145 were tight. To maximize stakeholder involvement during data collection and development of the report, the division convened an advisory committee comprised of MSWMAC and SWAC members and met with them four times, as well as discussing the progress of the review with the full advisory committees once a month for six months. This was in addition to two public workshops held to review the modeling assumptions and methods, and an online survey of self-haul transfer station customers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process was not collaborative</td>
<td>• City of Kirkland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Report Structure and Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report should be better organized and more concise; focus on clear description of the alternatives and a comparison of adverse and beneficial impacts and monetary costs – in a matrix form when possible; use consistent language</td>
<td>• Jean Garber</td>
<td>The report has been revised to improve organization, clarity, and consistency of language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze how each alternative would (or would not) meet the guiding principles listed in the report</td>
<td>• Jean Garber</td>
<td>Although a sample analysis for each guiding principle is not included, the guiding principles are discussed and referenced throughout the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide data on projected population growth in the various transfer station service areas along with tonnage forecasts</td>
<td>• Jean Garber</td>
<td>Maps showing the population in 2010 and the projected populations in 2025 and 2035 are included in Appendix D. A chart with the tonnage forecast is on page 16 of the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include analysis of Bellevue and four Point Cities staying in the system including costs and traffic</td>
<td>• City of Kirkland&lt;br&gt;• City of Federal Way&lt;br&gt;• City of Renton</td>
<td>Estimates indicate rates would be lower if Bellevue and the four Point Cities remain in the system because fixed costs would be spread over more tons. There could be a minimal increase in the amount of commercial haulers on the road if these cities elect to remain in the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Include projections at current recycling rate and at a 60 percent rate</td>
<td>• City of Federal Way</td>
<td>Page 15 shows projections at 60 percent, but does not show projections at current rate of 53 percent. As mentioned on page 14, transactions will be minimally affected by the recycling rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more cost information for concepts and</td>
<td>• City of Auburn</td>
<td>Additional cost information is included in the body of the report and in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Attachment B to the September 9, 2015 PIC Agenda Item 9*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>King County Solid Waste Division Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| strategies, including operational and capital costs; provide information about costs over time | • City of Burien  
• City of Federal Way  
• City of Kirkland | Appendix I. The division does not have sufficient information to provide a life cycle cost analysis for each concept |
| Provide a life cycle cost analysis for each concept                     | • City of Burien  
• Jean Garber |                                                                                                          |
| Include discussion of anticipated impact to ratepayers; include the cost of each concept in terms of its effect on the average King County resident’s monthly garbage bill | • City of Burien  
• City of Federal Way  
• City of Kirkland  
• Jean Garber | The effect on ratepayers will vary depending where in the county they are located and which concept and strategies are ultimately selected. Building a Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station would increase costs across the county; not building the station and implementing other strategies to manage transactions could lower costs for customers in some geographic areas and raise costs for customers in other areas. Estimates of how the various concepts and strategies would impact the tipping fee and the effect on a resident’s monthly garbage bill are included in Appendix I. |
| Provide objective, evidence-based recommendations in the final report   | • Jean Garber | Recommendations are on pages 5 and 6 and in the Conclusion section.                                      |
| Cities and the County need to identify final options and make final decisions on the Transfer Plan | • City of Bothell | The division anticipates that this final report will lead to additional regional discussions on key policy decisions on the Transfer Plan and broader system issues. Those decisions will be reflected in an updated Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. |

Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station

| Keep NERTS as an option/site/build NERTS                               | • City of Bellevue  
• City of Bothell  
• Jean Garber  
• Joint city letter  
• City of Kirkland – City Manager  
• City of Newcastle  
• City of North Bend  
• City of Renton  
• City of Sammamish | The division agrees that a Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station should remain as an option for a future potential facility. |
<p>| Only two cities, Redmond and Woodinville, do not prefer a new NERTS; the majority of KC cities preferring a system that is equitable to all ratepayers and host cities, more effort should be given to exploring siting options of a new NERTS | • City of Renton | There are several options for managing transactional demand in the northeast portion of the county if the region is willing to adopt alternative strategies that balance demand and avoid excessive customer wait times. Under these circumstances, a Northeast Transfer Station is not needed at this time but should remain an option as a potential future facility. The division recommends conducting a pilot |
| Alternatives that don’t include building a NERTS                      | • Jean Garber |                                                                                                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>King County Solid Waste Division Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>should not be called “viable”</td>
<td></td>
<td>program to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of demand management and mitigation strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the review and agree with the County’s conclusions that another transfer station is not needed</td>
<td>City of Redmond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data does not support the County’s conclusion that the operational and policy changes will fully mitigate the decision not to build a new NERTS when Houghton closes, and the solid waste transfer and disposal system will be negatively impacted</td>
<td>City of Bellevue, City of Renton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If NERTS is not built, residents living in the north part of the County may find it easier to use transfer stations in Snohomish County</td>
<td>City of Bothell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions and strategies, such as mandatory curbside service and variable (peak) pricing, are untested and lack regional support</td>
<td>City of Bellevue, Joint city letter, City of Kirkland, City of North Bend, City of Renton, City of Sammamish</td>
<td>Though the results show a Northeast is not needed at this time, the modeled demand management strategies are untested and would benefit from real-life analysis. The division recommends conducting a pilot program to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of demand management and mitigation strategies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed strategies did not adequately consider impacts to large institutional self-haulers or small business owners</td>
<td>City of Bellevue, Joint City letter, City of Kirkland</td>
<td>The analysis of the strategies did consider effects on large institutional self-haulers and small business owners (See Tables 5 and 6 on pages 29 and 33) in the report. Self-haul restrictions would not apply to customers with charge accounts with the division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System and Service Equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts that do not include NERTS are inconsistent with the County Code requirement for regional equity in siting transfer stations/Comprehensive Plan must strive for regional equity</td>
<td>City of Bellevue, Jean Garber, Joint city letter, City of Kirkland, City of North Bend, City of Renton</td>
<td>The County’s goal is to ensure that residents and businesses within the King County solid waste system have access to services at a reasonable price. Effects of concepts and strategies will be distributed as equitably as possible. The County will continue to work with stakeholders to evaluate options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts and strategies will result in disproportionate impacts across the County and system inefficiency</td>
<td>City of Bellevue, City of Bothell, Joint city letter, City of Kirkland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>King County Solid Waste Division Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urge the County to carefully consider the future and plan a system</td>
<td>• City of Renton</td>
<td>To be responsive to the Council motion,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that provides a geographically balanced, flexible system of transfer</td>
<td>• City of North Bend</td>
<td>the division explored concepts that do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stations that is able to meet the needs of a growing County</td>
<td>• City of Sammamish</td>
<td>not include a Northeast Recycling and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without placing undue burden on just one area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Transfer Station; however, the division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>recommends that it remain as a potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not support the County policy of equity and social justice</td>
<td>• City of Bellevue</td>
<td>Implementation of any concept and/or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• John Brekke</td>
<td>strategy will consider equity and social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Jean Garber</td>
<td>justice and distribute effects as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Kirkland</td>
<td>equitably as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and Fee Equity</td>
<td>• City of Bellevue</td>
<td>In a survey completed for this report,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities in affected areas will experience increased curbside</td>
<td>• City of Bothell</td>
<td>haulers have indicated that some of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collection costs</td>
<td>• Joint City letter</td>
<td>concepts and strategies will affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Kirkland</td>
<td>curbside collection rates (see Appendix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Newcastle</td>
<td>C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of North Bend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Renton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Sammamish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fees and rates paid by customers in northeast King County will</td>
<td>• Joint City letter</td>
<td>Regardless of the chosen path for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be supporting higher levels of service and increased capital</td>
<td>• City of Kirkland</td>
<td>managing transactional demand, some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>investments in other parts of the County, but not the northeast</td>
<td>• City of Renton</td>
<td>customers may face cost increases, such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Sammamish</td>
<td>as longer drive times, collection costs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support service and fee equity to keep collection costs down</td>
<td>• City of Federal Way</td>
<td>while others may not. In order to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Joint city letter</td>
<td>effectively manage transactional demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Kirkland</td>
<td>while continuing to provide the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of North Bend</td>
<td>level of service, demand management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Renton</td>
<td>strategies will be implemented as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Sammamish</td>
<td>equitably as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling Rate Assumptions and Effect on Recycling</td>
<td>• City of Bellevue</td>
<td>The County seeks to ensure that tip fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% diversion level is/may be unrealistic and</td>
<td></td>
<td>are kept as low as reasonably possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>while achieving our regional environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and service goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>King County Solid Waste Division Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| there is no contingency plan if the region does not reach the 70% recycling rate | • Joint city letter  
• City of Kirkland  
• City of Federal Way  
• City of North Bend  
• City of Renton  
• City of Sammamish | Hills landfill, but does not have as much of an effect on the transfer system. Whether materials are brought to the transfer station as garbage or recycling, it is the number of transactions that makes a difference. With higher recycling rates there may be fewer transactions from the commercial haulers, but self-haul traffic, which represents approximately 80 percent of the system’s transactional volume, is expected remain at similar levels. |
| The plan does not provide northeast residents and businesses with the recycling services available at other transfer stations, discouraging recycling and negatively affecting the region’s ability to achieve its 70% recycling goal | • City of Kirkland | Some of the concepts and strategies would reduce the availability of recycling options at County transfer stations, so such decisions should consider these impacts as we are develop our roadmap to reach a 70 percent recycling rate. |

**Effect on Environment and Permits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>King County Solid Waste Division Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Concepts and strategies will cause significant adverse environmental impacts that were not considered in the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station Conditional Use Permit; additional SEPA review will be needed | • City of Bellevue  
• Jean Garber  
• Joint City letter  
• City of Kirkland | The division recommends conducting a pilot program to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of demand management and mitigation strategies. In addition to pilot programs, the division will work with the City of Bellevue to address their concerns regarding the Conditional Use Permit. |
| Not building NERTS is against county policy to reduce GHG emissions | • Jean Garber | The recommendations from this review will be incorporated into the Transfer Chapter of the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan, which will be subject to environmental review including consideration of GHG emissions. |
| Illegal dumping may increase with some alternatives                  | • Jean Garber | The concern of a potential increase in illegal dumping is noted in Table 6 on page 33. In the past, raising rates or changing hours at our rural stations has not led to measurable increases in illegal dumping. |

**Effect on other transfer stations and communities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>King County Solid Waste Division Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Customer service will be reduced at Factoria and Shoreline and Increased use at Renton will result in longer queues and wait times.</td>
<td>• City of Renton</td>
<td>If a new Northeast Recycling and Transfer Station is not built, and the Houghton and Renton Transfer Stations are closed, all of the other transfer stations would likely be busier. The division would seek efficiencies and strategies to ensure that customer wait times are not excessive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton should be closed; County continues to delay closure of the Houghton Transfer Station, now as late as 2023</td>
<td>• City of Kirkland</td>
<td>The County is committed to close the Houghton station as soon as replacement capacity is available, whether through mitigation strategies, identification of additional capacity elsewhere, or siting and building a new facility in the service area. The year 2023 was selected for analysis because it would provide a worst case scenario due to high...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>King County Solid Waste Division Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| If NERTS is not built, peak pricing places additional trip loads on both regional and local roads | • City of Renton  
• City of Newcastle | The division recommends conducting a pilot program to test the effectiveness and potential impacts of demand management and mitigation strategies. |
| **Renton Transfer Station** | | |
| Do not close the Renton Transfer Station without putting it to a vote and/or providing viable options. | • Anonymous | Council Motion 14145 directed the division to include the Renton Transfer Station in this review to assess the effect its closure might have on customers. Under any of the concepts, closure of the Renton Transfer Station would not have a significant effect on the ability of the system to provide service. |
| County has not committed to close the Renton Transfer Station unless there is adequate capacity and Concepts 0, 1, and 2 do not provide additional capacity [the City wants the transfer station closed] | • City of Renton | |
| **South County Recycling and Transfer Station** | | |
| Supportive of the South County siting process and supportive of City of Algona and County cooperating on equitable mitigation for the timely siting of a new SCRTS | • City of Federal Way | The division is continuing its efforts to site a South County Recycling and Transfer Station. |
| Transfer Plan Review did not consider the south county; encourage finalizing negotiations with the City of Algona to before the Transfer Plan Review is complete | • Marie-Anne Harkness  
• John Brekke  
• Bill Boyd  
• Eleanor Parks | Council Motion 14145 which required additional review of the Transfer System Plan did not include review of the south county. However, the division analyzed potential effects based on customer use patterns of the system and determined that decisions made for the northeast and Renton areas would have little to no impact on the south county area (see Appendix H). |
May 6, 2015

Christie True, Director
King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
201 South Jackson Street, Room 700
Seattle, WA 98104

RE: Adequacy of Analysis and Mitigation for the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station Permits

Dear Ms. True:

This is to provide you with information about the City of Bellevue’s concerns regarding revisions currently under study to transfer service plans in the northeast portion of King County. After review of the Transfer Plan Review, Part 2, Draft Report, it is apparent that modifications to the regional system now under consideration by the County will result in environmental impacts to the Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station (RTS) that were not addressed by the Conditional Use Permit applications submitted to City of Bellevue for review in 2012. At that time, the Factoria RTS was characterized as one of eight existing King County transfer stations, and analyzed as such. As described in the new Draft Report, significant changes in (1) existing and planned stations and (2) operational strategies are under consideration. If these changes are implemented, the City will need to require a new Conditional Use Permit in order to analyze and address the anticipated impacts. In addition, a full Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that evaluates the alternatives being considered by the County will be necessary BEFORE options are foreclosed or actions set in motion that would make the impacts identified in the Draft Transfer Plan a virtual certainty in Factoria.

The Conditional Use Permit (12 110986 LB) and Critical Area Land Use Permit (12 110987 LO) for the Factoria RTS were approved by the City of Bellevue on November 21, 2012. The Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance for these applications was issued by King County on March 8, 2012. The Transportation section of that DNS primarily referenced traffic impacts during construction. Traffic impacts during operation of the site were addressed in the DNS by this statement: “Due to anticipated volume growth at the Factoria RTS, evaluation during operation may be required to assess the need for an additional inbound scale to minimize traffic queuing under future conditions.”

Although the City of Bellevue did not issue the DNS for this application, City staff did review and assess long term, mid-range, and short term operational impacts during review of the CUP.
application. An approval of the CUP relied upon project disclosures provided by the County. With regard to long term traffic impacts, staff determined that the proposal was consistent with the City’s Transportation Facilities Plan EIS. Payment of a traffic impact fee alleviates traffic congestion caused by the cumulative impacts of development. Analysis of mid-range traffic impacts, typically assessed through a Traffic Standards Code (BCC 14.10) concurrency analysis, was not undertaken since the proposal’s net p.m. peak hour trip generation of 12 trips did not meet the 30 p.m. peak hour threshold. Information as to short term operational impacts was provided in the “Factoria Recycling and Transfer Station Replacement Project Traffic Impact Analysis” dated January, 2012, by HDR Engineering, Inc. This traffic impact analysis (TIA) was reviewed by City staff, is included in the City’s file for this project, and was one of the bases upon which the CUP was conditioned and approved. Day-of-opening (assumed to be 2014) trip generation was determined to be 12 net new p.m. peak hour trips. Additional trips anticipated for the long term (assumed to be 2042) were forecasted to be 44 net new p.m. peak hour trips. The TIA analyzed both the 2014 and 2042 scenarios and determined that all the study intersections would remain at the same level of service with and without the proposed Factoria RTS improvements.

The County’s consultant also provided a Queuing Analysis Technical Memorandum, dated November 3, 2011. This Memorandum indicated that the average queue at the entrance would not produce any negative effects to the adjacent commercial driveway on either the weekdays or the weekends in 2014, but would spill back to the commercial driveway for 10% of the station’s operating hours on the weekdays and 60% on the weekends in 2042. The Development Services Department (DSD) of the City of Bellevue concurred with the conclusions reached in the County’s DNS and the technical memoranda submitted in support of the County’s CUP application. In addition to the King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks, Solid Waste Division (KCSWD), Mitigated DNS and the queuing and traffic impact analyses described above, the following technical memoranda were also used as the bases upon which the CUP was conditioned and approved:

- Visual Quality Impact Assessment
- Geotechnical Report
- Biological Evaluation
- Critical Areas Report
- Noise
- Air Quality

KCSWD is now considering operational, policy, and capital strategies for providing transfer service to northeast King County. These Concepts and their resulting impacts, described in the Transfer Plan Review, Part 2, Draft Report, include abandonment of a Northeast Transfer Station project, closure of the Houghton Transfer Station, closure of the Renton Transfer Station, and various operational strategies regarding hours of operation and restrictions upon classes of users. These strategies prioritize customer wait time and efficient usage of transfer stations.
Unfortunately, these priorities would result in unmitigated impacts on the operation of the Factoria RTS and the surrounding public facilities and on the use of private property in the vicinity. For example, Concept 2 restricts the hours that self-haulers can use the Factoria RTS, and also extends the hours, so that self-haulers are encouraged to use those extended hours. As documented in spreadsheets in Attachment 3 of the Draft Report, this restriction shifts trips to Bellevue’s street system peak hours, increasing volumes between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. by hundreds of trips. This operational change pushes self-haul access to the Factoria RTS into the p.m. traffic peak for the City of Bellevue. This impact was not analyzed as part of the Factoria RTS application review, is not consistent with the terms of the County’s CUP approval, represents an unmitigated impact that would be inconsistent with SEPA and GMA, and will not be permitted to occur in the City.

Additionally, as noted in the Draft Report, weekday queues at the Factoria RTS of 130 vehicles and Saturday queues of over 180 vehicles are predicted to occur with closing of the Houghton Transfer Station. Mitigation strategies for these queues are referenced, but are not otherwise detailed. Not only would these queues represent another unmitigated impact on properties in the vicinity of the Factoria RTS, the queue lengths would not meet the County’s own level of service standards and would significantly reduce customer functionality at the Factoria RTS and other remaining transfer stations in the system.

The impacts of the range of strategies now contemplated by the County’s plan for providing transfer service were not addressed by the Conditional Use Permit approved by Bellevue for the Factoria RTS. Therefore, to the extent that program changes to the transfer station system by KCSWD change assumptions upon which the Factoria RTS CUP was issued and conditioned, the County will be held to impact levels disclosed in the CUP. Modification to the approved CUP will be necessary based on updated analysis of the above-referenced technical memoranda before any operational changes can be made to Factoria. Given the information contained in the Transfer Plan Review Draft Report, the operational changes contemplated in several of the identified Concepts appear likely to cause a significant adverse environmental impact for which mitigation cannot be easily identified. Therefore, a full EIS that evaluates the alternatives being considered by the County will be necessary.

Should the County commit to pursuing any of the Concepts that would change the currently eight station system, a new CUP application would be required based on analysis contained in an EIS. This new application would, at a minimum, need to address increased p.m. peak hour trip generation, queuing, and levels of service at affected City of Bellevue intersections, the air quality impacts associated with the queuing, and the redistribution of regional traffic that would be necessary to access a more distributed system of transfer station facilities as well as the noise impacts associated with expanded station operations that would be necessary to redistribute the solid waste tonnage to fewer stations. It is anticipated that a concurrency analysis would be required as a component of this review. In addition, payment of an updated traffic impact fee, currently anticipated to be $5000 per p.m. peak hour trip as of January 1, 2016, would be
required with any approval of expanded usage at the Factoria RTS. It is our expectation that the County would pursue all necessary approvals and environmental review before any changes are made to the existing system plans that would change Factoria RTS operations disclosed by the County in its application for CUP approval. Please be advised that the City will begin proceedings necessary to enforce the terms of the existing CUP approval should it become necessary.

Sincerely,

Carol Helland, Director, Land Use Division Development Services Department

Cc: Bellevue City Councilmembers
King County Councilmembers
Dow Constantine, King County Executive
Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives, King County Executive
Pat McLaughlin, Director, King County Solid Waste Division
Bob Burns, Deputy Director, Department of Natural Resources and Parks
Kevin Kiernan, Assistant Division Director, Solid Waste Division, DNRP
Diane Yates, Intergovernmental Liaison, Solid Waste Division, DNRP
Item 10
E911 Oversight

UPDATE

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

Regional Policy Committee (RPC) Members
Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond; Councilmember Bill Pelozza, Auburn; Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville; Mayor Amy Walen, Kirkland; Mayor Suzette Cooke, Kent (alternate); Mayor Dave Hill, Algona (alternate)

Update
The Regional Policy Committee (RPC) is scheduled to make a recommendation at its September 9, 2015 meeting on the establishment of a committee to provide oversight of E911 operations, and development and implementation of Next Generation 911 technology in King County. At the PIC meeting, staff will provide PIC members with an update on the action taken at the RPC meeting, and next steps in the process.

Background
King County’s Enhanced 911 (E911) system provides emergency dispatch services to the more than two million residents in the county. The E911 system consists of the King County Enhanced 911 Program Office (currently housed within the King County Office of Emergency Management), and 12 Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bothell Police Department</th>
<th>Redmond Police Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enumclaw Police Department</td>
<td>Seattle Fire Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah Police Department</td>
<td>Seattle Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>University of Washington Police Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East King County Regional Public Safety Communications Agency (NORCOM)¹</td>
<td>Valley Communications Center²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Seattle Police Department</td>
<td>Washington State Patrol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ NORCOM serves the following agencies: Bellevue Police and Fire, Bothell Fire, Clyde Hill
Police, Duvall FD 45, Eastside Fire and Rescue, Fall City FD 27, Kirkland Police and Fire, Medina Police, Mercer Island Police and Fire, Northshore Fire, Redmond Fire, Shoreline Fire, Skykomish Fire, Snoqualmie Fire, Snoqualmie Pass Fire & Rescue (FD 51), and Woodinville Fire & Rescue.
² Valley Com serves the following agencies: City of Algona Police, City of Auburn Police, City of Black Diamond Police, Burien/Normandy Park FD 2, City of Des Moines Police, City of Federal Way Police, City of Kent Police, Fire and EMS, King County Medic One, Maple Valley FD 43, Mountain View FD 44, North Highline Fire, City of Pacific Police, Palmer/Seleck FD 47, City of Renton Police, Fire and EMS, SeaTac Fire, South King Fire and Rescue, Skyway FD 20, City of Tukwila Police, Fire and EMS, Valley Regional Fire Authority, and Vashon Island Fire and Rescue
For several years, this region has been exploring ways to enhance the E911 system. These include but are not limited to looking at moving to “Next Generation 911” (NG911), which would allow digital information (such as text messages, photos, and videos) to be sent by the public to the PSAPs (the 911 call taking and dispatch agencies), and on to first responders.

HISTORY
In 2012, King County retained the firm GeoCom to conduct an assessment of the existing E911 system in King County, including a review of the existing operations and technology at each of the 12 PSAPs. The 2012 GeoCom report was met with significant skepticism by many cities (particularly those cities who operated their own PSAPs), because the stated goal of the review “was to determine the feasibility of consolidating none, some, or all of the PSAPs and public safety communications functions serving the county and municipalities within King County.”

In 2012, during the 2013 budget process, the County Council adopted a budget proviso requiring the Executive to develop a plan for implementing the GeoCom report. That plan was initially due to the council on May 31, 2013. A work group was formed, but unable to come to consensus. The deadline was extended to September 2014, and the scope of the proviso was changed from reporting on recommendations to reporting on progress and plans for completion. The Executive reported to the County Council in 2014 that a new “PSAP Future Configuration Recommendation Committee” would be formed to make recommendations on next steps.

In the meantime, due to opposition from many PSAPs and cities, the County Executive’s office has backed off of the initial proposal to consolidate PSAPs. Instead, the focus of the work has shifted to coming up with a governance structure that will enable the region to move forward with NG911. There has also been a focus on a looming budgetary crisis within the E911 program.

The King County Council included a proviso in its 2015-2016 budget for the Auditor’s Office to conduct a financial and technical audit of King County’s 911 system. The Auditor’s Report found:

King County has been a national leader in updating and enhancing its 911 system. However, it anticipates the program will run out of money within the next three years and it faces a number of other challenges in its current efforts to implement Next Generation 911 services. The lack of an effective governance structure that includes King County and its PSAP partners is the most serious of these challenges. Because of this, while solutions exist for many of the financial and technical challenges that we identify in our report, there is currently no formal means for King County and its partners to make decisions. We also found that King County has not consistently followed its own guidelines and process for managing information technology projects.

Based on these findings, the Auditor’s Report recommended the following:
We recommend that King County temporarily suspend its implementation of Next Generation 911 until this governance issue can be resolved. In addition, we make recommendations to help King County and its partners move forward with implementation of Next Generation 911. Our recommendations focus on improving collaboration and planning as well as establishing a financial baseline that would allow stakeholders to agree on required spending and estimated revenue for the program.

The Auditor’s Report is based in part on a study conducted by an outside firm, Mission Critical Partners. That full report can be found on the Auditor’s website, and an executive summary is included as Attachment A. That report was critical of the County’s E911 Office, describing the approach taken to planning to be “piecemeal” noting, “The absence of project planning, timelines, accountability and a collaborative requirements-gathering process are the primary barriers King County faces to successfully implement NG9-1-1. The expected upcoming budget shortfall is indicative of these and other problems the County faces.”

In addition to calling for the Auditor’s review of the E911 system in King County, the budget adopted by the King County Council also contained a proviso requiring the County Executive to transmit an ordinance establishing a “King County regional public safety answering point oversight committee.” The Auditor’s Report made a similar recommendation, noting that the County lacked a formal governance structure for decision making on matters related to E911. The Auditor’s Report recommended that the County Executive create a governance mechanism that would build on the group called for by the County Council. “This group should balance King County’s statutory responsibilities under Washington state law, with providing a formal, clear, and transparent mechanism for the Public Safety Answering Points and other regional partners to participate in the decision-making process.”

In response to the County Council’s budget proviso, the County Executive transmitted a Proposed Ordinance 2015-0255, Attachment B, which would establish the King County Regional Public Safety Answering Point Oversight Committee ("Oversight Committee"). The proposed ordinance also defines a proposed work plan for the Oversight Committee, the primary objective of which is to recommend a strategic plan for the implementation, governance and operation of the Next Generation 911 (NG911) system in King County. The ordinance received a dual referral to the COW, and to the Regional Policy Committee (RPC).

Directors of the various PSAPs were unhappy with the recommendations contained in the ordinance transmitted by the Executive, as well as the fact that the process was developed without consultation with the PSAPs and other stakeholders, and submitted their own proposal, Attachments C and D.

The RPC will review and make a recommendation on the competing proposals at its September 9, 2015 meeting.

**E911 Oversight Committee**

A preliminary note on terminology: The King County Council budget proviso called for the establishment of a “King County regional public safety answering point oversight committee.”
The original ordinance submitted by the Executive maintained this terminology. Both the PSAP Directors and the County Executive’s Office now agree that the term “PSAP Oversight Committee” is a misnomer. The committee would provide oversight in some capacity to the E911 system, not the individual PSAPs. The PSAP Directors have proposed the title of “King County Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Steering Committee (REPSC).” While the ultimate title of the committee is to be determined, this memo uses the term “E911 Oversight Committee” (or “Committee”) as a placeholder.

The PSAP Directors met with representatives from the Executive’s office on Monday August 31, 2015. As of the drafting of this staff report, both the Executive’s office and the PSAP Directors were working on amendments to their proposals. The below comparison references the version of the Executive’s proposal submitted to the County Council on June 30, 2015, and the version of the PSAP Directors’ proposal sent to RPC members in August 2015, except as otherwise noted. Updated materials will be distributed to PIC members as they become available.

**Makeup of the E911 Oversight Committee**

The King County Council’s budget proviso contained a list of proposed members for the committee:

- the vice chair of regional coordination of the council
- the chair of the law, justice, health and human services committee\(^3\)
- the executive or his designee
- a city of Seattle elected official appointed by the mayor
- three elected officials from other jurisdictions to be appointed by the council
- a representative of the Sound Cities Association
- a representative of a public safety agency, which is police, fire or emergency medical services
- a nonvoting technical and facilitation consultant selected by the executive.

The proposal submitted by the Executive was similar but not identical to that list. Instead of one representative of “a public safety agency, which is police, fire or emergency medical services,” the Executive proposed adding three representatives of public safety agencies: a representative of the elected Sheriff, a police chief, and a fire chief. The Executive has subsequently withdrawn the suggestion to have a representative of the elected Sheriff on the committee.

The proposal submitted by the PSAP Directors was also similar to the list contained in the Council budget proviso, with two differences. The PSAP Directors proposed having 5, rather than 3, elected city officials on the committee. Under this proposal, these would be in addition to an SCA representative on the committee. The most significant difference between the PSAP Directors proposal and the Executive’s proposal would be the addition of 2 PSAP directors on the committee: one from a large agency (NORCOM or Valley Com) and one from a small agency.

\(^3\) Subsequently renamed the “law, justice and emergency management committee.”
Questions for RPC members include:

- Should the Committee include only elected officials?
- If non-elected officials are on the Committee, should they be voting or non-voting members?
- If non-elected officials are on the Committee, should membership include PSAP directors?
- Should there be a technical advisory committee (TAC) established to give guidance to the Committee and, if so, what should membership on the TAC consist of, and what level of formality should the TAC have?

**Role and Responsibilities of the E911 Oversight Committee**

The proposals from the Executive and the PSAP Directors differ significantly as to the role and responsibilities of the Committee.

**Executive Proposal:**

Under the Executive’s proposal, the “primary objective” of the Committee would be to “recommend to the King County Executive and Council a strategic plan for the implementation, governance and operation of the Next Generation 911 (NG911) system in King County." Under the Executive’s proposal, the Committee would also establish bylaws and recommend a future governance structure, operating rules, and infrastructure for future countywide E911 operations. The Committee would be tasked with developing a 10-year strategic plan that would include:

- Vision and Mission Statement for King County E911;
- Guiding principles for the King County E911 system;
- Goals of the King County E911 system;
- Governance for the regional organizational structure;
- Organizational structure and rules for the regional system; and
- COW Packet Materials Page 109
- Implementation steps, to address, at a minimum, the following issues:
  - NG911 infrastructure needs and investments
  - Staffing and training needs and investments
  - Transitional issues
  - Recommended sustainable financial plan, built from a baseline budget; and
  - Scope, schedule and budget for implementation steps.

The proposal submitted by the Executive focuses on development and implementation of NG911. It does not provide significant detail on the role of the Committee (and interest of stakeholders) in oversight of the E911 system, which is a concern given the findings of the Auditor’s Report.

**PSAP Directors’ Proposal**

Under the PSAP Directors’ proposal, the purpose of the Committee would be “owning, operating, maintaining, managing and providing ongoing upgrading, maintenance and operation of the Enhanced 911 system previously operated by the King County E-911 Program..."
Office.” The proposal includes future formation of a nonprofit corporation that would take over ownership of the system.

The duties of the Committee would include:

- Providing oversight of the technology, operations, administration and finances of the King County E-911 Program office
- Completing the above mission and purpose of the Committee
- Providing ongoing evaluation and recommendations for improvement of 911 services
- Developing a strategic plan for Next Generation 911 technology
- Developing timelines and work plans as necessary to carry out its purpose
- Receiving and considering all proper matters in relation to E-911 Program technology, operations, finance and administration
- Reviewing and analyzing all prior historical documents deemed necessary by the REPSC including all financial, management, technical and other records of the E-911 Program Office
- Hiring, monitoring and overseeing the performance of King County E-911 Program Manager who would serve "at the pleasure of" the Committee
- Providing an annual report to the County Executive and King County Council on progress

Under this proposal, the Committee would also “have final authority over annual distributions to the PSAPs of any and all E-911 taxes collected by King County.”

The PSAP Directors’ proposed ordinance would also clarify that it would “not in any way regulate or create oversight of the operations, finances, technology or management of the current twelve King County PSAPs.”

**Questions for RPC Members to decide**

Both proposals envision the Committee developing a strategic plan for design and implementation of a regional NG 911 system. Some issues to be resolved between these two competing proposals are:

- Should the Committee be empowered to hire its own facilitator and set the work plan for the Committee?
- Should the Committee have a greater role in overseeing the E911 system on an ongoing basis, particularly given the Auditor’s Report findings?
- Should the Committee own and operate the E911 office?
  - If so, should a new nonprofit organization be formed for ownership?
  - Should the Committee have responsibility for hiring, firing, and oversight of the employees of the E911 office?
- Should the Committee have final authority over the annual distributions of E911 taxes?
- Should the ordinance clarify that the Committee would not have oversight authority over the PSAPs?
- To the extent that some of these are still open questions, should they be within the purview of the Committee to determine?
Next Steps
As noted above, both the PSAP Directors and the Executive are working on refinements to their proposals at this time. Additional materials will be provided to PIC members as they become available. Additionally, more materials on this topic will be a part of the RPC meeting materials, which were not available at the time of this writing. The RPC members are scheduled to take action on September 9, 2015.

Attachments
A. Auditor’s Report
B. King County Executive’s Proposed Ordinance
C. PSAP Directors’ Proposed Ordinance
D. PSAP Directors’ Talking Points Memo to RPC Members
King County has been an early leader in updating and enhancing its 911 system. However, it has moved forward without a clear plan and it lacks an effective governance structure that includes emergency dispatch centers. These issues, along with the added costs to implement newer technology, have resulted in strained relationships and lack of agreement on a path forward. We recommend King County temporarily suspend work on Next Generation 911 until these governance and planning issues are resolved and a financial plan can be developed.
King County Auditor’s Office

To Advance Performance and Accountability

**Mission:** Promote improved performance, accountability, and transparency in King County government through objective and independent audits and studies.

**Values:** Independence ~ Credibility ~ Impact

The King County Auditor’s Office was created by charter in 1969 as an independent agency within the legislative branch of county government. The office conducts oversight of county government through independent audits, capital projects oversight, and other studies. The results of this work are presented to the Metropolitan King County Council and are communicated to the King County Executive and the public. The King County Auditor’s Office performs its work in accordance with Government Auditing Standards.
King County 911 System: Governance Structure and Plan Needed to Move Forward

June 23, 2015

Why This Audit Is Important

King County’s Enhanced 911 (E911) system provides emergency dispatch services to more than two million county residents. Telephone customers pay the more than $20 million cost for the system from monthly excise taxes. Personnel in the King County Enhanced 911 Program Office and 12 emergency dispatch centers – called Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) – manage and operate the system. King County and its PSAP partners are in the process of implementing Next Generation 911, a national initiative aimed at modernizing and improving the capabilities of the 911 system. The King County Council included a proviso in its 2015-2016 budget for the Auditor’s Office to conduct a financial and technical audit of King County’s 911 system.

What We Found

King County has been a national leader in updating and enhancing its 911 system. However, it anticipates the program will run out of money within the next three years and it faces a number of other challenges in its current efforts to implement Next Generation 911 services. The lack of an effective governance structure that includes King County and its PSAP partners is the most serious of these challenges. Because of this, while solutions exist for many of the financial and technical challenges that we identify in our report, there is currently no formal means for King County and its partners to make decisions. We also found that King County has not consistently followed its own guidelines and process for managing information technology projects.

What We Recommend

We recommend that King County temporarily suspend its implementation of Next Generation 911 until this governance issue can be resolved. In addition, we make recommendations to help King County and its partners move forward with implementation of Next Generation 911. Our recommendations focus on improving collaboration and planning as well as establishing a financial baseline that would allow stakeholders to agree on required spending and estimated revenue for the program.
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Section Summary

While King County has been an early leader in pursuing Next Generation 911 (NG 911) technology, it faces potential financial challenges that will require suspending implementation to establish a governance structure and detailed implementation plan. The King County Enhanced 911 (E911) Program Office’s financial plan indicates that it will run out of money by the end of 2018. There are several ways to modify or eliminate the unfunded expenditures projected to precipitate this financial crisis. However, the County lacks a decision-making structure that balances its responsibilities with the concerns of the 12 independent Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) agencies. In addition, forward progress depends upon an agreed-upon financial baseline and detailed NG 911 implementation plan.

If it does not make changes, the E911 program will run out of money soon

Our financial consultant found that the E911 program will run out of money by 2018 if it does not make changes in planned spending. Although revenues increased with the increase in telephone user fees in 2011, the E911 Program Office financial plan shows a negative fund balance in 2018. The E911 Program Office has been aware of this financial challenge since 2011. The two main factors driving the balance negative are expenses related to NG 911 and high and rising levels of PSAP support. Exhibit A shows the E911 actual and planned fund balance between 2005 and 2022, and how the current approach to 911 spending is unsustainable.

Exhibit A: Planned unfunded expenditures would push E911 fund balance to zero by 2018

Source: King County Auditor’s Office visualization of Miller & Miller analysis of E911 program ending fund balances using actual and projected financial data (not adjusted for inflation).

1 Next Generation 911 (NG 911) refers to an initiative aimed at modernizing the 911 service infrastructure in the United States and Canada to improve public emergency communications services in a wireless mobile society. In addition to calling 911 from a phone, it intends to enable the public to transmit text, images, video, and data to 911 centers (referred to as Public Safety Answering Points, or PSAPs).

2 Two consultants provided financial and technical expertise to this audit: Miller & Miller conducted the financial review, and Mission Critical Partners conducted the technical review.

3 Under the current state law, cell phone, wireline, and Voice over Internet Protocol users pay $.95 per month in 911 excise taxes; $.70 goes to the counties and the remaining $.25 goes to the state of Washington.
1. Program Faces Financial and Planning Challenges

While some costs are one-time expenses, both the system costs for the E911 network and database and PSAP support costs, such as revenue distribution and on-location technical staff, continue to increase, as shown in Exhibit B. Spending peaked in 2015 with the hardware and network expenses needed to upgrade the system for NG 911.

Exhibit B: 911 system costs and PSAP support are the E911 program’s major expenditures

It is important to note that while the effort to modernize 911 services is a national expectation, timing and service standards have not yet been finalized by the Federal Communications Commission. In addition, the level of PSAP support is discretionary and determined by the E911 Program Office. Revenue sharing is allowable under the King County Enhanced 911 Participation Agreement, but it is the lowest priority expense listed. In 2014, PSAP support accounted for over half of E911 expenditures.

In 2013, the E911 Program Office and PSAP stakeholders convened a process to identify solutions to the impending financial crisis. They brainstormed some options, but lacked a functional decision-making process to move forward. We will discuss some options for addressing the financial challenges below.
1. Program Faces Financial and Planning Challenges

The current informal governance system used by the E911 Program Office to get feedback and provide information to the PSAPs is not working well. Under Washington state law, counties are given the primary responsibility for managing the 911 systems in their jurisdictions. In King County, the E911 Program Office coordinates and manages 911 services, while the 12 PSAPs answer 911 calls and dispatch emergency service as shown in Exhibit C.

Exhibit C: E911 Program Office supports PSAPs through distribution of excise taxes

Phone company collects $ from phone user fees

State distributes $ to Program Office

Program Office distributes $ to PSAPs based on call volume and access lines

12 PSAPs answer 911 calls and dispatch emergency service

Source: King County Auditor’s Office

The current 911 system operation and the implementation of NG 911 requires a great deal of coordination and cooperation between the E911 Program Office and the PSAPs, however, there is not a formal structure for collaboration and decision-making. In a proviso in its 2015-2016 budget, the King County Council mandated the creation of a Regional PSAP Oversight Committee, which could be the basis for an ongoing governance structure. In addition, there are other examples of potential governance structures from public safety-related King County programs as shown in Exhibit D.
1. Program Faces Financial and Planning Challenges

While the current PSAP Director’s Group provides a forum for discussing issues and disseminating information, it lacks a formal structure delineating which decisions should be made by King County and which require input from PSAPs and other stakeholders. This structure is especially important with the implementation of NG 911, as many of the decisions made about how and in what sequence to take the steps necessary to get to NG 911 will have a considerable impact on the PSAPs and how they conduct their day to day operations.

During interviews with both the Auditor’s Office and our technical consultant, Mission Critical Partners (MCP), many of the PSAPs expressed frustration at the lack of input they had in both the selections and sequencing of projects that the E911 Program Office chose to pursue. They indicated that they were not always notified of the decisions that the E911 Program Office had made that impacted them and in cases where they did provide input, they did not think that their input was adequately considered. One consequence of this lack of formal governance system is that the formerly strong relationship between the E911 Program Office and PSAPs has, in some cases, deteriorated to the point that it has been difficult to work together on issues, such as implementing interim text-to-911 and broadening the use of Smart911 around King County.

There are a number of examples of effective regional governance organizations in King County that could serve as a model for the E911 system. King County and its regional partners work together to provide a number of public safety related services across the county. The governance bodies that are used to administer and provide oversight to these systems provide examples that can be used in creating a governance organization for the E911 system. Another potential governance system could be the Regional PSAP Oversight Committee mandated in a proviso in the 2015-2016 budget. While the County Executive has until July 1, 2015 to transmit an ordinance to the County Council to establish this committee, its membership is outlined in the proviso.

---

4 Smart911 is an online database where citizens can provide information about their family or dwellings that can enhance emergency communication and response.
**1. Program Faces Financial and Planning Challenges**

*Exhibit D: King County has several examples of regional public safety governance systems*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Governing Body</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Voting Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS)</td>
<td>Advisory Committee</td>
<td>• Bellevue Police Department</td>
<td>Each member has equal voting authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Issaquah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Seattle Budget Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Federal Way Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• King County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• King County Budget Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• King County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Kirkland Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Seattle Police Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• South County Regional Jail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Emergency Management Radio System</td>
<td>Regional Communications Board</td>
<td>• King County</td>
<td>Each member has equal voting authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Seattle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eastside Public Safety Communications Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Valley Communications³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E911 System</td>
<td>Proposed Regional PSAP Oversight Committee</td>
<td>• Chair of the County Council</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Vice Chair of Regional Coordination of the Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Chair of the Law, Justice, and Emergency Management Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• County Executive or designee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• City of Seattle elected official appointed by the Mayor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Three elected officials from other jurisdictions appointed by the County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Representative of the Sound Cities Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Representative of a public safety agency, appointed by the County Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nonvoting technical and facilitation consultant selected by the County Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: King County Auditor’s Office

³The Eastside Public Safety Communications Agency was established by the cities of Bellevue, Redmond, Kirkland, Mercer Island, and Issaquah to provide emergency radio service. Valley Communications is an agency consisting of the cities of Auburn, Federal Way, Kent, Renton, and Tukwila.
Recommendation 1

The County Executive should create a governance mechanism that builds on the County Council-directed strategic planning group. This group should balance King County’s statutory responsibilities under Washington state law, with providing a formal, clear, and transparent mechanism for the Public Safety Answering Points and other regional partners to participate in the decision-making process.

To resolve financial challenges, stakeholders must agree on a baseline budget upon which to evaluate proposed solutions to the financial challenges facing the system. Our financial consultant verified that the historical financial data the E911 Program Office reported in the last ten years is accurate. Nonetheless, financial planning depends on an agreed-upon baseline of required costs and anticipated revenues. This baseline will provide a solid foundation for analyzing the implications of various options to address the financial challenges facing the 911 system.

Clear and accurate communication between the E911 Program Office and stakeholders is critical to developing and maintaining a functional financial relationship. King County’s E911 stakeholders have expressed confusion about the system’s finances. PSAP leaders have expressed frustration that they are not clear about what money is being spent on, which expenses are required, and which are discretionary. Further, they perceive that numbers have changed repeatedly without adequate explanation. Some of this confusion may stem from the lack of documented project management practices, as explored below.

In 2013, E911 stakeholders convened a committee to recommend options for how to address the potential unfunded expenditures. Although the committee did not finalize any recommendations, it did brainstorm some options. Our consultant’s analysis of the quantifiable and feasible options found that reducing PSAP support costs has the greatest potential to reduce the projected deficit, but the magnitude of the needed reductions is dependent on developing a better estimate of the costs of implementing NG 911. For detailed information on the analysis of options to reduce the deficit, please see Appendix 1.

Recommendation 2

The Enhanced 911 Program Office should collaborate with stakeholders to agree on a financial baseline of required spending and estimated revenues. It should implement a systematic and documented process to regularly update the baseline as elements change, and communicate updates with stakeholders.
I. Program Faces Financial and Planning Challenges

Lack of a plan hinders implementation of Next Generation 911

The King County E911 Program Office initiated implementation of NG 911 without a clear and detailed plan. While King County has been at the forefront of NG 911 technology with its participation in national and state level work groups, it faces both financial and technical challenges to effectively implement NG 911. These challenges, in part, are the result of the lack of a clear and detailed NG 911 implementation plan. Because many of the details and requirements surrounding NG 911 are still being determined at the state and federal level, King County could suspend efforts to implement NG 911 without negative effect until it has developed an implementation plan that includes timelines, accountability, a collaborative requirements-gathering process, and a financial plan.

Planning is an essential step for implementing complex projects

The implementation of NG 911 is a complex multi-year process that will impact both the E911 Program Office and the 12 PSAPs. While increasing the capabilities of the 911 system, NG 911 is also expected to increase overall costs. Lack of planning and coordination was one of the primary issues that some PSAPs raised regarding their relationship with the E911 Program Office. They also questioned the utility of some of the projects that the E911 Program Office implemented. These issues could be mitigated through effective planning.

The importance of adequate planning is magnified because of the complex nature of implementing NG 911, which involves more than a dozen different stakeholders and a system that is essential for public safety. The Project Management Body of Knowledge, or PMBOK, defines the planning process as “those processes performed to establish the total scope of the effort, define and refine objectives, and develop the course of action required to attain those objectives.” These processes are important because they clearly define and outline what the project is trying to achieve, define and sequence activities necessary to achieve project objectives, estimate the resources necessary to complete project, define the project schedule, and identify risks and risk mitigation strategies.

Temporarily suspending implementation will not undermine King County’s

King County should suspend implementation of NG 911 until it creates a clear and detailed NG 911 implementation plan. The details and requirements of NG 911 are still being determined at both the state and federal level. Therefore, slowing down implementation will not have negative consequences. Instead, delaying implementation will allow the vendors that King County’s system relies on for 911 services and equipment

---

*PMBOK Fifth Edition. The PMBOK is a widely acknowledged and internationally recognized standard that details the application of knowledge, skills, tools, and techniques to meet project requirements.*
1. Program Faces Financial and Planning Challenges

to modernize and update their services and products to meet the emerging standards. For example, security has been a key challenge King County has faced in upgrading its 911 system. Many of the vendors of 911 services and equipment have not yet adequately addressed the security concerns raised by both the E911 Program Office and the PSAPs. Temporarily suspending NG 911 implementation efforts could give these vendors time to address security concerns.

**Two efforts are nearly complete or required and should therefore continue.** Two efforts currently underway, interim text-to-911 and compliance with Priority One Washington State mandatory security requirements should continue because they are either nearly complete or are required to receive state funding.

**Recommendation 3**
The Enhanced 911 Program Office should suspend projects intended to support or implement Next Generation 911 until it has created a Next Generation 911 implementation plan and vetted this plan with stakeholders.
2. KCIT Oversight of E911 Technology Projects

Section Summary

Submitting E911 technology projects to King County Information Technology’s Project Review Board could mitigate challenges with planning and implementation. The Project Review Board (PRB) oversees all of the technology projects in King County. For agencies, the benefits of submitting projects to PRB include project management and technical assistance. However, the E911 Program Office has not submitted many of its recent technology projects to the PRB for review, so these projects have not received the benefits of the PRB process.

PRB is a part of the King County Department of Information Technology (KCIT) that oversees all technology projects at King County agencies. As part of this oversight process, agencies must prepare and submit a number of documents that help with project management, including:

- **Project Plans** that identify the scope, schedule, and budget
- **Business Cases** that justify the need for the project
- **Cost/Benefit Analyses** that weigh the strengths and weaknesses of different alternatives
- **Benefit Realization Reports** that compare the value of the project after a year to its expected value.

The PRB process also provides technical assistance by connecting agencies to technology experts at KCIT that can provide guidance on network and security issues.

**The E911 Program Office has not submitted many of its recent technology projects to the PRB for review.** In the past, the E911 Program Office submitted some of its technology projects to the PRB for review, but more recent projects related to the implementation of NG 911 have not gone through this process. Normally a technology project requires PRB approval to receive funding during the budget process, but projects implementing NG 911 already have a dedicated funding source. However, KCIT managers state that even separately funded projects should still go through the PRB process.

**The PRB process could have saved the E911 Program Office and the PSAPs time, effort, and resources.** Since recent technology projects did not go through the PRB process, these projects do not have the plans, business cases, or analyses that are helpful for effective project management. Similarly, the E911 Program Office has not benefited from oversight by the
2. KCIT Oversight of E911 Technology Projects

network security experts at KCIT. For example, a recent project attempted to pair large PSAPs together so that there would be a backup in case of a system failure. However, shortly before this new system was set to go live, security defects were identified and the project was halted.

**Recommendation 4**

The Enhanced 911 Program Office should follow King County Information Technology policies, including the use of the Project Review Board process for all technology-related projects.
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Analysis of Financial Scenarios To Alleviate Projected Deficit

Although several of the scenarios brainstormed by a committee of PSAP representatives (called the Recommendations Committee) could make significant reductions in the projected E911 funding shortfall, only reducing PSAP revenue distribution could completely eliminate it. To evaluate the scenarios the Recommendations Committee brainstormed to reduce 911 system costs, we performed the following steps.

1. **Identified the total projected deficit.** Our financial consultant normalized the current financial path to avoid artificially inflating projected expenditures by the unusually high 2015 spending on 911 system costs, Intergovernmental Services, and Communication Equipment Replacement ($14.8 million higher than the average of 2014 actual and 2016 projected amounts). The normalized current path results in a total ending fund balance deficit of $35.5 million in 2022. Keeping projected reserves of $5.1 million intact, the target amount to eliminate the deficit is $40.6 million.

2. **Evaluated the quantifiable and feasible scenarios to determine which could alleviate this deficit.** We assessed the 13 financial scenarios the Recommendations Committee identified as appropriate to consider further, and eliminated the ones where we could not quantify the impact (Countywide Logging Recorder, Countywide CAD System, and PSAP Consolidation). We also eliminated those that were not likely to be possible to implement (Enact 1/10 of 1% Tax, Raise 911 excise taxes, Virtual PSAPs). We asked our financial consultant to analyze the remaining scenarios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>Reduce PSAP revenue distribution (0%, 25%, 50%, and 75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eliminate funding for technical FTEs at PSAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Eliminate PSAP equipment funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Further reserve account modification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A Recommendation Committee of policy makers representing the jurisdictions of each PSAP in the county convened to make financial and policy recommendations to King County regarding future options for the E-911 Program. The committee met from fall 2013 through fall 2014 but did not produce formal or final recommendations.
* Although our consultant based his analysis on forecasted revenues and expenses based on historical actuals (which would not account for any acceleration in spending related to NG 911), the E911 Program Office projection for ending fund balance in 2022 is very close to the forecasted: -$40.2 million projected versus -$40.6 million forecasted.
* The King County E-911 & PSAP Planning Interim Recommendations Report Draft – v 10/7/14 describes the Virtual PSAPs option as “all call receivers working from remote locations, no centralized PSAP work locations.”
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Analysis of Financial Scenarios To Alleviate Projected Deficit (continued)

3. **Determined which scenario can alleviate the projected funding deficit in 2022.** Our consultant analyzed the above scenarios by projecting a straight line trend based on historical actuals. This projection does not account for any additional costs related to NG 911. More targeted analysis depends on a clear and accurate implementation plan for NG 911. Based on historical projections, our consultant reported the following conclusion: reducing PSAP support revenue distribution is the only single option that can eliminate the $35.5 million deficit while preserving about $5 million of reserves. Eliminating or reducing funding for subcategories of PSAP support (on-location PSAP technical staff and PSAP equipment funding) could provide significant savings, but neither could generate enough savings individually to provide the $40.6 million needed to sustain the E911 program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Scenario (implement 2016)</th>
<th>Savings in 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-11</td>
<td>Reduce PSAP revenue distribution</td>
<td>Total PSAP funding of $107.7 million would need to be reduced by 38% to $67 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Eliminate funding for technical FTEs at PSAPs</td>
<td>Up to $27.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Eliminate PSAP equipment funding</td>
<td>$27.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Further reserve account modification</td>
<td>Projected reserves in 2022 are $5.2 million, which provides little relief from the funding shortfall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table above, reducing PSAP revenue distribution is the only single option that can alleviate the projected deficit. However, the calculated reduction in PSAP support payments illustrated above is a hypothetical number based on the consultant’s projection methodology. It is not intended to be a recommendation. Decision-makers may wish to combine the above options (or others not included in this analysis) to identify a feasible solution.
Appendix 2

Mission Critical Partners Executive Summary and Recommendations

Under contract with the King County Auditor’s Office, Mission Critical Partners (MCP) conducted a technical evaluation of King County’s implementation of Next Generation 911 and summarized their findings in a report. The executive summary and recommendations from that report are included in this appendix and their full report is on the King County Auditor’s Office website. MCP’s findings and recommendations closely correspond and were used as evidence to support the findings included in this report.
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Mission Critical Partners Executive Summary and Recommendations (continued)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mission Critical Partners, Inc. (MCP) is pleased to present the results of the King County, Washington, Next Generation 9-1-1 (NG9-1-1) Technical Review. The primary goal is to provide King County (County) with observations and recommendations based on national standards that can be used to develop a solid and sustainable NG9-1-1 strategic plan going forward. The County also has engaged an outside firm to review historical financial information for the King County E9-1-1 Program Office (PO) and determine to what extent the program faces a budget shortfall over the next seven years.

MCP was tasked with reviewing the PO initiatives as they relate to the transition and implementation of NG9-1-1, and how those initiatives align with national standards and best practices. A key element of a program analysis is to assess the current strategy and planning processes that are being used to drive implementation decisions. Currently the PO does not have a formal strategic plan or NG9-1-1 project plan available for review.

King County has been engaged at the forefront of NG9-1-1 technology since its participation in the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) NG9-1-1 Initiative Proof of Concept (POC) testing in 2008\(^1\). Since that time many agencies across the United States regard King County as a leader in the emergency communications industry. MCP acknowledges the willingness and dedication that the PO has demonstrated with regard to embracing new technologies and participating in national work groups that will assist the industry in improving our nation’s 9-1-1 system.

The eagerness by which the PO has embraced new technology however has overshadowed the importance of first developing a solid and sustainable project plan for NG9-1-1-related activities. The absence of project planning, timelines, accountability and a collaborative requirements-gathering process are the primary barriers King County faces to successfully implement NG9-1-1. The expected upcoming budget shortfall is indicative of these and other problems the County faces.

Engaging multiple projects and highly visible activity such as participation in NG9-1-1 development working groups and ongoing trials of new technology can appear to indicate substantial progress toward NG9-1-1. The flurry of ongoing activity however can mask a lack of formal processes, planning and due diligence. Such is the case with the King County PO. During the review of multiple documents it became evident that the PO has taken on numerous projects over the last several years, but many projects are incomplete and numerous projects have begun to overlap. The State E9-1-1 Office also is working with an outside firm to assess the security of its Emergency Services Internet Protocol (IP) network (ESInet), which was deployed to all public safety answering points (PSAPs) in the state in 2010 and 2012. These security issues, perceived by agencies to have been preventable, have been referenced as one of the reasons that many agencies are hesitant to embrace further technology implementations for NG9-1-1.

---
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Mission Critical Partners Executive Summary and Recommendations (continued)

MCP interviewed multiple representatives from County agencies and PSAPs to ascertain their views on NG9-1-1 and the progress toward implementation. Many of those interviewed expressed concern with what they view as a piecemeal approach to NG9-1-1 and technology-related projects. They also expressed concern with the level of technical and project management expertise possessed by the PO staff. Insufficient staffing of the PO also was described as a concern.

During the interviews it became apparent that there is significant discord between the PO and its member agencies, and between the agencies themselves. The discord has reached a point where it is directly interfering with the ability of the County to make progress regarding the transition to NG9-1-1. It is MCP’s observation that unless resolved, this dysfunction will continue to hamper efforts to improve constituent service levels and will delay implementation of important transition elements such as interim text-to-9-1-1 service. Interim text-to-9-1-1 service currently has much higher visibility with the public than the transition to other components of NG9-1-1. It is in the best interest of King County to address the concern with this issue and develop an implementation strategy with stakeholder buy-in as soon as possible.

Based on our findings, MCP recommends:

1. **King County should temporarily stop the forward momentum of NG9-1-1 and reassess/reprioritize the projects in progress to assure viability and appropriate return on investment.** Given that the State plans to soon issue a Request for Proposal (RFP) for a new ESInet and likely will extend the timeframe for NENA I3 functionality until the 2019-2020 timeframe, King County should not feel pressured to continue moving forward with new NG9-1-1 projects until a strategic plan is in place and supported by relevant stakeholders.

2. **Efforts to improve communications between the PO and the PSAP community should continue to foster cooperation, and ensure accountability and progress.** King County may wish to employ neutral third-parties to help advance stakeholders’ interests and lead to mutually beneficial solutions.

3. **The PO should continue to prioritize resolution to the identified security vulnerabilities within the ESInet.** Collaboration with County IT resources is recommended to assure that pending resolution is aligned with County regulations.

4. **The PO, working with its partners, should continue to implement interim text-to-9-1-1 service.** This service will likely become an expectation of King County’s residents when other counties in the State announce their plans to implement this NG9-1-1 transition technology in 2015. The PO should identify a target implementation date and plan that is acceptable to its stakeholders. Allowing the issue to remain stalled at the PSAP Committee level is not in the best interest of stakeholder agencies or the public.
5. The PO, working with its partners, should establish a formal structure for collaboration and decision-making into planning and policy for NG9-1-1 services in the County. The proposed Regional PSAP Oversight Committee appears to be a step toward establishing this structure. The Committee should collaborate with the PO, regional PSAP directors and public safety agencies to assure that the pending strategic plan for NG9-1-1 has the appropriate level of stakeholder support. The PO should undertake the following action items as part of the planning process:

   a. Develop a stakeholder planning-and-implementation coordinating body. This group would develop a needs assessment, determine the operational and system requirements, and identify the baseline functionality necessary for any proposed NG9-1-1 solution.

   b. Develop a transition plan to ensure the successful transition from the current 9-1-1 system to the new system and the management and operation of the system for optimal health and security. Transition-planning agreements also should be established. Agreements should address timelines, a statement of expectations, anticipated functionality, coordination of contingencies, and any cost considerations throughout the various levels of transition. PSAP agreements should be updated so that agency management will clearly understand their responsibilities and the responsibility of the PO. Service requirements and performance standards for all NG9-1-1 functional areas should be part of a comprehensive NG9-1-1 Plan. Functional areas should include standards related to GIS, call-handling procedures, policy-based routing rules, ESINet design, data sharing, security and privacy.

   c. Develop performance metrics, to determine the effectiveness of the NG9-1-1 system and identify any modifications needed to meet the desired performance criteria. Requirements for the necessary management information system (MIS) should then be drafted to assure that reporting is available to track system performance. These metrics should include system testing processes and system acceptance thresholds.

   d. Initiate an ongoing review of the ALI, MSAG and GIS synchronization status to assure that the NENA required 98 percent match rate is maintained.

   e. Establish consensus on technical support, standards and procedures that will be used to assure the minimum level of system security.
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Miller & Miller Executive Summary

Miller and Miller CPA conducted a financial evaluation of the E911 Program Office under contract with the King County Auditor’s Office and summarized their findings in a final summary working paper, which is on the King County Auditor’s Office website. Overall, they found that while the E911 Program Office had provided somewhat confusing and contrary financial information to its partners in the summer of 2014, the overall financial information reported more recently is reasonable and closely corresponds audited countywide financial reports.

Historical Financial Results

Miller and Miller found that the financial information reported by the E911 Program Office for the period from 2005 to 2014 closely matches the information reported in King County’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), which is audited by the Washington State Auditor’s Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Beginning Fund Balance</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$9,941,647</td>
<td>$12,776,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$12,776,003</td>
<td>$14,650,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$14,650,615</td>
<td>$16,673,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$16,673,202</td>
<td>$18,653,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$18,653,051</td>
<td>$18,178,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$18,178,206</td>
<td>$16,353,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$16,353,040</td>
<td>$15,189,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$15,189,400</td>
<td>$20,055,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$20,055,001</td>
<td>$24,333,733</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table provides a breakdown of revenues and expenditures for each fiscal year:

### Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$6,873,434</td>
<td>$6,781,758</td>
<td>$6,251,586</td>
<td>$376,118</td>
<td>$280,428</td>
<td>$13,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$7,411,820</td>
<td>$8,654,330</td>
<td>$9,251,750</td>
<td>$371,718</td>
<td>$840</td>
<td>$840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>$9,251,750</td>
<td>$10,035,322</td>
<td>$10,171,815</td>
<td>$379,318</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$1,567,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$11,256,615</td>
<td>$10,868,650</td>
<td>$10,273,340</td>
<td>$160,121</td>
<td>$6,706</td>
<td>$2,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$13,643,615</td>
<td>$12,776,003</td>
<td>$11,773,444</td>
<td>$101,289</td>
<td>$43,556</td>
<td>$79,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$15,382,400</td>
<td>$13,873,615</td>
<td>$14,650,615</td>
<td>$22,977,893</td>
<td>$23,432,141</td>
<td>$24,339,687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Wages, Benefits &amp; Retirement</th>
<th>Supplies</th>
<th>Direct Services</th>
<th>911 System Costs</th>
<th>PSAP Support</th>
<th>911 System Maintenance</th>
<th>Intergovernmental Services</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Comm Equip Replacement</th>
<th>Total Expenditures</th>
<th>Excess (Deficiency) of Revenues over Expenditures</th>
<th>Other Fund Transactions</th>
<th>Ending Fund Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>$(475,397)</td>
<td>$(10,248)</td>
<td>$(335,192)</td>
<td>$(6,319,615)</td>
<td>$(2,899,527)</td>
<td>$(859,490)</td>
<td>$(576,556)</td>
<td>$(905,418)</td>
<td>$(2,892,323)</td>
<td>$(12,381,443)</td>
<td>$(14,650,615)</td>
<td>$(2,390)</td>
<td>$(12,776,003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$(800,089)</td>
<td>$(61,715)</td>
<td>$(267,304)</td>
<td>$(3,497,840)</td>
<td>$(10,836,146)</td>
<td>$(1,293,793)</td>
<td>$(570,020)</td>
<td>$(373,033)</td>
<td>$(897,529)</td>
<td>$(840)</td>
<td>$(20,055,001)</td>
<td>$(371,718)</td>
<td>$(20,055,001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$(1,033,846)</td>
<td>$(88,507)</td>
<td>$(1,033,846)</td>
<td>$(4,967,650)</td>
<td>$(11,584,125)</td>
<td>$(1,293,793)</td>
<td>$(618,828)</td>
<td>$(373,033)</td>
<td>$(88,507)</td>
<td>$(840)</td>
<td>$(27,048,783)</td>
<td>$(371,718)</td>
<td>$(27,048,783)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Miller & Miller Executive Summary (continued)

Revenues and Expenditures Are Increasing
As shown in the table above, total revenues have consistently increased since 2011, when the Washington State Legislature increased the excise taxes on switched access lines (land lines), wireless access lines (cell phones), and Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP). The share of revenue from each of these sources has changed over time, as usage of land lines has declined while cell phone usage has increased.

While revenues have increased, expenditures have also increased, but at a lower rate, causing the program’s fund balance to grow over this period, from almost $13 million in 2005 to more than $27 million in 2014.
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King County

Dow Constantine
King County Executive
401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 800
Seattle, WA 98104-1818
206-263-9600 Fax 206-296-0194
TTY Relay: 711
www.kingcounty.gov

June 18, 2015

Kymber Waltmunson
King County Auditor
Room 1033
COURTHOUSE

Dear Ms. Waltmunson:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide a response to the “King County 911 System: Governance Structure and Plan Needed to Move Forward” report. I, along with the Department of Executive Services (DES) and the E911 Program Office, appreciate your review and recommendations.

As noted in your report, the E911 Program Office recognized in 2011 that the current financial plan was not sustainable in the future Next Generation 911 (NG911) environment. In coordination with my office and DES, the E911 Program Office initiated a process with the Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) to assess the current system and make recommendations for a future NG911 system that would be financially sustainable and continue to provide effective 911 service to the public. Prior to this process, the E911 Program Office and the PSAPs had a long history of cooperatively working together to coordinate this important life-safety service. As indicated in your report, although the sharing of 911 revenue with the PSAPs is the lowest priority expense in the current policies, in 2014 PSAP support accounted for over half of E911 expenditures, demonstrating the commitment to partnering with the PSAPs due to their critical role of answering the 911 calls.

We recognize the importance of establishing a new governance structure for the E911 Program, and have outlined governance as an important component of the work plan for the new Regional PSAP Oversight Committee. This committee will recommend a strategic plan for the implementation, governance, and operation of the NG911 system in King County.
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The Auditor’s Office financial consultant verified that the historical financial data reported by the E911 Program Office in the last ten years is accurate. We concur that agreement on a financial baseline and a process to update the baseline is a critical step in the Regional PSAP Oversight Committee’s work plan. The E911 Program Office’s 2015/2016 biennial budget included the addition of a Finance Manager FTE, and the hiring process for this position is in progress. The Finance Manager will be in place prior to the initiation of the committee’s meetings, so he/she will be available to assist in providing financial information to the committee and stakeholders.

Knowing that NG911 was imminent in the future, the E911 Program Office has implemented projects over the past ten years to prepare the E911 System infrastructure for this new technology. As NG911 is becoming more fully developed and it will soon be feasible to implement NG911 technology and services, we agree that the development of an NG911 implementation plan in coordination with the PSAPs and other stakeholders is necessary. The Regional PSAP Oversight Committee will develop and recommend a sustainable 10-year strategic plan for the NG911 implementation in King County.

In addition, the E911 Program Office’s 2015/2016 biennial budget included the addition of a Project Manager FTE, and the hiring process for this position is in progress. The Project Manager will be in place and available to manage the implementation of the projects identified in the NG911 implementation plan. The E911 Program Office’s 2015/2016 biennial budget also included the addition of a Systems Engineer and a PSAP Equipment Administrator to assist in the implementation and ongoing operation and maintenance of the upgraded E911 System. The addition of these FTEs will ensure that the Program Office has sufficient staff resources to support the system and the PSAPs.

The E911 Program Office has followed King County Information Technology policies, including the use of the Project Review Board process as outlined in those policies, for E911 technology projects. We agree that it is important for this practice to continue. The Program Office will work with the King County IT Governance Manager to examine the policies and develop a plan for the review of appropriate E911 technology projects.

I am committed to ensuring that our E911 System continues to provide the best 911 service possible to the people of King County as we continue to progress into the NG911 environment.
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Thank you for your review of the King County 911 System and for your recommendations. If you have questions regarding this report, please call Caroline Whalen, County Administrative Officer, Department of Executive Services, at 206-263-9750.

Sincerely,

Dow Constantine
King County Executive

Enclosure

cc: Fred Jarrett, Deputy County Executive, King County Executive Office (KCEO)
Rhonda Berry, Chief of Operations, KCEO
Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives, KCEO
Caroline Whalen, County Administrative Officer, Department of Executive Services (DES)
Walt Hubbard, Director, Office of Emergency Management, DES
Marlys Davis, E911 Program Manager, E-911 Program Office, DES
## Executive Response (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor Recommendation</th>
<th>Agency Position</th>
<th>Schedule for Implementation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #1</td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td>The Regional PSAP Oversight Committee is expected to complete their recommended Strategic Plan, which includes governance, by February 29, 2016. The Executive estimates that the new governance structure will be implemented by July 31, 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The County Executive should create a governance mechanism that builds on the County Council-directed strategic planning group. This group should balance King County’s statutory responsibilities under Washington State law, with providing a formal, clear, and transparent mechanism for the Public Safety Answering Points and other regional partners to participate in the decision-making process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation #2</td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td>Based on the estimate that the new governance structure will be implemented by July 31, 2016, the Executive estimates that a financial baseline and a process to update the baseline will be established by December 31, 2016.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Enhanced 911 Program Office should collaborate with stakeholders to agree on a financial baseline of required spending and estimated revenues. It should implement a systematic and documented process to regularly update the baseline as elements change, and communicate updates with stakeholders.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Executive Response (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auditor Recommendation</th>
<th>Agency Position</th>
<th>Schedule for Implementation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #3</strong></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td>The Enhanced 911 Program Office has already suspended Next Generation 911 projects and will continue to do so until an implementation plan has been developed and approved through the new governance structure referenced in Recommendation #1 above, with the exception of continuing the implementation of interim text-to-911 and compliance with Priority One Washington State mandatory security requirements as recommended by the Auditor’s Office.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation #4</strong></td>
<td>Concur</td>
<td>The Enhanced 911 Program Office will continue to follow Information Technology policies, including the use of the Project Review Board (PRB) process, for all new technology-related projects. The E911 Program Office will also actively seek guidance from KCIT staff to ensure that all PRB policies and procedures are consistently applied.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to interim text-to-911 and State security requirements, the Enhanced 911 Program Office will also continue:

- Implementation of Smart911, which has been implemented in 7 of the PSAPs for over 2 years, and the remaining PSAPs will be completed later this year. In addition, Seattle is planning to launch their campaign to encourage people to sign up beginning August 4, 2015.
- Implementation of an Enhanced 911 System security solution to ensure that King County’s portion of the statewide system meets national security standards to reduce vulnerabilities.
Statement of Compliance, Scope, Objective & Methodology

Statement of Compliance with Government Auditing Standards
We conducted this performance audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Audit Scope and Objectives
In its 2015-2016 biennial budget, the King County Council directed the King County Auditor’s Office to conduct a review of King County’s Enhanced 911 (E911) program. Specifically, it directed us to conduct:

A. A financial review of the King County E911 program, its reserves and financial policies, including an evaluation of the county's systems compared to national best practices.

B. A technical audit of King County's implementation of Next Generation 911 policies, standards, technology, and implementation timelines, including evaluation of King County's program compared to state requirements and actions and national best practices.

Methodology
To conduct this review, we hired experienced financial and technical consultants to provide subject matter expertise and address the scope items above. In addition, we interviewed management and key staff from the King County Office of Emergency Management, the E911 Program Office, the Departments of Executive Services and Information Technology, and the Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget.

We conducted site visits to Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) of varying sizes and types, including Valley Communications Center, the North East King County Regional Public Safety Communication Agency (NORCOM), University of Washington, and Seattle Police Department. We also interviewed key staff from the Redmond, Issaquah, and King County Sheriff’s Office PSAPs.

We reviewed documents produced by the E911 Program Office, groups of stakeholders, and discussed the content with both PSAPs and E911 managers. We also reviewed national literature about 911 and Next Generation 911 and relevant local, state, and federal legislation to understand the parameters and context the King County E911 system operates in.
We assessed the E911 Program Office’s information technology project management processes by reviewing available documentation and interviewing managers and key staff in both the E911 Program Office and the King County Department of Information Technology.

**Scope of Work on Internal Controls**
We assessed internal controls relevant to the audit objectives. This included review of selected policies, plans, processes, and reports. In performing our audit work, we identified concerns related to the accuracy of some historical documentation, and did not rely upon these documents in shaping our analysis. Our financial consultant tested the reliability of financial data provided by the E911 Program Office using a variety of techniques relevant to the type of data, its source, and our potential purposes. We determined that the historical financial data presented in the report were reliable, and the financial plan figures were reliable for our purposes.
List of Recommendations & Implementation Schedule

**Recommendation 1:** The County Executive should create a governance mechanism that builds on the County Council-directed strategic planning group. This group should balance King County’s statutory responsibilities under Washington state law, with providing a formal, clear, and transparent mechanism for the Public Safety Answering Points and other regional partners to participate in the decision-making process.

**Implementation Date:** July 31, 2016

**Estimate of Impact:** A functioning governance system will facilitate identification and review of the options that the E911 program has to address its impending financial shortfall. It will provide a venue that stakeholders can use to evaluate potential options and agree on a course of action.

**Recommendation 2:** The Enhanced 911 Program Office should collaborate with stakeholders to agree on a financial baseline of required spending and estimated revenues. It should implement a systematic and documented process to regularly update the baseline as elements change, and communicate updates with stakeholders.

**Implementation Date:** December 31, 2016

**Estimate of Impact:** A baseline of required spending and estimated revenues is a necessary first step in determining feasible options to address the expected financial shortfall. It will allow stakeholders to understand the magnitude of the shortfall and how much flexibility they have in addressing this shortfall.

**Recommendation 3:** The Enhanced 911 Program Office should suspend projects intended to support or implement Next Generation 911 until it has created a Next Generation 911 implementation plan and vetted this plan with stakeholders.

**Implementation Date:** Ongoing

**Estimate of Impact:** Suspending implementation of Next Generation 911 will allow the E911 Program Office and other stakeholders to focus on developing and reviewing an implementation plan. Creation of this plan will facilitate coordination among stakeholders and potentially identify more efficient and effective means to implement Next Generation 911.
**Recommendation 4:** The Enhanced 911 Program Office should follow King County Information Technology policies, including the use of the Project Review Board process for all technology-related projects.

**Implementation Date:** Ongoing

**Estimate of Impact:** King County has dedicated time and other resources toward improving and maturing its management of IT projects. By using the Project Review Board processes, the E911 Program Office will be able to take advantage of this work and of other King County resources like information technology (IT) security and enterprise architecture. These steps could improve the planning and implementation of E911 IT projects and facilitate the transition to Next Generation 911.
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Ordinance

Proposed No. 2015-0255.1  Sponsors Hague

AN ORDINANCE establishing the King County regional
public safety answering point oversight committee, as
directed by Ordinance 17941, Section 24, Proviso P1.

STATEMENT OF FACTS:

1. In November 2014, the council adopted the 2015/2016 King County
Biennial Budget Ordinance, Ordinance 17941, subject to the provisions set
forth in the ordinance.

2. Ordinance 17941, Section 24, includes a proviso P1 that requires the
executive to transmit an ordinance by July 1, 2015, establishing a King
County regional public safety answering point oversight committee.

3. The executive has transmitted a work plan as set forth as Attachment A
to this ordinance that describes the purpose, processes and role of the
committee relative to recommending a strategic plan for the
implementation, governance and operation of the Next Generation 911
system in King County, to include proposed governance structures,
operating rules and infrastructure for the countywide Enhanced 911
operations.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:
SECTION 1. A. The King County regional public safety answering point oversight committee is hereby established.

B. The committee's purpose, processes and role relative to recommending a strategic plan for the implementation, governance and operation of the Next Generation 911 system in King County, to include proposed governance structures, operating rules and infrastructure for countywide Enhanced 911 operations, is described in Attachment A to this ordinance. The committee expires upon completion of the work plan set forth in Attachment A to this ordinance.

C. The committee shall consist of:

1. The chair of the council;

2. The vice chair of regional coordination of the council;

3. The chair of the law, justice and emergency management committee of the council;

4. The executive or the executive's designee;

5. A city of Seattle elected official, appointed by the mayor;

6. Three elected officials from other jurisdictions, appointed by the county council;

7. A representative of the Sound Cities Association;

8. A representative of a public safety agency, which is police, fire or emergency
38 medical services, appointed by the county council; and
39 9. A nonvoting technical and facilitation consultant, selected by the executive.
40

KING COUNTY COUNCIL
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON

ATTEST:

Larry Phillips, Chair

Anne Noris, Clerk of the Council

APPROVED this _____ day of ____________, _____

Dow Constantine, County Executive

Attachments: A. Department of Executive Services Public Safety Answering Point Oversight Committee Work Plan
Department of Executive Services
Public Safety Answering Point Oversight Committee Work Plan

A regional oversight committee charged with recommending a strategic plan for the implementation, governance and operation of the Next Generation 911 system in King County, to include proposed governance structures, operating rules and infrastructure for countywide Enhanced 911 operations.

June 30, 2015

Prepared for:
King County Council

Prepared by:
Department of Executive Services
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Introduction

Ordinance 17941, which adopted the 2015/2016 King County Biennial Budget included proviso (P1) that states:

Of this appropriation, $500,000 shall not be expended or encumbered until the executive transmits an ordinance establishing the King County regional public safety answering point oversight committee and the ordinance is adopted by the council. The ordinance shall reference the subject matter, the proviso's ordinance, ordinance section and proviso number in both the title and body of the motion [sic].

The ordinance shall include, but not be limited to:

A. A description of the purpose, processes and role of the committee relative to recommending a strategic plan for the implementation, governance and operation of the Next Generation 911 system in King County, to include proposed governance structures, operating rules and infrastructure for countywide Enhanced 911 operations; and

B. Committee membership including the chair of the council, the vice chair of regional coordination of the council or the vice chair's successor, the chair of the law, justice, health and human services committee, or the committees successor, the executive or his designee, a city of Seattle elected official appointed by the mayor, three elected officials from other jurisdictions to be appointed by the council, a representative of the Sound Cities Association, a representative of a public safety agency, which is police, fire or emergency medical services, to be appointed by the council and a nonvoting technical and facilitation consultant selected by the executive.

The department of executive services and the office of performance, strategy and budget shall provide any necessary support to develop the ordinance required by this proviso.

The executive must file the ordinance required by this proviso by July 1, 2015, 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, the council chief of staff, the policy staff director and the lead staff for the committee of the whole, or its successor.

This work plan addresses the requirements of Proviso 1 from Section 24 of Ordinance 17941.
Scope of Work

This section outlines the scope of work, including the objectives, oversight committee membership, responsibilities of the facilitator/mediator, and key assumptions supporting the scope and budget.

Objectives of the King County Regional Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Oversight Committee

The primary objective of the committee is to recommend to the King County Executive and Council a strategic plan for the implementation, governance and operation of the Next Generation 911 (NG911) system in King County. This work will specifically include proposed governance structures, operating rules and infrastructure for countywide Enhanced 911 (E911) operations. In addition to the full committee meetings, several sub committees may be formed to complete the work on this project.

The committee will undertake the following tasks:

1. **Receive background information on E-911; PSAPs; the local, state and national status of NG-911; an overview of the work from the previous phases of the PSAP planning process; and the financial review and technical audit conducted by the King County Auditor’s Office.**

   **Committee work:** The committee will receive the following orientation:

   - The 2015/2016 budget proposal;
   - The role of PSAPs in public safety;
   - The national vision for NG911;
   - State implementation of NG911;
   - The current state of NG911 in the County;
     - The major technical and operational components of NG911;
     - Changes and issues arising from the implementation of NG911;
   - Current organizational structures of King County and statewide E911 provision;
   - Governance structure options;
   - The body of work developed from previous efforts in the past four years to contribute to a common base of understanding of the current E911 structure, funding and operations within King County;
   - An overview of the work of the recommendation committee established for the planning process in 2014; and
   - The most recent work by the King County Auditor’s Office, which included a financial review and a technical audit of E911.

2. **Recommend components of a sustainable 10-year strategic plan for the E911 system and NG911 implementation in King County:**

   King County E911 Program funding and operations have been heavily effected by changing technology (e.g. the now-pervasive use of cellular phones and SMS messaging), and the different ways the public interacts with 911. To address these changes, the E911 Program Office and PSAPs have worked together to implement NG911 technology over the last decade. The Automatic Location Identification (ALI) Database, PSAP Mapping System, backroom E 911 equipment at the PSAPs, and the ALI displays at the...
PSAP call answering positions have been upgraded for NG911. The transition to a statewide NG911 network was completed in 2011. The chart below shows NG911 projects that have been completed or are in-progress.

![Timeline of Next Generation 911 Projects](chart.png)

Efforts will continue to ensure that King County’s system is capable of receiving 911 calls and data once NG911 service is commercially available. It is anticipated that the additional data and data distribution resulting from NG911 upgrades will increase system costs and staffing needs at PSAPs. For example, text and data have different staffing requirements than voice calls, and this situation creates challenges for all PSAPs to handle these new demands. As a result, NG911 will be more expensive than E911 due to increased costs of new technology, additional services to the public and ongoing system operations.

The realities of NG911 costs, combined with the less-reliable 9111 funding from wireless and VoIP technology, necessitate a collective recommendation for a service-driven, sustainable 10-year strategic plan.

King County E911 is in agreement with the King County Auditor’s recommendation to temporarily suspend implementation of new NG911 technology until a detailed NG911 implementation plan is completed. King County E911 also agrees with the report recommendation to continue to implement those efforts that are nearly complete, interim text to 911 compliance with state mandatory security requirements, and SMART 911 and will work closely with PSAPs to implement these components.

**Committee work:** The plan will include recommendations on the following components:

- Vision and Mission Statement for King County E911;
- Guiding principles for the King County E911 system;
- Goals of the King County E911 system;
- Governance for the regional organizational structure;
- Organizational structure and rules for the regional system; and
Implementation steps: The committee will recommend steps needed to implement the strategic plan and a reasonable timeline and financially sustainable plan to achieve those steps. At a minimum, those steps will address the following issues:
- NG911 infrastructure needs and investments;
- Staffing and training needs and investments;
- Transitional issues;
- Recommended sustainable financial plan, built from a baseline budget; and
- Scope, schedule and budget for implementation steps.

3. Produce Recommended Strategic Plan

Committee work: Based on the recommendations per task #2 above, the committee will produce and submit to the Executive and Council a recommended strategic plan for the implementation, governance and operation of the E911 system in King County, including implementation of NG911.
Responsibilities of Committee Members, Facilitator, Project Coordination Team and Project Manager

**Committee:** (Established by ordinance with membership approved by the King County Council); The Committee is responsible for recommending a strategic plan for the implementation, governance and operation of the Next Generation 911 (NG911) system in King County and proposed governance structures, operating rules and infrastructure for countywide Enhanced 911 (E911) operations.

**Facilitator:** (A non-voting committee member selected by the Executive); The Facilitator will have the overall responsibility for working with Committee members, laying the process foundation, building the framework for consensus and guiding the Committee towards producing a recommended strategic plan as directed by the proviso. The Project Manager will be responsible for managing the contract with the Facilitator.

**Project Team and Project Manager:** The Project Manager is primarily responsible for directing the work of the Facilitator, ensuring the Facilitator has support for a successful process and for leading the Project Team. The Project Manager will report to the Department of Executive Services. The Project Team is an internal King County staff team from the Executive and Council branches, formed to provide input and support to the Project Manager and Facilitator.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Project Team &amp; Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Lay the Process Foundation** | **Participate in Initial interviews with Facilitator and:**  
  - Express opinions, perspectives, and interests.  
  - Identify possible solutions that might be proposed during the meetings. | **Conduct initial interviews with Committee members and:**  
  - Understand their opinions, perspectives, and interests.  
  - Learn of possible solutions that they may propose during the meetings.  
  - Ensure members are comfortable with and supportive of the process. | **Assist with developing interview script to be used by facilitator** |
| **Establish by-laws**  | **Work with Project Manager to develop a detailed work plan, budget and schedule.** | **Project Manager - Work with facilitator to develop a detailed work plan, budget and schedule.** |                                                                                 |

Review draft materials  
Work with Project
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Project Team &amp; Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordination Team to define topics that will be a part of the committee process and those that will be addressed in the Strategic Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft and finalize the letter that invites the committee members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide a memo that summarizes general themes of the interviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Project Coordination Team to brief, review, provide input on, and organize a background notebook of information for committee members.</td>
<td>Provide materials for background notebook that will help guide the discussion in this process; Review this notebook with facilitator, and recommend additions and changes;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Project Coordination Team to create an overall schedule to achieve the objectives of the committee and establish specific agendas for committee meetings.</td>
<td>Project Manager: Establish agendas for Committee meetings; Prepare agendas for meetings with Project Coordination Team, in consultation with the facilitator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate with Project Coordination Team to review and comment on meeting materials and presentations.</td>
<td>Assist facilitator with creating meeting materials and presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Project Team &amp; Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attend seven Committee meetings between September and February. Meetings are anticipated to be three hours each.</td>
<td>Prepare for, convene, facilitate and follow up on committee meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attend additional meetings as needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Project Team &amp; Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate as needed with Facilitator between meetings.</td>
<td>Propose committee ground rules and procedures, and finalize those with members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build positive working relationships with committee members</td>
<td>Communicate as needed with committee members between meetings to build relationships, maintain their engagement and move the group toward objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule special committee meetings and subcommittee meetings, if any.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide all materials and logistic support for meetings.</td>
<td>Provide logistic support for all committee meetings — i.e. secure and schedule meeting locations, provide name tags and name tents, provide flip charts and easels, provide sign-in sheets, copying and distribution of materials related to the committee work — i.e. background notebooks, briefing materials and all hard copy materials.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide refreshments, as appropriate, and any necessary audio/visual aids.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft meeting notes that include next steps and action items, including deadlines and assignments, from each meeting.</td>
<td>Establish parameters of meeting notes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If meeting summaries are prepared for the Project Coordination Team meetings, they will be prepared by County staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Project Team &amp; Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordination Team will be responsive to requests for information and analysis from committee members and the public. Facilitator will work with the Committee and County staff to insure that volume and type of requests are reasonable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attend and support Project Coordination Team meetings with Facilitator.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Prepare meeting summaries of the key discussions, decisions and agreements, and distribute to members for comment and correction in a timely manner sufficient for members' review.  
  - Edit meeting summary, if needed, then re-distribute the finalized summary of the meeting with the draft agenda for the next session. |           |                                                                             |                                             |
| Propose and help committee evaluate potential recommendations. |           |                                                                             |                                             |
| Attend Project Coordination Team meetings with King County staff. |           |                                                                             | Attend and support Project Coordination Team meetings with Facilitator. |
| Coordinate with King County staff as necessary. |           |                                                                             |                                             |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Project Team &amp; Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft and finalize the Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and strive to reach consensus on a recommended 10-year Strategic Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and approve final report.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare a summary report that documents the process, information</td>
<td>Support preparation of a summary report that documents the process,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Project Team &amp; Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>provided to the Committee, Committee discussion summaries and the consensus recommended 10 year Strategic Plan, implementation steps and timeline.</td>
<td>information provided to the committee, committee discussion summaries and the consensus recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Circulate the draft report to all participants and stakeholders, and solicit comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Include dissenting comments, if any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In conjunction with Project Coordination Team, produce the final consensus report to be presented to the Committee for approval.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Project Coordination Team to prepare presentation materials and messaging pieces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate with the committee and Project Coordinator on how the recommendations should be presented to the King County Executive, King County Council and others as appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tasks, deliverables, milestones and budget

The table below outlines the tasks involved in supporting the Committee, and tentative deliverables milestones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepare &amp; Reach Agreement on</td>
<td>Final scope of work, budget and schedule</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>July 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Work and Schedule</td>
<td>Final invitation letter to committee members</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>July 30, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial communication with</td>
<td>Initial interviews w/committee members</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>August 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Members</td>
<td>Memo that summarizes members interests</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>August 28, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of key findings and mutual interests</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>August 28, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up Committee meetings and</td>
<td>Schedule meetings for Committee, and Project</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>August 3, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>framework</td>
<td>Coordination Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide all materials, logistic support for meetings</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare initial materials for</td>
<td>Create background notebook</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>August 17, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee</td>
<td>Review and shape background notebook</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>August 28, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Materials for</td>
<td>Work with Project Coordination Team to prepare and</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Meetings</td>
<td>establish committee meeting agendas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare meeting materials, presentations</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment on meeting agendas, materials and</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Build the Framework of Consensus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitate Committee Meetings</strong></td>
<td>Prepare for, facilitate and follow-up on committee meetings</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare ground rules</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>August 28, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare and distribute meeting summaries</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handle meeting logistics, materials preparation</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ongoing communication with committee members</strong></td>
<td>Build relationships with committee members</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate with members between meetings</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respond to requests for information</td>
<td>Project Coordination Team</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitate Subcommittee meetings (if needed)</strong></td>
<td>Facilitate and support sub-committees as needed</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication w/ Staff</strong></td>
<td>Project Coordination Team logistics</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attend Project Coordination Team</td>
<td>Facilitator, Project Manager, Project Coordination Team</td>
<td>2-4 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinate with County Staff as needed</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Finalize the Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prepare Final Recommended Strategic Plan</strong></td>
<td>Draft outline of draft recommended strategic plan</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>November 20, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Draft, support preparation of recommended strategic plan</td>
<td>Facilitator/Project Coordination Team</td>
<td>December 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare final recommended strategic plan</td>
<td>Facilitator/Project Coordination Team</td>
<td>February 1, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participate in Briefings and updates of Executive, Council and Other Stakeholders</strong></td>
<td>Prepare presentation materials summarizing committee work</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>February 29, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations to stakeholders as needed</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Facilitation Budget:** $125,000
Proposed Schedule

This proposed schedule is subject to change based on planning with facilitator once a contract is executed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Th</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Committee Meeting Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Overview, introductions, role, scope, schedule,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Discuss vision, mission, principles and goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Review and discuss governance structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Infrastructure needs and investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Finance plan, operating structure options and rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Draft recommended Plan distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Provide final recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Approve report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee meetings
Project Coordination Team meetings
Project Coordination Team; members and responsibilities

Project Coordination Team: This team’s role is to assist the facilitator with planning and preparation of materials and agendas for upcoming meetings and de briefs of past meetings. Plan to meet the Friday after each committee meeting and one or two weeks prior.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Group/Agency/Councilmember</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>(see previous tables)</td>
<td>Dept. of Executive Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Facilitator &amp; Project Support</td>
<td>Central Council Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lise Kaye</td>
<td>Senior Legislative Analyst</td>
<td>County Legislative Policy Liaison</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlys Davis</td>
<td>E-911 Manager</td>
<td>E-911 Program</td>
<td>E-911 Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subject Matter Expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Woodcock</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Emergency Management Policy Expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Koney</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Department-Level Policy Expertise</td>
<td>Dept. of Executive Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helene</td>
<td>Budget Manager</td>
<td>County-level Financial Policy Guidance</td>
<td>Performance, Strategy and Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellickson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dlame Carlson</td>
<td>Director Regional Initiatives</td>
<td>Executive Office Strategic Direction</td>
<td>Executive’s Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Committee Membership

Committee membership was specified in the P1 proviso. Two additional members are being recommended by the Executive. One position to allow for both a fire and police representative to serve on the Committee and a second position providing for an elected law enforcement official.

Members will be selected to provide a balanced representation of providers and customers of small and large PSAPs including consideration of geographic representation. Representatives will be identified through consultation with stakeholders and will be recruited by the Executive’s office. The final membership will be transmitted separately and confirmed by the King County Council through the passage of a companion motion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Representation</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designated by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Chair</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair Regional Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Law Safety Justice Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive or designee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Elected Official</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed by Seattle Mayor per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official other jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official other jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official other jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed by SCA per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police or Fire Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Recommended additional positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official Law Enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-voting Member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation Consultant</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Selected by Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DRAFT PROPOSAL

KING COUNTY E-911 PROGRAM OVERSIGHT ORDINANCE

Title: A SUBSTITUTE ORDINANCE establishing the King County Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Oversight Steering Committee (REPSC), pursuant to the purposes intended by Ordinance 17941, Section 24, Proviso P1 and the audits conducted pursuant thereto.

Purpose: Pursuant to audits authorized by Ordinance 17941, Section 24, Proviso P1; and upon a finding that it is necessary to assure the provision of quality, cost-effective 9-1-1 service and that it is vital to public safety to assure that new 911 technology is implemented in accordance with the recent audit findings as well as best practices and national standards; the King County Council hereby establishes the King County Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Oversight Steering Committee (REPSC) and adopts the following provisions and rules with respect thereto.

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF KING COUNTY:

SECTION 1. The King County Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Steering Committee (REPSC)

A. Establishment: Pursuant to the authority of RCW 39.34.030, 82.14B.030, 82.14B.040 and 82.14B.063, the County hereby adopts this Ordinance to provide for the establishment of the King County Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Steering Committee (REPSC). Further, King County Ordinance 4A.200.280 is hereby amended to add subsection (F) to provide that the manager of the Enhanced 911 Emergency Telephone System Fund shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the REPSC and that the REPSC shall have final decision-making authority over all distributions from the Enhanced 911 Emergency Telephone System Fund.

B. Mission and Purpose: The purpose of the REPSC will be for owning, operating, maintaining, managing and providing ongoing upgrading, maintenance and operation of the Enhanced 911 system previously operated by the King County E-911 Program Office until such time as the REPSC and King County are able to establish a Washington State non-profit corporation pursuant to Chapters 39.34 and 24.06 of the Revised Code of Washington to be known as the Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Oversight Board (RENOB) and the RENOB is ready to assume all powers, duties and obligations of the REPSC. This shall include but not be limited to developing a regional strategic plan for Next Generation 911.

C. Term: The work of the Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Steering Committee will cease with the establishment of and transition to a permanent Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Oversight Board (RENOB) by incorporation, memorandum, ordinance and/or any other such formal action as may be required.

D. Voting Membership: The Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Steering Committee is intended to involve all stakeholders in Emergency 9-1-1 communications and to insure that collaboration and partnership amongst all stakeholders takes place from inception to conclusion. Membership shall consist of the following appointees:
   1. The chair of the council;
   2. The vice chair of regional coordination of the council;
3. The chair of the law, justice and emergency management committee of the council;
4. The executive or the executive’s designee;
5. A city of Seattle official, appointed by the mayor;
6. Five elected officials from other King County jurisdictions, appointed by the county council;
7. A large PSAP representative selected from NORCOM and Valley Communications
8. A small PSAP representative selected from Redmond, Issaquah, Enumclaw, Bothell, Port of Seattle and the University of Washington
9. A representative of the Sound Cities Association;
10. A non-elected, sworn and certified representative of a King County law enforcement agency
11. A sworn and certified representative of a King County fire agency not otherwise represented by membership on the REPSC

E. **Term of Office:** All REPSC members shall serve as long as they hold their respective positions with the agency they represent, or until the agency they represent recommends replacement. A member may hold only one position on the REPSC at one time.

F. **Liaisons.** The following positions shall serve in a non-voting capacity as a resource for the REPSC
   1. Deputy Director; King County Emergency Management
   2. King County E-911 Program Manager
   3. Directors or their Designees from all King County PSAPs
   4. King County E-911 Program Finance Manager;
   5. KC Prosecutor or KC Council legal staff designee
   6. An elected King County Law Enforcement official
   7. A Deputy Director level representative from King County Information Technology
   8. Lise Kaye, E-911 Liaison to King County Council
   9. Such other liaisons as the REPSC may determine as needed for the REPSC to carry out its duties and responsibilities.

G. **Authority:** The REPSC shall have authority to retain such facilitators, experts or other professionals as necessary to advise and guide the REPSC in its deliberations and decisions. The REPC shall develop its own work plan and time-table as it determines for the completion of its work. The REPC shall have authority to review all current or future E-911 program office budgets, plans, technology, operations and/or initiatives and to obtain copies of any and all documents that it deems necessary to achieve its purpose.

H. **Funding:** Funding for the REPSC shall come from E-911 Program Office funds. The REPSC will develop and propose an annual operating budget within 90 days of enactment of this Ordinance.

I. **Powers of Voting Members:** The duties and powers of the REPSC shall be as specified herein and the REPSC shall make such rules and regulations as necessary to carry out the provisions of this Ordinance.

J. **Voting Rights and Responsibilities of Voting Members:**
   1. All members of the REPSC shall have full and equal voting rights and responsibilities on matters brought before the REPSC.
2. All members must vote on all matters brought before the REPSC unless excused for a specific stated conflict of interest by a majority vote of those members present.

3. The Deputy Director of King County Emergency Management shall serve as staff and act as Chairman until a Chairperson is elected from the membership at the first meeting of the REPSC. Thereafter, the Deputy Director of Emergency Management shall serve as a liaison between the REPSC and the King County E-911 Program Office.

4. A Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson shall be elected each year at the September meeting of the REPSC, or the first meeting held thereafter if no meeting is held in September. The King County Prosecuting Attorney or his designee shall preside over the election of officers. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman must be selected from voting members of the REPSC.

5. Any voting member of the REPSC is eligible to be nominated and serve as Chairperson or Vice Chairperson. Nominations do not require a second. Members nominated shall be voted on individually in reverse order, with the last nomination being voted on first. The positions of Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be filled by a majority vote of the REPSC.

6. The Committee shall not conduct business unless a quorum is present. A quorum is defined as a majority of appointed members, excluding vacant seats.

K. **Meetings:** The REPSC initially shall meet at regularly scheduled intervals as needed to accomplish its Mission and Purpose. Special meetings may be called by the Chairman or upon the written request of five or more members for the purpose of transacting any business designated in the call. The call for a special meeting shall be made by e-mail, telephone, mail or whatever means necessary. Notification will be received at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting.

L. **Duties of the REPSC**

1. The duties of the REPSC shall be to provide oversight of the technology, operations, administration and finances of the King County E-911 Program office until such time as an Ordinance for permanent E-911 oversight authority under the RENOBS is adopted by King County Council and all other required governmental signatories as detained herein.

2. Complete the Purpose and Mission of the REPSC.

3. Providing ongoing evaluation and recommendations for improvement of 911 services;

4. Develop a strategic plan for Next Generation 911 technology.

5. Develop timelines and work plans as necessary to carry out its purpose.

6. Receive and consider all proper matters in relation to E-911 Program technology, operations, finance and administration.

7. Review and analyze all prior historical documents deemed necessary by the REPSC including all financial, management, technical and other records of the E-911 Program Office.

8. Hire, monitor and oversee the performance of King County E-911 Program Manager who shall serve at the pleasure of the REPSC

9. Provide an annual report to the County Executive and King County Council on progress.

**SECTION 2. Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) Providing 9-1-1 Emergency Communications**

A. This Ordinance is not intended to and does not in any way regulate or create oversight of the operations, finances, technology or management of the current twelve King County PSAPs.

B. The REPSC shall have final authority over annual distributions to the PSAPs of any and all E-911 taxes collected by King County.

C. The REPSC shall be responsible for negotiating and finalizing any and all participation agreements it deems necessary for the distribution of E-911 taxes to King County PSAPs.
**History: how did we get here?**
King County funded a consultant study (GEOCOM) in 2012 that ultimately supported the county’s interest in consolidation of PSAPs as a way to pay for NG 911 in the future.

- Outcome was a flawed and one-sided process, motivating a majority of the PSAPs to work together and engage the King County Council.
- Working with PSAP coalition, King County Council created 2015-16 budget provisos that required technical and financial audits, as well as established the mandate for the creation of a transparent and inclusive regional 911 emergency number steering committee.

1. **Why are we here today?**
   - PSAPs openly rejected the Executive’s proposed ordinance
   - PSAPs suggest the RPC consider forwarding to the County Council a proposed substitute ordinance that more accurately reflects the intent of the council and the PSAPs to establish an open and transparent process for the design, development, and implementation of a truly regional Next Generation 911 system in King County.

2. **Highlights of the core issues/objections driving a proposed substitute ordinance**

   **Implementing Next Generation 911 is a LONG TERM, constantly evolving national 911 technology transformation requiring careful and ongoing review and evaluation as a regional initiative.**
   **It is NOT a federal mandate with a timeline or deadline.**

- Collaboration and partnership needed in all aspects of E-911 Program Office Operations, Management & Finance
  - No collaboration yet: Executive’s Proposed Ordinance drafted by King County without any communication with PSAPs. (upcoming meeting 8/31/15 with county pending – this may change)
  - Majority of ordinance circumvents the intent and responsibilities of a regional governance/steering committee.
  - It is a repeat of the last 3 years of King County E-911 Program Office “imposed” process under a different name.
    - KC E-911 developed a “work plan” without any input or review
    - KC E-911 implementing “work plan” even before Ordinance approved
    - County is already hiring facilitator with no involvement or consultation with PSAPs
  - County placing all of its own employees in key roles of the entire process; no PSAP, council staff, or regional involvement in day to day plan
  - Proposes aggressive County timeline with no consultation with and/or respect for other jurisdictions

- Audits say we need “Oversight” of KC E-911 Program Office
  - Title needs work – need Regional Oversight Board of KC E-911 Office (not oversight of PSAPs) (King County is in agreement here).
  - We are focused on the 25% of money spent by KC E-911; not the 75% spent by individual PSAPs
  - Audits show we need permanent oversight of finances, management, technology of KC E-911 office to assure smooth, reliable, safe technology upgrades within budget
PSAP Regional Talking Points & Interests

- Oversight must be regional, representative and collaborative
- Development of Regional Oversight Ordinance must be result of a collaborative process
- Collaboration starts at the very beginning – must be involved in all things

3. Proposed Substitute Ordinance highlights
   - PSAPs proposing Substitute Ordinance that will establish Regional 9-1-1- Emergency Program Steering Committee (REPS)
     - Purpose: will be to assure regional collaboration that will establish a permanent Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Oversight Board (REPB)
     - Facilitate an inclusive and collaborative environment for regional planning to move forward
     - Regional Membership (15) that includes all stakeholders in 911 Emergency Communications as follows:
       - Chair of Council
       - Vice Chair of Regional Coordination of Council
       - Chair of LJEM Committee
       - County Executive or designee
       - City of Seattle Official
       - 5 elected officials from jurisdictions appointed by Council
       - Large PSAP representative from NORCOM or Valley Communications
       - A Small PSAP representative from Redmond, Issaquah, Enumclaw, Bothell, UW
       - Sound Cities Representative
       - Police Chief
       - Fire Chief

   - Tasks: REPSC will:
     - Hire its own facilitator
     - Establish its own timeline
     - Issue its own work plan for collaboration and consensus building on a regional Next Generation 911 strategic plan
     - Finalize organizational plan for permanent Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Oversight Board (REPB)

4. Action items request of RPC
   - Reject executives proposed ordinance
   - Work with PSAPs to craft and submit to KC council a viable proposed substitute ordinance
     - Provide us with an open & transparent process
     - Ensure that the process is collaborative
     - Ask the County to do business differently
     - Ask the County to pay attention to details – sensitivity to nature and naming of work

On the topic of leadership for the 911 Office

We seek an honest broker that has or can develop the leadership ability to navigate the complex issues we are facing. This leader must be committed to developing and maintaining strong organizational leadership skills, be versed in aspects of project management, and proactive communications with stakeholders. We are looking for a leader who can work to bring the PSAPs & the county together to work collaboratively on issues. The PSAPs respect the commitment and dedication of current county 911 staff and seek to provide direction on the type of leadership style we believe would best serve the public and the agencies we collectively serve.
Item 11
Service Guidelines Task Force

UPDATE

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

SCA Representatives to the Service Guidelines Task Force
Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn; Mayor Fred Butler, Issaquah; Mayor Suzette Cooke, Kent; Deputy Mayor Chris Eggen, Shoreline; Mayor Jim Ferrell, Federal Way; Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie; Mayor John Marchione, Redmond.

Update
The Public Issues Committee has been updated on work by the Service Guidelines Task Force since its formation, with a pre-PIC workshop in March 2015. Task Force members are currently evaluating Metro’s technical analysis on target service levels, service types, and alternative transit services which respond to Draft Principles and Recommendations drawn from conversations during Task Force meetings to date. The final Service Guidelines Principles and Recommendations are expected to be complete by October 2015 so they can be incorporated into Metro’s Strategic Plan. Updates to the Strategic Plan and the Service Guidelines will be transmitted to the County Council in December 2015. At the September 9, 2015 PIC meeting, staff will update the PIC on progress made since the July PIC meeting in addressing concerns raised by SCA member cities.

Background
The adopted 2015-2016 King County Biennial Budget included a proviso requiring the Executive to transmit a motion establishing a regional stakeholder transit Service Guidelines Task Force. The Task Force is tasked with considering the varied purposes and performance characteristics of different types of transit service. Target service levels on transit corridors are identified through a scoring system, with points assigned for 50 percent productivity, 25 percent social equity, and 25 percent geographic value. The Task Force will evaluate how the geographic value and social equity standards have been incorporated into the adopted guidelines. Further, the Task Force will make recommendations for guidelines for alternative services implementation.

More background on the Service Guidelines Task Force objectives and membership can be found in the SCA staff memo from the April 8, 2015 PIC meeting, page 52.
The Service Guidelines Task Force will do this work in the first part of 2015 so that it can influence development of both Metro’s long range plan, scheduled to be complete by mid-2016, and its service guidelines update, scheduled to be complete by April 2016.

**Technical Analysis of Target Service Levels, Service Types, and Alternative Services**

The seventh meeting(s) of the Task Force were held as a two Technical Workshops on August 13 and August 17, 2015 in response to the Preliminary Draft Principles and Recommendations. The same materials were presented at both workshops. The agenda included a presentation by Metro of target service level analysis and service type analysis. The workshop also included a discussion on a possible expansion of the alternative services program.

By way of background, the Preliminary Draft Principles and Recommendations are drawn from conversations which have occurred during Task Force meetings to date and are intended to initiate conversations among Task Force members. The Preliminary Draft Principles and Recommendations were drafted on June 12, 2015 by John Howell, facilitator from Cedar River Group, and can be found [here](#).

**Target Service Levels**

SCA members of the Task Force requested additional target service level analysis related to minimum level of service standards, the addition of destination data, an added value for park-and-rides, a broader definition of social equity, and a sliding scale for evaluating social equity and geographic value scoring. As a result of requests by Task Force members, Metro has conducted analysis on the potential changes to target service levels. Based on the analysis results by Metro, an additional 148,100 hours of investment need have been identified, with 37 corridors identified for additional investment to reach target service level. The table below reflects Metro’s response to SCA member’s requests related to target service levels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCA Request for Analysis</th>
<th>Metro Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criteria should consider a sliding scale for social equity</td>
<td>Metro evaluated a gradated point system to evaluate low-income (0-5) and minority (0-5) factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate the RTTF definition of social equity to include youth, students, and elderly</td>
<td>Metro’s evaluation included a larger population using a revised definition of low-income, consistent with ORCA LIFT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation criteria should consider a sliding scale for geographic value</td>
<td>Metro evaluated a gradated point system for geographic value. All corridors will now receive a minimum of 2 points for providing connections between centers. A corridor could earn 2, 5, 7 or 10 points using a new point methodology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Define a minimum level of service standard for service types</td>
<td>Metro’s evaluation ensures that a minimum level of service is met on all corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA Request for Analysis</td>
<td>Metro Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A measurement should be added for the value of park-and-rides (both owned and leased)</strong></td>
<td>Metro’s evaluation includes points for park-and-ride lots of over 150 stalls or more (both owned and leased).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility and connectivity to centers should be evaluated</strong></td>
<td>Minimum service levels, geographic value sliding scale, and Service Type Option 4 incorporate value for connection to centers in our region.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Service Types**
SCA members of the Task Force requested more information on how service types could more accurately measure performance of routes against like-services, such as density and route function. As a result of requests by Task Force members, Metro has assessed three new potential service type options which could better account for density/market served and mobility/function. The new potential service types were compared to outcomes of the current service type family (Seattle Core, Non-Seattle Core, and Alternative Services) during reduction scenarios in a document that can be found [here](#). The new service type options presented by Metro are:

- Peak Emphasis (Urban, Suburban/Rural, Peak/Express, Demand Response)
- Peak Emphasis by Market (Urban all-day, Suburban/Rural all-day, Urban peak, Suburban/Rural peak, Demand Response)
- PSRC Vision 2040-based (Metropolitan City, Core, City, Other Smaller City, Demand Response)

**Alternative Services Program**
SCA members of the Task Force have expressed interest in expanding the alternative services program to serve rural and emerging markets, while complementing fixed-route services. In response to Task Force requests, Metro provided potential refinements, criteria and standards to the alternative services program, which can be found [here](#). The potential changes outline how communities could receive alternative services through proposed allocation criteria. Additionally, potential changes outline opportunities for partnership, performance measurement standards, and circumstances what would enable an alternative service to transition into fixed-route services.

**Ongoing Issues for Task Force**
SCA members of the Task Force continue to advocate for issues raised previously at PIC, including the following:

- Metro’s performance measures should not penalize deadhead trips when a route is not close to a bus base.
- Metro needs to more thoroughly incorporate destination data into the evaluation of a route or corridor.
- Metro should better reflect the value of mobility by evaluating travel time and connection to centers.
• Metro should address how Service Guidelines will interact and be implemented with the Long Range Plan.
• Metro must engage jurisdictions and local communities on a regular basis to better understand transit needs, which could include alternative transit service programs. In doing so, Metro could further identify opportunities for partnership with regional organizations, tribes, local jurisdictions, social services organizations, and the private sector.
• Metro should develop clearer performance measures and evaluation processes that consider different service types, including alternative services.
• Metro should better reflect access to the regional system through ongoing transit integration efforts that could help to achieve geographic value, social equity, and connection to centers.

Task Force Timeline
The Service Guidelines Task Force held its first meeting on March 4, 2015 and will continue to meet thru early-October, as the schedule has been extended based on a request from Task Force members to see analysis on potential target service level and service type changes. The Service Guidelines Task Force is expected to submit a report with its recommendations for changes to Metro's service guidelines to the King County Executive and King County Council after their final meeting. Updates to Metro's strategic plan and service guidelines are expected to be transmitted to the County Council in December.

Previous meetings and topics were as follows:
1. Wednesday, March 4: Regional Transit Task Force recommendations and introduction to the service guidelines (Presentation material)
2. Wednesday, April 1: Performance measurement and geographic value in Metro’s planning process (Presentation material)
3. Thursday, April 30: Social equity in Metro’s planning process (Presentation material)
4. Thursday, May 21: Geographic value, service types and reduction/investment decisions (Presentation material)
5. Wednesday, June 3: Alternative Services and Services Types (Presentation material)
6. Tuesday, June 16: Potential Changes to the Guidelines (Draft Principles and Recommendations)
7. August 13 and August 17: Technical workshops to describe analysis on service types and outcomes from higher level recommended changes to the service guidelines (Presentation, Service Types Options, Alternative Services Policy Framework)

Future meetings are as follows:
8. September 17: Task Force meeting on preliminary recommendations (Mercer Island Community and Events Center, 3 – 6pm)
9. October 7: Task Force meeting on final recommendations (Chinook Building, Seattle – 3 – 6pm)
**Next Steps**

The next meeting of the Task Force will be held on September 17, 2015 to discuss preliminary recommendations, taking into consideration the requested analysis on target service levels, service types, and alternative services. A final meeting will be held on October 7, 2015.

SCA staff will continue working with SCA Task Force members and Metro staff to better understand how the proposed changes to the service guidelines will impact transit service throughout King County, as well as how the service guidelines will influence Metro’s long range plan efforts. More information on the Service Guidelines Task Force can be found [here](#).
Item 12
Best Starts for Kids Levy

UPDATE

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

SCA Executive Board Members
Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, President; Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, Vice President;
Councilmember Don Gerend, Sammamish, Treasurer; Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, Member at
Large; Mayor John Marchione, Redmond, Past President

Update

The PIC voted unanimously in July to forward a position to the SCA Board of Directors urging
the King County Council to place the Best Starts for Kids levy on the ballot for voters’
consideration. Subsequently, the Board voted unanimously in July to adopt the position. The
King County Council ultimately voted 8-1 on July 22, 2015 to place the Best Starts for Kids levy
on the November 3, 2015 ballot. It will appear as King County Proposition 1.

Background
After reviewing the Best Starts for Kids (BSK) Levy ordinance at the May PIC meeting (see May
13, 2015 PIC Packet, page 70) and voting unanimously in June to bring back a policy position for
final consideration (see June 10, 2015 PIC Packet, page 71), the PIC then voted unanimously in
July to recommend the following position to the SCA Board of Directors (see July 8, 2015 PIC
Packet, page 21):

In order to support the healthy development of children and youth, families and
communities across King County, the Sound Cities Association (SCA) urges the King
County Council to place the Best Starts for Kids levy on the November 2015 ballot for
consideration by the voters.

Subsequently, the SCA Board of Directors unanimously supported the position during the July
Board meeting. SCA President Mayor Matt Larson of Snoqualmie and SCA Vice President Mayor
Nancy Backus of Auburn then sent a letter, Attachment A, to the King County Council
announcing SCA’s support for placing the BSK levy on the November 2015 ballot.

King County Council Action
The King County Council held a lengthy public hearing on July 20, 2015, during which SCA
President Mayor Matt Larson of Snoqualmie, SCA Vice President Nancy Backus of Auburn,
Councilmember De’Sean Quinn of Tukwila, and Mayor Leanne Guier of Pacific testified in
support of the levy proposal. On July 22, 2015, the Council voted 8-1 to send the Best Starts for Kids levy to the voters in November (Ordinance 18088, as adopted, is downloadable [here](#)). Councilmember Regan Dunn stated that he voted no because of remaining concerns about potential suppression of junior taxing districts. Several amendments were adopted, altering the ordinance slightly from what was last reviewed by the PIC. Those amendments are as follows:

- An amendment clarifying that hospitals and other mental health providers in King County would be eligible to receive funding for mental health services for children and youth
- An amendment clarifying, within the statement of facts, that levy proceeds would be distributed in a manner that is “geographically equitable”
- An amendment clarifying the role of a board to provide advice and oversight to the levy
- An amendment to the statement of facts adding detail about the impacts of domestic violence and sexual assault as an adverse childhood experiences
- An amendment that would make metropolitan parks districts whose levies are suppressed by the BSK levy whole (up to $1 million), so long as the activities funded are consistent with the overall purposes of the BSK levy and if authorized by a future Council ordinance
- An amendment that would make fire districts whose levies are suppressed by the BSK levy whole, so long as the activities funded are consistent with the overall purposes of the BSK levy and if authorized by a future Council ordinance
- An amendment to the findings of fact stating that it is the intent of the Council and Executive to consider economic conditions, the national consumer price index, and the needs of seniors, low income individuals, and other vulnerable populations when determining the percentage by which to increase the levy each year passed. The county is authorized to implement a medium increase of three percent annually.
- As a companion to the amendment above, an amendment requiring the implementation plan to include economic indicators to aid the Council in determining what percent, if any, to increase the levy by annually, and requiring the Executive to make a recommendation based on these factors also passed.

**Next Steps**

With the King County Council’s action, the Best Starts for Kids levy will now appear on the November 3, 2015 ballot as King County Proposition 1.

**Attachments**

A. [SCA letter of support for placing BSK levy on November 2015 ballot](#)
July 17, 2015

Dear Chair Phillips and Members of the King County Council:  

In order to support the healthy development of children and youth, families and communities across King County, the Sound Cities Association (SCA) urges the King County Council to place the Best Starts for Kids levy on the November 2015 ballot for consideration by the voters. This position is unanimously supported by our Board of Directors, and by the Public Issues Committee (PIC) of SCA, on which each of our 36 cities has a voting seat.

As you know, the Sound Cities Association was founded to help cities in King County act locally and partner regionally to create vital, livable communities through advocacy, education, leadership, mutual support, and networking. The healthy development of our children is key to the future of our County, and thus of central importance to our member cities. We need to shift from a costly, crisis-oriented response on health and social issues to one that focuses on prevention and eliminating disparities by providing access to services that will allow children and youth to realize their full potential.

We want to thank the County Council for being responsive to concerns raised by cities. We are particularly pleased to see that funding for public health services such as maternity support services and the nurse family partnership are now called out specifically in the levy. We are also pleased to see the role of cities in the levy being better spelled out. By involving cities and having geographic balance in the planning an implementation of the levy, as well as ongoing oversight and governance of the levy, we will ensure that the needs of youth and children from all parts of the County are understood and addressed.

While children throughout the County have needs that can and should be addressed, we do wish to stress that it is critical that funds from the levy go where they are most needed. King County is known for its high quality of life, yet it has some of the nation’s worst health and social disparities. On average, the County ranks well on social and health measures. But this masks the fact that the County faces significant inequities in health and well-being. Addressing these disparities, and ensuring that all children in our County have the opportunity to thrive, is critical to the health and well-being of our children, and our regional economy. We therefore encourage you to place this levy on the November ballot for consideration by the voters.

Sincerely,

Matt Larson  
President, Sound Cities Association  
Mayor, City of Snoqualmie

Nancy Backus  
Vice President, Sound Cities Association  
Mayor, City of Auburn

Matt Larson  
President, Sound Cities Association  
Mayor, City of Snoqualmie

Nancy Backus  
Vice President, Sound Cities Association  
Mayor, City of Auburn
**Item 13**
Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County

**UPDATE**

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

**Update**
Members will have an opportunity to update the PIC in regards to upcoming 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 as reported by SCA Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Bothell Parks Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Kirkland Aquatics and Recreation District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>Tukwila School District Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Kent Fire Department Regional Fire Authority – Fire Benefit Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Renton Regional Fire Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Tukwila Regional Fire Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Highline School District Capital</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>

### Potential Future Ballot Measures as reported by King County

<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 Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Office of Law Enforcement Oversight charter amendment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Move Seattle transportation levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>Seattle Schools</td>
<td>District operations and capital levies (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Low-income housing levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Sound Transit</td>
<td>ST3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Veterans and Human Services Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent Ballot Measure Results

- **City of Redmond Proposition 1 – Public Safety & Transportation Maintenance**
  - Failed (47% yes, 53% no)
- **City of Redmond Proposition 2 – Parks Services Funding**
  - Failed (46% yes, 54% no)
- **Shoreline Fire District Proposition 1 – Fire Benefit Charge**
  - Approved (75% yes, 25% no)
- **Shoreline Fire District Proposition 2 – Construction/Capital Bonds**
  - Approved (80% yes, 20% no)
- **King County Fire Protection District No. 30 (Skykomish) – Fire Protection Bonds**
  - Approved (67% yes, 33% no)

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](mailto:Katie@soundcities.org).
**Item 14**  
**SCA Issues for 2015  
UPDATE**

SCA Staff Contact  
Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst, [katie@soundcities.org](mailto:katie@soundcities.org), 206-433-7169

**Update**

SCA staff is seeking feedback on issues members would like the PIC to consider in 2015.

**Background**  
At the January 14, 2015 Public Issues Committee (PIC) meeting, SCA Executive Director asked members to note any issues PIC should consider in 2015. Following is a list of issues members noted at that meeting, and at subsequent meetings. SCA staff will keep this list updated throughout the year. This will be an ongoing, monthly PIC item.

**Issues for 2015:**

- **Homelessness**
  - Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC
  - Discussion on steps being undertaken by cities to address homelessness during 9/9/2015 Pre-PIC workshop

- **Best Starts for Kids Levy**
  - Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC
  - Pre-PIC item 4/8/2015
  - Final action taken in 7/8/2015
  - Update during 9/9/2015 PIC meeting

- **Food Policy**
  - Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC
  - PSRC Regional Food Policy Council Blueprints were on agenda for 2/11/2015 as an informational item
  - At 4/8/2015 PIC, it was suggested that PIC have a future briefing on the King County Local Food Initiative
  - Future items may come back to PIC in 2015
• Sound Transit 3
  o Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC, discussed at 4/8/2015 PIC
  o A briefing on ST3 will come to PIC as a pre-PIC workshop on 10/14/2015 in concert with a briefing on Metro’s Long Range Plan

• Service Guidelines Task Force
  o Pre-PIC item 3/11/2015, monthly updates will be provided to PIC
  o SCA staff will monitor and provide updates at future PIC meetings

• Metro Long Range Plan
  o Pre-PIC item on 3/11/2015
  o SCA staff is monitoring and will come to PIC as a pre-PIC workshop on 10/14/2015

• Solid Waste Transfer Plan Review
  o Update scheduled for 9/9/2015

• Solid Waste Comprehensive Plan/Recycling Targets
  o Pre-PIC workshop on 5/13/2015
  o Discussed recycling targets on 7/8/2015
  o Will bring DOE NW Commingled Working Group Report – due out before end of 2015

• Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee (RLSJC) issues
  o Identified at 4/8/2015 PIC
  o SCA Caucus Chair Councilmember Kate Kruller, Tukwila, will chair the RLSJC in 2016. At the 10/14/2015 PIC meeting, PIC members will be asked to offer possible discussion and presentation topics for the RLSJC’s seven meetings in 2016.

• Funding for roads in unincorporated King County (Bridges and Roads Task Force)
  o Identified at 4/8/2015 PIC
  o This item was discussed at length at 4/8/2015 and 8/26/2015 SCA Board meeting
  o Return to 9/9/2015 PIC meeting to provide an overview of the new Bridges and Roads Task Force

• E911 Oversight
  o Identified at 7/8/2015 PIC
  o SCA staff will monitor and provide updates at future PIC meetings, including an update at the 9/9/2015 PIC meeting
• Environmental Health Services – Temporary Event and Farmers Market Fees (Board of Health)
  o Discussed during the 9/10/2014 and 2/11/2015 PIC meetings
  o Update during the 9/9/2015 PIC meeting

• Low Impact Development
  o Identified during the 8/26/2015 SCA Board Executive Committee Meeting
  o SCA staff will provide background and education to PIC members at a future pre-PIC

• PSRC Economic Development District Board (EDDB) Action Items for 2016
  o Identified by members of the EDDB
  o Will be placed on an upcoming PIC agenda for consideration
  o The EDDB will also be doing a significant update to the Regional Economic Strategy in 2016

If you or your city have additional items to be added to this list, please contact Katie Kuciemba at Katie@soundcities.org.