<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Welcome and Roll Call</strong> – Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, Chair</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Public Comment</strong> – Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, Chair</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Approval of minutes</strong> – September 9, 2015 meeting</td>
<td>2 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Chair’s Report</strong> – Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, Chair</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Executive Director’s Report</strong> – Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Advisory Task Force Appointments</strong></td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTION ITEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hank Margeson, PIC Nominating Committee Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Appointment of 2016 PIC Nominating Committee Members</strong></td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACTION ITEM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair Talmas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee 2016 Agenda</strong></td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellie Wilson-Jones, Policy Analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5 minute overview, 10 minute discussion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>Potential Amendment to Countywide Planning Policies re: Affordable Housing</strong></td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doreen Booth, Policy Analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5 minute overview, 10 minute discussion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>E911 Oversight</strong></td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UPDATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Page 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deanna Dawson, Executive Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5 minute update, 5 minute discussion)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. **Service Guidelines Task Force**
   **UPDATE**
   Page 87
   Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst
   (5 minute update, 5 minute discussion)

12. **Farmers Market and Temporary Event Fees**
   **UPDATE**
   Page 99
   Ellie Wilson-Jones, Policy Analyst
   (2 minute update, 3 minute Q and A)

13. **Bridges and Roads Task Force**
   **UPDATE**
   Page 103
   Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst
   (5 minute update, 5 minute Q and A)

14. **Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County**
   **UPDATE**
   Page 107
   Katie Kuciemba, Senior Policy Analyst
   (2 minute update, 3 minute comments)

15. **SCA Issues for 2015**
    **UPDATE**
    Page 109
    Deanna Dawson, Executive Director
    (2 minute update, 3 minute comments)

16. **Informational Items**
    **Member City Efforts to Address Homelessness**
    Page 111

17. **Upcoming Events**
    b. Public Issues Committee Meeting – **Thursday, November 12 – 7:00 PM** – Renton City Hall
       *(Please note date change due to Veteran’s Day)*
    c. SCA Annual Meeting and Networking Dinner – Wednesday, December 2, 2015 – 5:30 PM – Renton Pavilion Event Center
    d. Public Sector Economic Development Summit – December 11, 2015 – Save the Date

18. **For the Good of the Order**

19. **Adjourn**
Did You Know?

October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month. Nationally, one in four women will experience intimate partner violence in her life and almost half of immigrant women will experience abuse. In Washington, there were a total of 49,360 domestic violence incidents, including 8,531 violations of protection or no contact orders, reported by law enforcement agencies for 12 months in 2013-14. These incidents accounted for more than half of all reported crimes against persons. Among the Washington domestic violence incidents, seventy percent of the victims were women. To raise awareness and encourage action, many domestic violence agencies and local governments are holding events this fall:

**September 26, 2015**
Purple Light Nights Community Tree Lighting and "Take a Step Against Domestic Violence" 5K walk/run
Hosted by the Covington DV Task Force
6:00 p.m. 5K walk, 7:00 p.m. dinner, 7:30 p.m. 6th annual tree lighting

**October 1, 2015**
Lifewire Hope Starts Here Breakfast
7:30 a.m., Meydenbauer Center, Register Here

**October 3, 2015**
An Evening of Promise: Dawn's 19th Annual Benefit Auction and Awards Gala
5:30-9:30 p.m., Hyatt Regency Bellevue, Register Here

**October 5, 2015**
Auburn Candlelight Vigil for Domestic Violence Awareness
Hosted by Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn City Council Members, and others
6 p.m., City Hall Plaza, 25 West Main St., Auburn

**October 16, 2015**
Auburn DV Task Force First Annual Domestic Violence Awareness Event
Speaker: Denise Brown, Sister to Nicole Brown Simpson
1:00-3:00 p.m., Grace Community Church, Auburn, WA, Register Here

**October 20, 2015**
New Beginnings Annual Benefit Lunch
12:00 p.m., Downtown Seattle Nordstrom, Register Here

**October 24, 2015**
Domestic Violence Awareness Shabbat-Jewish Family Service
Contact Cynthia Gamel, 206-726-3629

**November 12, 2015**
King County Coalition Against Domestic Violence 16th Annual Take Action Awards
5:00-7:00 p.m., Wing Luke Museum, 719 S. King St. Seattle, WA 98104, Register Here

Want to share an event not included in this list? Contact SCA Policy Analyst Ellie Wilson-Jones at ellie@soundcities.org.
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 7:05 PM. 22 cities had representation (Attachment A). Guests present included: Bill Peloza, Auburn City Council; Largo Wales, Auburn City Council; John Stilin, Redmond City Council; Kamuron Gurol, City of Burien; Dana Hinman, City of Auburn; Wendy Poston, City of Burien; Edie Gilliss, City of Seattle; Diane Carlson, King County Executive’s Office; Maria Wood, Public Health – Seattle and King County.

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 July 8, 2015 Minutes**
Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, moved, seconded by Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, to approve the July 8, 2015 meeting minutes.

There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously.

4. **Chair’s Report**
Chair Talmas reported that the SCA leadership met earlier in the day with both Seattle Mayor Ed Murray and King County Executive Dow Constantine. The meeting with Mayor Murray largely focused on efforts to address homelessness and affordable housing, and included preliminary discussions on how joint methods could result in positive outcomes. Chair Talmas reported that at the meeting with Executive Constantine, the main topic of discussion was the E911 oversight issue. The Regional Policy Committee (RPC) also reviewed the E911 oversight issue in its meeting. This issue is on this meeting’s agenda for update and discussion.

5. **Executive Director’s Report**
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, reminded members of the SCA priorities for 2015: transportation; human services; and economic development. She highlighted that SCA has been working on transportation related issues through the statewide transportation package, and through continued work on the Service Guidelines Task Force and Bridges and Roads Task Force. SCA has been working on human services issues such as homelessness, including today’s pre-PIC workshop, and through work on the Best Starts for Kids levy. Efforts in economic development continue with SCA’s work with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Economic Development District Board (EDDB). Dawson reported that Deputy Mayor Catherine Standard,
Lake Forest Park, has been elected Vice President of the EDBB. Dawson reported that SCA has been working with King County and the City of Seattle to hold a Public Sector Economic Development Summit on December 11, 2015. This will be an all-day event; more details to come.

Dawson announced that the next SCA Networking Dinner is scheduled for October 28, 2015 featuring Attorney General Bob Ferguson as the keynote speaker.

Dawson provided additional information on the meeting between SCA leadership and Seattle Mayor Ed Murray. Mayor Murray discussed two legislative proposals related to affordable housing with SCA leadership: a proposal for a “REET 3” (Real Estate Excise Tax) of .25% to create affordable housing, and a tax credit for affordable housing preservation. Seattle staff will provide additional information on both these proposals to SCA staff. Members interested in pursuing these options can contact Dawson.

Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, asked for additional information on the tax credit option. Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, noted that he had recently had a conversation with Seattle Councilmember Sally Bagshaw about requirements for a certain percentage of units to be affordable. Additional details on options that Seattle is considering can be found in the Seattle HALA (Seattle Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda) Report.

Dawson reported that there will be an Emergency Medical Service (EMS) Advisory Task Force to review two independent studies that are required under the adopted Medic One/EMS 2014-2019 Strategic Plan. Cities with populations over 50,000 will have a seat on the task force. SCA will appoint four representatives from cities with populations under 50,000. Dawson noted that SCA will send out a call for nominations for the new EMS task force.

Dawson reported that the PIC Nominating Committee will have one member rotating off each year. At the end of 2015, Councilmember Ross Loudenback, North Bend, will be stepping down from his seat on the committee. Dawson stated that a new Snoqualmie Valley representative will be appointed by the PIC Chair at the October 14 PIC meeting. Members interested in serving in that role should contact Dawson.

6. Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) Appointments
Redmond Council President Hank Margeson, PIC Nominating Committee Chair, thanked members of the committee. Chair Margeson reported that both current SWAC appointees are retiring as elected officials at the end of the year vacating the appointment mid-term. This appointment will be effective January 1, 2016 and will expire on September 30, 2017.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, moved, seconded by Council President Ed Prince, Renton, to recommend to the SCA Board of Directors the appointment of Mayor David Baker, Kenmore, and Councilmember Largo Wales, Auburn, as members to the Solid Waste Advisory Committee, with terms ending 9/30/17.

The motion passed unanimously.
Chair Talmas thanked the PIC Nominating Committee members.

7. Farmers Market and Temporary Event Fees
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, recognized Councilmember Largo Wales, Auburn, who chairs the Board of Health Environmental Health Fees Subcommittee and was present to hear PIC input on proposed fee adjustments for farmers market and temporary event vendors. Wilson-Jones then provided background about the Board of Health’s (BOH) role with regard to fees charged by the Environmental Health Services Division (EHS) of Public Health and provided an update on fee-setting for farmers market and temporary event vendors.

Under the BOH Code, EHS administers permitting programs meant to curtail the risk of disease. The King County Council and BOH have shared responsibility for the financial oversight of EHS. The BOH sets permit fees for EHS, and the King County Council adopts EHS’s operating budget. Fees are based on a full cost-recovery model. As a result, factors such as whether a permitted organization is a non-profit or for-profit business or the community value of farmers 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. So the fees must recover costs, but not exceed them.

The permitting program that is the focus of this discussion is the Food Program and specifically, permits that are required for farmers market and temporary event vendors. Vendors who sell whole produce or simply offer samples are not required to get permits, but those who sell prepared foods must apply to EHS for a permit.

In September 2014, the PIC discussed a new rate structure then being developed for all of EHS in response to a King County Performance Audit and a consultant’s rate and time study. At that point, EHS permit fees had not been increased since 2012. 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 audit and consultant found that both the hourly rate being charged and the amount of time being charged for on a given permit type were not reflective of true costs to EHS. So EHS staff, working with the consultant, developed new rate and fee proposals for consideration by the subcommittee chaired by Councilmember Wales and then by the BOH.

The resultant rate and fee proposal would have recouped what EHS judged costs to be, but unfortunately also would have resulted in fee increases of between 42 percent and 264 percent for farmers market and temporary event permittees. In October 2014, the SCA Board of Directors sent a letter to the King County Council, expressing concerns about this proposal. Following their receipt of that feedback, the King County Council adopted the biennial budget with provisos related to holding down fees for farmers market and temporary events in 2015.

In February 2015, the PIC received an update about a revised EHS rate proposal. On February 19, 2015, the BOH adopted a revised hourly rate for many EHS permit types, including a new $215 hourly rate for food permits, but farmers market and temporary event permit fees were not adjusted at that time. The BOH instead directed EHS staff to work with stakeholders and the subcommittee chaired by Councilmember Wales to develop a new rate proposal.
EHS staff have since gone back to the drawing board for a redesign of the permit structure for vendors. They reconsidered the risk associated with vending various types of foods, the frequency of inspections necessary to ensure safety, and talked with stakeholders. The result is a proposed fee structure that allows for permittees to apply for a single permit to cover multiple events. The structure is also now more closely tied with the risk associated with the foods vendors prepare. Councilmember Wales and Wilson-Jones attended a stakeholder meeting in Tukwila in June of this year and heard vendors voice support for these changes, however specific permitting fees were not discussed at that time.

Wilson-Jones directed PIC members to page 67 of the September PIC packet, which summarizes the current rate proposal as well as existing fees and the past proposal. Under the permit structure currently in place, vendors who sell foods that are included on a “limited foods” list generated by EHS can get a permit for a single event for $55. The foods included on that list of “limited foods” range from espresso to hot dogs. Vendors selling any other foods pay $281 for a single event. Under the proposed fee structure there would be no “limited foods” list. Instead, there would be three classes of permit—low, medium, and high risk—based on the risk associated with the ingredients and food preparation method used. Foods previously on the limited list would be low or medium risk.

Wilson-Jones highlighted the fees for single events, which would increase across all permit types, though by less than was previously proposed. The new proposed rate structure would allow vendors to apply for a single event permit, as before, but also a multiple or unlimited event permit. Permittees who attend several events could see a substantial savings from what was previously proposed, and, in some cases, from the current permit structure. They would also have the ease of applying for a single permit for many events rather than applying and getting inspected for every event. 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.

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, would be offered at a rate of $215 per staff hour for all services provided.

Wilson-Jones noted that EHS staff are still contemplating changes to two elements of the fee structure. First, EHS staff have 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. Second, EHS also issues permits to farmers market coordinators. A revised fee structure has not yet been developed for those permits but is anticipated soon. EHS staff have been occupied responding to recent salmonella and E. coli outbreaks in King County and, as a result, have been delayed in addressing these issues.

The BOH 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 BOH meeting, the SCA BOH members are seeking input from the PIC. However, no action by the PIC is anticipated given the BOH’s timeline for adoption of revised fees.

Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, asked whether a single event permit would cover a multi-day event or whether a different permit is required for each day of an event. Wilson-Jones and BOH Administrator Maria Wood clarified that single event permits for temporary events are good for the duration of event, even if it runs multiple days. (Note: To elaborate on the information that was presented to the PIC, permits for farmers market vendors are valid for an entire season at a given market location.)

Councilmember Largo Wales, Auburn, who chairs the BOH Environmental Health Fees Subcommittee and has experience with the permitting process as a Kiwanis member, spoke to the strengths of the current fee proposal. She noted that there would be flexibility for multiple event permit holders. She stated that, as a Kiwanian, she sells food at multiple events and would be able to apply for a single permit to cover those events. She said vendors could serve different menus at each event and would not need to list that menu information at the time of application, flexibility vendors requested. Additionally, the proposed permit structure rewards those who are inspected and found to not have problems through eligibility for an unlimited event permit and reduced inspection requirements. Councilmember Wales also highlighted two other improvements from the current permit structure. First, permit fees would be based on the risk associated with the foods being prepared. Second, a single organization managing multiple vendors for an event would have the opportunity to apply for a blanket permit, so each vendor would not need to go through the permitting process. She said this approach would work well for the annual Bon Odori event in Auburn.

Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, asked about the process for updating fees and whether they might be adjusted annually based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI). BOH Administrator Maria Wood stated that, under recent changes to the BOH code, EHS staff will now review fees annually and can adjust fees by up to CPI + one percent annually with a five percent cap. Wilson-Jones clarified that any increases larger than that are subject to BOH action. An annual financial report will also be provided to the BOH. Additionally, a more in-depth analysis of the EHS fees will be conducted every five years for consideration by the BOH. (Note: The frequency of these reviews was misstated at the PIC meeting, they were formerly conducted every three years and will now be conducted every five years. The information contained here has been corrected.)

Councilmember Bob Keller, Sammamish, asked about the requirements for certified booth operators and farmers market managers. Wilson-Jones answered that permittees who receive a multiple or unlimited event permit under the proposed permit structure would be required to have a certified booth operator present to offset some of the risk associated with less frequent inspection requirements. The two-year booth operator certification would cost $95. EHS staff are still working on updating the fee structure for farmers market coordinators. Councilmember Keller also asked about vendors who donate their food to an event, noting that the proposed fee structure would represent a significant cost increase. Wilson-Jones stated that there would indeed be a significant fee increase for single event permittees, particularly those who would previously have qualified for a $55 limited foods permit. However, the new permit structure
would allow, as an alternative, for an event organizer to get a blanket permit under which the organizer would pay an hourly rate to cover all vendor permitting for the event.

Councilmember Barry Ladenberg, SeaTac, noted that the fee increase for single event permittees is substantial, with a jump from the current rate of $55 to a proposed rate of $320 for some vendors. Councilmember Ladenburg then asked what consequences would be associated with a failed inspection, such as an event being shut down or a reinspection fee, under the proposed permit structure. Wilson-Jones answered that when a violation is detected, EHS staff work with the vendor to remain open if the violation can be immediately remedied or reopen as quickly as possible once the violation is remedied. When a serious violation is detected and resinspection is required, vendors would be assessed a $160 reinspection fee for an additional inspection. *(Note: To elaborate on the information that was presented to the PIC, the current fee for reinspection is equal to one-half of the applicable permit fee.)*

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, stated that he was concerned about the impact of the proposed fee increases on small city events, noting that it will make it difficult to attract food vendors. It will also be very expensive for the Algona Boy Scout Troop that sells hot dogs as a fundraiser. Mayor Hill added that he liked the idea of an unlimited event permit as well as the option for a blanket permit for an entire event and asked how that would work. Wilson-Jones answered that the fee for the blanket permit would be based on the EHS staff time required to review plans and a single permit application covering all vendors and to conduct onsite inspections during the vent. Information would be collected from individual vendors but they would not need to apply individually for event permits. Mayor Hill asked for more information about the various risk levels underlying the proposed rate structure. Descriptions of the proposed risk levels are contained on page 66 of the September PIC packet.

Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, asked how many non-profits attended the Tukwila stakeholder meeting. He stated that it is important to keep costs down for non-profits doing single events and encouraged education and outreach to ensure applicants are aware of the best permit type to apply for. Wilson-Jones stated that the attendees at the Tukwila stakeholder meeting included non-profit organizations and churches as well as at least one business, Whole Foods.

Mayor Leanne Guier, Pacific, said that small events, like those in Pacific, would be unable to attract food vendors under proposed permit fees and suggested using lodging taxes to pay permit fees or assist vendors with doing so.

Councilmember Benson Wong, Mercer Island, asked whether stakeholders had seen the proposed permit fees. Wilson-Jones stated that the proposed fees have not yet been presented to all stakeholders. They were first presented to the BOH Environmental Health Fees Subcommittee in August and will be presented to the BOH on September 17, with possible BOH action in October. EHS staff will be conducting a stakeholder meeting in late September. Councilmember Wong asked about the possibility of phasing in the fee increases. Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, stated that the feedback from the PIC will be helpful for Councilmember Wales and the other SCA BOH members as they consider the proposed fee increases.
Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, stated that vendors at Tukwila’s Fourth of July event indicated that they barely made a profit, but said she was encouraged that EHS is reconsidering the single event permit fee increases. Council President Kruller voiced support for the concept of a multiple event permit and urged consideration of a payment program for vendors to pay fees throughout the course of the year rather than prior to their events.

8. Bridges and Roads Task Force
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, introduced the Bridges and Roads Task Force which was convened on August 12 by King County Executive Constantine to identify policy and fiscal strategies to maintain and preserve King County’s rural or unincorporated roads and bridges. Councilmember Lambert collaborated in the creation of the Task Force, whose scope of work includes making recommendations for greater efficiencies, strategies for decreasing the County’s road infrastructure, and evaluating various funding sources to increase revenue. Revenue increases may take the form of grants, tolling, Transportation Benefit District funding, or legislative solutions.

Kuciemba recognized PIC members Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, and Councilmember Amy Ockerlander, Duvall, who serve on the task force as city representatives. Also serving as a city representative is City Administrator Bob Harrison, Issaquah. In total, 21 members serve on the Task Force including agriculture and business representatives, emergency management professionals, community members, recreational advocates, environmental groups, and planning organization leadership. SCA was not asked to have a formal role in the make-up of the Task Force.

By way of background, King County maintains approximately 1,500 miles of roads and over 180 bridges in rural or unincorporated areas, much of which are in increasingly poor condition. Kuciemba reported that without new revenue sources, the County projects an approximately $260 million revenue shortfall per year over the next 10-year period.

At the first meeting on August 12, Task Force members were provided background on the county road assets, infrastructure and revenue challenges, and consequences if additional funding resources cannot be identified.

Kuciemba stated that, while it is concerning that King County has deferred maintenance of the road and bridge system to such poor conditions, cities are also struggling to meet the challenge of aging infrastructure. The 2015 Transportation Package makes significant progress in funding key projects and providing new authority for cities and counties, but there remains a substantial unfunded need for maintenance and preservation. This is not just a county problem; it’s a regional problem that impacts each local jurisdiction.

Cities have had their own challenges in funding roads and bridges, including roads that hadn't been well-maintained before annexation. Kuciemba questioned what is unique about the present situation that King County is facing.
Task Force members have expressed interest in learning what other jurisdictions are doing to increase revenue, reduce infrastructure ownership or find greater efficiencies. Kuciemba encouraged PIC members and their staff to help by answering the following questions:

- 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?
- How do you feel about the County proposing a Legislative approach to the financing of rural roads and bridges?

Kuciemba concluded her report by stating that a final recommendation from the Task Force is due to be complete by November 30, with a meeting in January 2016 to consider and recommend potential legislative approaches.

Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, stated that maintenance of roads and highways are a government responsibility. He was concerned that only three city officials were represented among the more than twenty members of the committee, and noted that more city elected officials should have been represented on the Task Force.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, questioned if the Task Force has a role in assessing critical infrastructure needs in the event of an earthquake or natural disaster – or in the planning of Cascadia Rising. Kuciemba responded that several members of the Task Force represent emergency management and fire/life/safety but this perspective should be monitored by all members of the Task Force.

Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, questioned the Task Force’s charge as it relates to all roads and bridges within the County, including those located in cities. He also questioned whether King County has assessed the condition of rural and unincorporated roads and bridges to identify critical need. Ladenburg stated that there are regional roads that should be evaluated in this Task Force because they connect the County and cities. Dawson responded that the SCA Board has had a conversation with County Executive Constantine about the focus of the Task Force, including how the County categorizes roads and bridges. Executive Constantine reported to SCA Board Members that the charge of the Task Force is to identify the most significant solutions for operating, maintaining and preserving the aging bridge and road system in unincorporated King County, for which the County has responsibility as the local government.

Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, stated that he is interested in the distinction and financial disparities between regional and rural road networks.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, referenced background information provided by King County stating that County roads are used by more than one million residents of incorporated King County. Margeson recognized that unincorporated King County residents use city roads, too. Cities are finding ways to finance roadway maintenance and preservation, while
sustaining bond ratings and citizen satisfactions. Some cities, such as Redmond, use their general fund.

Councilmember Dini Duclos, Federal Way, reported that roads in Federal Way were in deplorable condition when it became a city. Duclos expressed that cities are committed to maintenance and preservation of their roads; however, cities should not be penalized because the county is not maintaining their own roads and bridges.

Deputy Mayor Catherine Stanford, Lake Forest Park, suggested that the Task Force take a holistic, inclusive look at the King County roads and bridges and that it will be important to voice the needs of cities. There are some County-owned roads that have not been well-maintained, such as 145th and other roads in Lake Forest Park. Stanford stated that Lake Forest Park has formed a Transportation Benefit District to help fund maintenance and preservation of local roads. She noted that the Prop. 1 transportation levy that failed in 2014 would have contained revenues to fund roads in both cities and unincorporated areas.

9. Solid Waste Transfer Plan Review
Doreen Booth, SCA Policy Analyst, reported that the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee (MSWMAC), at the request of the Solid Waste Division (SWD), had been scheduled to take a position on the Transfer Plan 2 Final Report at their September 11, 2015 meeting. However, more recently, the SWD requested instead that no position be taken, noting that staff was very aware of the diverse positions of cities regarding the Final Report and the Northeast Transfer Station. Although no position was solicited, Booth noted it was still possible that MSWMAC would choose to take a position. Booth then provided background information on the Solid Waste and Transfer Management Plan updates.
Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, expressed SeaTac’s concern with the mandatory 70% recycling rate. Related to the transfer plan, Ladenburg asked what percentage of solid waste is coming from what geographic areas. He questioned how much of the tonnage was coming from non-participating jurisdictions.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, asked what the impact of Bellevue not signing the new interlocal agreement would have on the Factoria Transfer Station. Booth responded that besides Bellevue’s solid waste potentially not being taken to the Factoria Station as of 2028, there was no impact on the future of the station.

Booth also noted that many of the demand management strategies would occur at Factoria and Bellevue finds many of those strategies problematic. The city will require a new conditional use permit and Environmental Impact Statement prior to testing of any demand management strategies.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, acknowledged that it was a smart move going forward for the Solid Waste Division’s focus to be on updating the Comprehensive Solid Waste Management Plan. Margeson suggested that instead of focusing on 70% recycling, that the division focus on the end goal, to extend the life of the Cedar Hills Landfill, with increasing the recycling rate one thing that can be done to extend that life rather than being the end goal.
Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, noted that the Shoreline City Council wants the rate payers to come first. They want the system to be “right-sized,” not overbuilt.

Mayor Bernie Talmas, Woodinville, said that Woodinville has one of the largest recycling facilities in the region and there are no benefits to the city from hosting that facility. He also noted that just because something is recycled it still may end up in the landfill if there is no buyer for the commodity and a 70% recycling rate may not lead to increasing the life of Cedar Hills if material is not actually being recycled.

Councilmember Bill Peloza, Auburn, the chair of the Metropolitan Solid Waste Management Advisory Committee, noted that 78% of the material going to Cedar Hills each day is recyclable.

10. E911 Oversight

Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, noted that this matter had been on for discussion and possible action at the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) earlier in the day. Dawson provided members with a handout (Attachment B), a new proposed striker amendment introduced by the SCA caucus of the RPC. She noted that since the time the PIC packet went out to members a week ago, the County Executive’s office submitted a new proposal, and the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) directors submitted a counter proposal. In an effort to build consensus, the SCA Caucus of the RPC proposed a compromise, which drew from elements of each. Dawson summarized some of the differences between the various proposals.

Regarding Oversight Committee Makeup, Dawson noted that one major difference between the Executive proposal and the PSAP proposal was that the former did not include PSAP Directors on the Oversight Committee. The SCA caucus recommended that the PSAP Directors should be included on the Oversight Committee.

Another difference between the Executive proposal and the PSAP proposal was how many non-Seattle city representatives should be on the Oversight Committee. The Executive had proposed 3 non-Seattle city representatives (to be appointed by the County), plus an additional SCA representative. The PSAP directors had recommended that 5 non-Seattle city representatives, plus an additional SCA representative, be on the committee. The SCA caucus recommended a compromise of 4 non-Seattle city representatives, with members to be recommended by SCA. Having balanced representation, and including the PSAP Directors as voting members, will help to build trust and confidence in the process, and ensure that all stakeholders will buy into the eventual recommendations of the Committee.

The Executive’s proposal contained a recommendation for a Technical Advisory Committee and Project Coordination Team (PCT) to support the work of the Oversight Committee. The SCA caucus agreed with this recommendation. However, they wanted to ensure that the PCT had balanced membership from both the County, and the PSAPs.

Regarding work plan and timeline, the Executive’s proposal contained a detailed work plan, while the PSAP proposal would leave development of the work plan to the Oversight Committee. The SCA caucus agreed with the PSAPs that the Oversight Committee should have
responsibility for developing the work plan and timeline in order to ensure that the process is transparent and inclusive.

Another difference between the PSAP directors’ proposal and that of the Executive is that the PSAP proposal clarifies that the ordinance does not regulate or create oversight of the operations, finances, technology or management of the current twelve PSAPs in King County. The SCA caucus agreed that this was an important component.

Additionally, the PSAP directors included in their proposal that the Oversight Committee shall make recommendations on distribution of E911 taxes collected by the County. The SCA caucus agreed with this proposal.

Dawson noted that the Auditor’s Report pointed out the need for a “formal, clear, and transparent mechanism for the Public Safety Answering Points and other regional partners to participate in the decision-making process.” The SCA caucus believes that their compromise proposal would help to achieve this.

Dawson noted that because this proposal was developed not long before the meeting, the RPC deferred action on the item. She invited PIC members to share feedback in advance of the next RPC meeting.

Chair Talmas thanked SCA staff for their work on this item. He noted that the SCA Caucus of the RPC was unanimous in their support for this proposal.

Council President Hank Margsen, Redmond, noted that Redmond had raised some early concerns and worked to ensure that there was agreement among caucus members. He was pleased with the results of the collaboration, noting that the proposal was an attempt to honor the needs and interests of all stakeholders. He stressed that it was important that Redmond and other cities that operated PSAPs have the ability to make decisions on how those PSAPs are run. He noted that the delay of a month would enable members to work together and overcome any objections.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, noted that this is an important issue of public safety. He thanked Margsen for his work in helping to draft a compromise proposal. He felt it important that cities and PSAPs have a strong voice in the process.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, noted that the city of Issaquah has a large interest in this matter. He noted concerns related to both decision making, but also financial responsibility. The city of Issaquah’s PSAP does more than just answer 911 calls. It also, for example, handles ingress and egress at the municipal jail. The operation of the PSAP has a large impact on the overall operations of the city. Marts asked for a deadline by which feedback should be provided. Dawson asked that any initial feedback on the proposal be given within the week, so that comments could be incorporated and shared with other stakeholders.
Councilmember Bill Peloza, Auburn, who serves on the RPC, complimented Dawson as well as King County Council staff for their work on putting together the proposal, and supporting documents.

11. Service Guidelines Task Force
Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst, reported that the Service Guidelines Task Force has been meeting since early-March 2015. In that time, the Task Force has discussed how Metro's transit service is evaluated and ways that service could be allocated in a more fair and equitable way to populations throughout King County. The Task Force met in mid-August to review technical analysis in three primary areas:

1) Target Service Levels (including geographic value and social equity);
2) Alternative Services (which includes vanpools, shuttles, ridesharing); and
3) Different types of transit service.

Kuciemba explained that the workshops were added to the schedule at the request of Task Force members – and SCA members in particular – to better understanding how Task Force recommendations could affect service investment and reduction decisions.

SCA members of the Task Force, including PIC members Mayor Larson and Mayor Backus, have been working closely to advocate for a series of priorities that reflects feedback from PIC members. A majority of the SCA priorities have now been reflected as areas of consensus, including:

- Develop minimum service standards so that there will be service with no less than 60 minute headways or alternative services could be implemented as appropriate;
- Add a measurement for the value of park-and-rides to help account for riders who live outside activity centers;
- Use better evaluation methods to meet geographic value objects that places value on connecting activity centers throughout the county;
- Use better evaluation methods to meet social equity objectives, including how to better serve transit-dependent riders;
- Add a greater emphasis on the needs of youth, elderly and persons with disabilities;
- Incorporate data regarding rider origin and destination;
- Develop a mobility metric to evaluate the time it take a rider to connect to centers; and
- Increase the Alternative Services program to address service needs where fixed routes may not be warranted, or to seed new markets, or to better provide connections for rural communities.

In addition to the priorities identified above, the Task Force has evaluated how transit performance is measured to reflect different service types. By way of background, Kuciemba explained that if Metro faces a service reduction scenario, Metro considers cuts based on performance within each service types. The current service types are “Seattle-core,” “Non-Seattle core,” and demand response or community shuttles.

Kuciemba stated that SCA members of the Task Force have asked to see changes that better take into consideration density and better reflect a measurement of like-services (such as
express service evaluated against other express service). Metro staff has evaluated three new service type options which better reflected the function of the route and density in different ways. Discussions about service types are expected to continue between Task Force members as consensus has not yet been achieved.

Task Force members have asked Metro to continue working on a new service type option that better reflects the importance of social equity, places a greater emphasis on connection to centers, provides protection to express services, does not penalize routes with deadhead trips – or trips without riders on the bus or far in proximity to a bus base, and that more equitably reduces services throughout the county in such a scenario.

As a result of these requests, Metro is undertaking additional technical analysis of a new service type option which will be shared at the September 17 meeting of the Service Guidelines Task Force. SCA members of the Task Force have been regularly caucusing to ensure the needs of all populations throughout King County are better reflected in times of service investment and in time of service reduction.

Kuciembba concluded that 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 in October. Updates to Metro’s strategic plan and service guidelines are expected to be transmitted to the County Council in December.

Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, and Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, thanked Kuciembba for her work staffing the Service Guidelines Task Force.

Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, stated that Metro has done a great job implementing alternative service and end-of-line options. Ladenburg noted that he appreciates King County taking a closer look at ways to better provide transit service.

Mayor Matt Larson, Snoqualmie, stated that SCA representatives of the Task Force are meeting an an ad hoc level with elected representation from Bellevue and Seattle which has been productive. In meeting with Councilmember Tom Rasmussen, Seattle, Larson learned that Seattle is experiencing temporary cancellation of Metro routes and inquired if other cities have experienced the same.

Councilmember Shelley Kloba, Kirkland, responded to Larson’s inquiry by stating that two Metro routes had been cancelled for a limited amount of time.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, also responded to Larson by stating that their Metro service has been hit or miss.

Diane Carlson, Director of Regional Initiatives for King County Executive Constantine, confirmed that the Metro service issues are related to a critical need to hire additional employees. King County Metro is working hard to minimize this situation to the extent possible and Kevin Desmond, King County Metro General Manager, is working on a response to the concerns expressed by local communities.
Kuciemba stated that SCA staff is planning an October 14 pre-PIC meeting focused on the future of transit and will be inviting Sound Transit to discuss ST3 and King County Metro to discuss their Long Range Plan.

Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, suggested that the pre-PIC meeting should include the topic of park-and-ride management, including Sound Transit’s proposed policy to charge for reserved parking stalls. Kuciemba agreed that this topic should be included as discussion at the pre-PIC meeting.

12. Best Starts for Kids Levy
Ellie Wilson-Jones, SCA Policy Analyst, provided an update on Best Starts for Kids, a six-year, $392 million levy proposal that is focused on investments in early interventions and prevention. Best Starts for Kids was first reviewed at the May PIC meeting. In June and July, the PIC considered and then unanimously adopted a position urging the King County Council to place the Best Starts for Kids ordinance on the November ballot. The SCA Board then adopted the position, and SCA President Matt Larson and Vice President Nancy Backus sent a letter to the King County Council announcing SCA’s support for placing the levy on the ballot.

On July 20, the King County Council held a lengthy public hearing on the levy ordinance, during which SCA President Mayor Matt Larson of Snoqualmie, SCA Vice President Nancy Backus of Auburn, Mayor Leanne Guier of Pacific, and Councilmember De’Sean Quinn of Tukwila testified in support of the levy proposal. On July 22, the Council voted 8-1 to send the levy to voters in November. Councilmember Regan Dunn, the sole “no” vote, stated he had concerns about potential suppression of junior taxing districts. A number of amendments to the levy ordinance were adopted prior to final passage, including amendments meant to stave off impacts to junior taxing districts. The amendments adopted since the PIC last considered the Best Starts for Kids levy ordinance in July are summarized on page 173 of the September PIC packet. With the King County Council’s action, the levy will now appear on the November 3, 2015 ballot as King County Proposition 1. A campaign to promote the levy has been established.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, requested more information about the amendment clarifying the role of a board to provide advice and oversight to the levy. Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, stated that SCA staff would follow up with more information about the amendment. (Note: Staff has since obtained the requested information. The final version of the Best Starts for Kids legislation, Ordinance 18088, renames the levy overseeing group as the “oversight and advisory board.” An earlier version of the legislation called this the “youth advisory board.” Additionally, the final ordinance states that the “duties of the oversight and advisory board shall include making recommendations on and monitoring the distribution of levy proceeds.”)

13. Future Levies and Ballot Measures in King County
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, reported that an updated list in included in the meeting material packet along with recent results. Dawson asked that members provide SCA staff with any updates to the list.
14. SCA Issues for 2015
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, noted that in addition to the items contained in the staff memo, SCA staff is working on an upcoming item related to 2016 “Action Items” from the PSRC economic Development District Board.

The Executive Committee of the SCA Board raised the issue of Low Impact Development (LID). In response to a question from Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, Mayor Nancy Backus, Auburn, noted that LID requirements could have a significant impact on development in cities including cost impacts to developers, and a change to planning and public works within cities. Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, noted that this is an issue that Redmond has been addressing. Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, noted this could have a huge impact on small cities.

Dawson noted another issue recently discussed by the Executive Committee of the SCA Board, public records laws as they relate to body cameras. This is an issue on which Sheriff Urquhart has been active. The Sheriff has met with Renton Mayor Denis Law, who brought the issue to the attention of SCA staff. Dawson reported that the Executive Committee of the SCA Board would learn more about the issue, and may bring an item to the PIC. The Executive Committee of the SCA Board also discussed briefly whether SCA should engage this year on the more general topic of public records requests, although as this is a statewide issue, it may be more appropriate to defer to Association of Washington Cities (AWC). She sought feedback from the PIC. Councilmember Chris Roberts, Shoreline, questioned whether the issue of body cameras was also more of a statewide than local or regional issue. Dawson responded that it was unclear at this time whether this was an issue that had more impact on cities in King County, and whether it was an issue on which SCA should take a position. Roberts noted that, as a city that contracts with the Sheriff, did have an interest in the body cameras issue. He was interested in the topic coming back to PIC. Councilmember Barry Ladenburg, SeaTac, noted that there were additional issues with body cameras beyond the public records request issue. Councilmember Shelley Kloba, Kirkland, raised an additional issue relating to records request, noting that in some jurisdictions parking enforcement officers took photos of license plates rather than chalking tires, thus creating a similar issue relating to storage and retention of the photos. Dawson will report back to PIC as more information on the topic becomes available.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, noting the good discussion on homelessness at the pre-PIC workshop, suggested that drug use is a similar regional issue. He suggested an upcoming pre-PIC meeting devoted to this topic.

15. Upcoming Events
The next Public Issues Committee Meeting will be held on Wednesday, October 14, 2015, at 7:00 PM at Renton City Hall.

The next SCA Networking Dinner will be held on Wednesday, October 28, 2015, at 5:30 PM at Renton Pavilion Event Center.

16. For the Good of the Order
Councilmember John Stilin, Redmond, announced that on September 23, 2015, there will be a Regional Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Advisory Committee to provide new opportunities to build great transit oriented communities.

Mayor Dave Hill, Algona, announced that Washington State Department of Transportation is working with the City of Algona on installing a sound wall along SR 167 as part of the southbound High Occupancy Toll (HOT) Lane project.

Council President Hank Margeson, Redmond, added to Councilmember Stilin’s comment regarding transit-oriented development (TOD) and the Regional Equitable Development Initiative (REDI) Fund. The greater Seattle area will be the third community in the country, following successful funds in Denver and the San Francisco Bay Area, to borrow funds to develop an equitable TOD fund concept. The goal of identifying $5 million as an initial public sector investment has been met, which will be leveraged with matching funders.

Councilmember Tola Marts, Issaquah, announced that Issaquah Salmon Days are October 3-4, 2015.

Council President Kate Kruller, Tukwila, announced that the Regional Law, Safety, and Justice Committee (RLSJ) is starting to put together its work plan for 2016. She asked that issues or ideas be brought forward for the RLSJ to consider.

Chair Talmas announced that on October 9, 2015, King County’s three sub-area transportation boards are hosting the Advanced Transportation Technologies Conference. The event was developed and sponsored by Eastside Transportation Partnership, South County Area Transportation Board, and SeaShore Transportation Forum. Co-sponsors include Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), King County Metro, Washington State Department of Transportation and others. More information will be sent to members by Katie Kuciemba, SCA Senior Policy Analyst.

17. Adjourn
The meeting was adjourned at 8:57 PM.
### 2015 Roll Call – Public Issues Committee Meeting
#### September 9, 2015

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

Voting members are highlighted in **gray**. Cities represented are **bolded**.
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.

Purpose: Pursuant to audits and the overall intent of the council authorized by Ordinance 17941, and keeping with the best interests of the public 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 best practices, collaborative models, and national standards to ensure that the lives of citizens, property, and our first responders are protected; 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).

B. Mission and Purpose: The purpose of the REPSC will be to execute the specific requirements and intent of the 2015-2016 King County budget proviso, including defining the processes and role of the committee as it relates to developing and implementing a strategic plan for the collaborative, regional design and implementation of Next Generation 911 (NG 911) technology and services in King County. To meet the proviso objectives, the scope of the committee’s role and responsibilities shall include but not be limited to working jointly with the King County Executive, King County Council, and all E-911 Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and beneficial stakeholders to provide critical oversight of the operations, technology, management and administration of the Enhanced 911 Fund for the purposes and mission set forth in this ordinance. Such oversight and critical planning processes shall continue until such time as the REPSC and King County are able to establish a permanent regional governance structure for NG 911 in King County. Pursuant to Chapters 39.34 and 24.06 of the Revised Code of Washington, such a permanent body may be known as the Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Oversight Board (RENOB), assuming all powers, duties and obligations of the REPSC.

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 ensure 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. Four elected officials from other King County jurisdictions, recommended by the Sound Cities Association
7. A non-elected, sworn and certified representative of a law enforcement agency in King County not otherwise represented by membership on the REPSC
8. A sworn and certified representative of a King County fire agency not otherwise represented by membership on the REPSC
9. A large PSAP representative selected from NORCOM and Valley Communications
10. A small PSAP representative selected from Redmond, Issaquah, Enumclaw, Bothell, Port of Seattle and the University of Washington

E. **Project Coordination Team**: In addition to the REPSC, there shall be a Project Coordination Team (PCT) comprised of King County staff and 3 representatives of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The PCT’s role is to manage the work to be conducted, including selecting the facilitator and any consultants and oversight of their work. They shall also assist the facilitator with technical advice, planning and preparation of materials and agendas for upcoming meetings, and debriefs of past meetings. The PCT plans to meet the Friday after each REPSC meeting and one or two weeks prior to the next REPSC meeting in order to set the REPSC meeting agenda. The PCT reports to the REPSC and will remain in effect until the REPSC’s work is completed. Membership shall include:
   1. A representative of the King County Executive’s Office chosen by the executive
   2. King County Council staff chosen by the council
   3. A representative of the King County Auditor’s Office chosen by the Auditor, or a representative of the King County Office of Emergency Management chosen by the executive
   4. A member of the TAC representing Seattle public safety
   5. A member of the TAC representing large PSAPs
   6. A member of the TAC representing small PSAPs

F. **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)** (Open to all PSAP Directors or their designees and other interested stakeholders): The TAC will be a resource to the REPSC and will be facilitated by the project facilitator. The TAC will have the opportunity to meet at least one week before REPSC meetings, review and comment on REPSC agendas and minutes, and provide technical expertise upon request of the REPSC. If the TAC wishes to provide a technical report to the REPSC, the TAC report shall be provided to REPSC members in advance and time at each REPSC meeting will be reserved for facilitator presentation of the TAC report.

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

H. **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. With the advice of the PCT, the REPSC shall develop its own work plan and time-table as it
determines for the completion of its work. The REPSC 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.

I. **Funding**: Funding for the REPSC shall come from E-911 Program Office funds.

J. **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.

K. **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 Chair until a Chair 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, the PCT, and the King County E-911 Program Office.
   4. A Chair and Vice-Chair 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 Chair and Vice-Chair must be selected from voting members of the REPSC.
   5. Any voting member of the REPSC is eligible to be nominated and serve as Chair or Vice Chair. 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 Chair and Vice Chair shall be filled by a majority vote of the REPSC.
   6. The RESPC shall not conduct business unless a quorum is present. A quorum is defined as a majority of appointed members, excluding vacant seats.

L. **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 Chair 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.

M. **Duties of the REPSC**
   1. The duties of the REPSC shall continue as described here until such time as an Ordinance for permanent E-911 oversight authority is adopted by King County Council and all other required governmental signatories as required herein.
   2. Complete the Purpose and Mission of the REPSC.
   3. Provide 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. Provide periodic reports to the King 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 PSAPs in King County.
B. The REPSC shall transmit recommendations to the King County council and the executive related to annual distributions to the PSAPs of E-911 taxes collected by King County.
C. In cooperation with King County, the REPSC shall be responsible for reviewing and forwarding its recommendations related to all participation agreements that specify the distribution of E-911 taxes to King County PSAPs.
Item 6: Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Advisory Task Force 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 Councilmember Tom Agnew, Bothell; Mayor Dave Hill, Algona; Councilmember Michael Janasz, Skykomish, and Deputy Mayor Sean Kelly, Maple Valley as members to the EMS Advisory Task Force, as recommended by the PIC Nominating Committee.

Background
The PIC Nominating Committee met on October 6, 2015, to consider and recommend nominees for four Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Advisory Task Force vacancies.

EMS Advisory Task Force
SCA has four members on the EMS Advisory Task Force, to be filled by elected officials from cities with populations of fewer than 50,000. SCA received five nominations to fill the vacancies. Applicants were Councilmember Tom Agnew, Bothell; Mayor Dave Hill, Algona; Councilmember Michael Janasz, Skykomish; Deputy Mayor Sean Kelly, Maple Valley; and Councilmember Marianne Klaas, Clyde Hill. After considering the five nominations for the EMS Advisory Task Force, the PIC Nominating Committee voted to recommend Councilmember Tom Agnew, Mayor Dave Hill, Councilmember Michael Janasz, and Deputy Mayor Sean Kelly for the four member positions.

Each city with a population of 50,000 or greater may appoint one representative directly to the EMS Advisory Task Force but are asked to advise SCA who you will be appointing. King County staff will be contacting those cities with more information about making these appointments.

About the EMS Advisory Task Force
In 2011, in preparation for reauthorization of the expiring Medic One/EMS levy, the King County Executive convened the EMS Advisory Task Force. Comprised of leaders and decision makers from throughout the region, the Task Force worked collaboratively with EMS stakeholders for nine months to develop an inter-jurisdictional agreement on an updated EMS
Strategic Plan and financing package for the next funding period, which started in 2014. While the Task Force completed its charge in July of 2012, its role was later expanded in the 2014-2019 Strategic Plan to include reviewing recommended independent studies during the levy period. King County is now planning to reconvene the Task Force to work on these studies.

The current responsibilities of the Task Force, as outlined in the adopted 2014-2019 Strategic Plan, are to review and approve the scope of work for two independent studies and to review the final recommendations contained in both study reports. The first study will examine the delivery of Advanced Life Support (ALS) services to inform the next Strategic Plan. The study is to include analysis of the number of ALS providers appropriate for King County, governance, and the impact changing the number of ALS providers would have for EMS system costs. The second study will review the implementation of two new initiatives for the current levy period. The first initiative relates to records management and the second is the Basic Life Support (BLS) Lead Agency Program, meant to test the concept of designating a BLS lead agency to coordinate BLS-related issues across agencies.
Item 7: Appointment of 2016 Public Issues Committee (PIC) Nominating Committee Members

Action Item

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

2015 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.

Action
The Public Issues Committee (PIC) Chair will appoint members to the 2016 Public Issues Committee (PIC) Nominating Committee.

Background
SCA Bylaw 4.17.7(g) provides that “A nominating committee of the Public Issues Committee consisting of one representative of each SCA Regional Caucus shall be appointed by the Chair of the Public Issues Committee in October to recommend appointments to the committee. Members shall serve for a period of one year.”

In order to have a mixture of experience and fresh voices on the PIC Nominating Committee, the PIC Chair has typically reappointed 3 of the existing members of the committee each year, and appointed one new member. This year, Councilmember Ross Loudenback of North Bend, representing the Snoqualmie Valley Caucus, has volunteered to step down from the committee. This creates a vacancy for one PIC member from the Snoqualmie Valley to serve on the committee.

SCA staff conducted outreach to PIC members from the Snoqualmie Valley to serve on the committee for 2016. Councilmember Amy Ockerlander of Duvall has volunteered to serve.

At the October 2015 PIC meeting, PIC Chair Bernie Talmas will appoint members to serve on the 2016 PIC Nominating Committee. The Committee will meet in November 2015 to make appointments for 2016 regional boards and committees, and will continue to meet as needed in 2016 to fill vacancies that arise during the course of the year.

Questions can be directed to SCA Executive Director Deanna Dawson at Deanna@soundcities.org.
Item 8:
Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee 2016 Agenda

DISCUSSION ITEM

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

SCA Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee (RLSJC) Members
RLSJC Vice Chair and Tukwila Council President Kate Kruller (caucus chair); Redmond Councilmember Dave Carson; Kent Council President Dana Ralph; Covington Councilmember Joseph Cimaomo Jr.; Kirkland Councilmember Toby Nixon; Shoreline Councilmember Jesse Salomon; Issaquah Councilmember Tola Marts; Auburn Councilmember Claude DaCorsi

Discussion Item

Tukwila City Council President Kate Kruller currently serves as the Vice Chair for the Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee (RLSJC) and is slated to Chair the Committee in 2016. In preparation for 2016, Council President Kruller, who is also the SCA Caucus Chair, is seeking suggestions from the PIC on topics for the RLSJC to consider next year.

Background
The Regional Law Safety and Justice Committee (RLSJC) is the local law and justice council for King County. As required by state law (RCW 82.09.300), the RLSJC includes members representing city legislative authorities, including SCA appointees, as well as members from law enforcement; prosecution; superior, juvenile, district, and municipal courts; the county jail; state corrections; and other required representational categories.

The RLSJC meets seven times a year to discuss issues broadly related to the fields of the law, safety, and justice. Meetings typically center around a theme and include several panels or presentations. Discussion at the RLSJC can be instrumental in broadening regional understanding of changes in the law and best or promising practices and fostering regional and cross-system collaboration. Meeting topics from 2015 included:

- January: Suburban King County Coordinating Council on Gangs, the Second Chance Reentry Grant, and community revitalization in Tukwila
- February: Updates on the Legislature, King County Sheriff’s Office, and Seattle Police Department
- March: Restorative justice and compassionate policing
- May: Race and social justice, with presentations about Highline Public School’s efforts to reduce suspensions, the vision for the new King County Department of Public Defense, and the juvenile justice race and equity plan
• July: An introduction from new Seattle Police Chief Kathleen O’Toole and discussions about mental health legislation and the Alternatives to Boarding Task Force
• September: King County District Court technology update, Puget Sound Emergency Radio Network (PSERN) project update, and Valley Communications Center tour
• December: Homelessness panel discussions

Leadership for the RLSJC rotates on a three-year cycle between King County, SCA, and the City of Seattle. In 2015, King County Superior Court Judge Beth Andrus is the RLSJC Chair and SCA Caucus Chair and Tukwila City Council President Kate Kruller serves as the Vice Chair. Under RLSJC’s scheduled leadership rotation, SCA Caucus Chair Kruller will chair the RLSJC in 2016 and the City of Seattle will appoint the next Vice Chair.

**RLSJC 2016 Agenda**

Seven meetings are scheduled in 2016, with six to be held at Seattle City Hall. The September 29, 2016 meeting will be hosted offsite, traditionally in an SCA member city. The dates are as follows:

• January 28, 2016
• February 25, 2016
• March 24, 2016
• May 26, 2016
• July 28, 2016
• September 29, 2016
• December 1, 2016

The RLSJC Chair—in consultation with a steering committee that also includes the Vice Chair and any RLSJC members wishing to participate—is charged with planning the RLSJC’s seven meetings for the year. In preparation for SCA’s 2016 term as RLSCJ Chair, Caucus Chair Kruller is seeking suggestions from the PIC on law, safety and justice issues of the greatest relevance to member cities. In consultation with the SCA RLSJC Caucus, the following list of potential topics has been generated:

• **Juvenile justice**, including discussion of gun violence and racial disproportionality (Scheduled for January 28, 2016)
• **Disaster Preparedness**, including discussion of what communities, city governments, and CERT (Community Emergency Response Team) programs are doing to prepare for a major earthquake or other large-scale incident (Proposed for September 29, 2016 meeting to coincide with National Preparedness Month)
• **Surveillance Equipment/Body Cameras**, including discussion of 2016 legislation, public records implications, and technological barriers to implementation
• **Performance Metrics and Law Enforcement**, including discussion about whether current metrics are effective in gauging progress toward policy goals and the limitations and misuse of data
• **Gangs**, including discussion of regional law enforcement collaboration, the number and regional reach of gangs, and best practices for responding to local gang activity, such as tagging

• **Street racing**, including discussion of the scope and impacts of street racing in South King County

• **Safety**, including discussion of fire operations

• **Police community outreach**, including discussion about innovative projects and practices police are using to build trust with the public

• **Sexual assault**, including a presentation from the King County Sexual Assault Resource Center about Sexual Assault Awareness Month (April) and the [BE LOUD campaign](#), which aims to raise awareness about sexual violence and educate communities on ways to prevent it

• **Marijuana**, including discussion of local regulatory and enforcement approaches and state-level legislation

• **Racial disproportionality and cultural competency**, including discussion of a bill that would require the state to evaluate the racial and ethnic impacts of some legislation and a presentation about law enforcement best practices for working with those with difficulty communicating in English

• **Heroin and opioids**, including discussion of drug abuse trends, 2015 naloxone law, and the difficulties of siting treatment services

• **Property crime**, including discussion of the state’s high property crime rate and recent legislative pushes to address it

• **State legislative update**, with a focus on law, safety, and justice related bills

**Next Steps**

SCA Caucus Chair Kate Kruller will bring the ideas of the SCA Caucus and PIC forward to the RLSJC Steering Committee for consideration in planning the 2016 RLSJC agenda.
Item 9:  
Potential Amendment to Countywide Planning Policies re: Affordable Housing  

Discussion Item

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

Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) Members  
Maple Valley Councilmember Layne Barnes (caucus chair); Sammamish Councilmember Tom Odell; Renton Council President Ed Prince; Covington Mayor Pro Tem Jeff Wagner; Issaquah Councilmember Tola Marts; Redmond Councilmember John Stilin; Mercer Island Councilmember Debbie Bertlin (alternate); Pacific Mayor Leanne Guier (alternate); Duvall Councilmember Jason Walker (alternate); Beaux Arts Village Councilmember Tom Stowe (alternate).

Interjurisdictional Team (IJT) Members (Staff to the GMPC)  
Jack Pace, Tukwila; Kevin Snyder, Auburn; Rob Odle, Redmond; Eric Shields, Kirkland

At the last meeting of the Interjurisdictional Team (IJT), the City of Seattle brought forth a proposal to amend the Countywide Planning Policies and to add a line stating that in adopting affordable housing policies, jurisdictions “[c]onsider the full range of programs, including mandatory programs, that will assist in meeting the jurisdiction’s share of the countywide need for affordable housing.” The purpose of this item is to seek feedback from PIC members as to this amendment in advance of the November 6, 2015 GMPC meeting.

The SCA caucus of the GMPC will meet ahead of the PIC meeting to discuss the proposal, and their recommendation will be provided to PIC members at the PIC meeting.

Summary
The Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) is responsible for making recommendations to the King County Council on amendments to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs). The City of Seattle is proposing a change to Countywide Planning Policy Housing-8, H-8. The policy currently reads:

H-8: Tailor housing policies and strategies to local needs, conditions and opportunities, recognizing the unique strengths and challenges of different cities and sub-regions.

The policy as amended would read:  
H-8: Tailor housing policies and strategies to local needs, conditions and opportunities, recognizing the unique strengths and challenges of different cities and sub-regions.  Consider
the full range of programs, including mandatory programs, that will assist in meeting the jurisdiction’s share of the countywide need for affordable housing.

This amendment surfaced during Seattle’s identification of ways to increase affordable housing in Seattle, as recommended by the Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA) Committee Report. Among the committee’s recommendations was adopting mandatory inclusionary housing requirements, requiring that affordable housing units be included in new housing developments (inclusionary zoning) and requiring commercial developments to contribute fees towards affordable housing. Seattle staff noted that they believe the existing CPPs support such mandatory programs but are asking that the CPPs clarify such support with an explicit reference to mandatory programs.

Typically, CPP amendments go through a two meeting approval process at the GMPC to allow members the opportunity to fully consider policy amendments. Seattle is proposing that the GMPC make the proposed amendment at their November 6, 2015 meeting, as opposed to introducing the proposal in November with action on the proposal at a later meeting. (The next meeting of the GMPC would likely be in February 2016.)

GMPC members are seeking feedback from the PIC on both the substance and the timing of the Seattle proposal.

Background
The King County Countywide Planning Policies were initially adopted in 1992 after the passage of the state Growth Management Act. In 2012, the CPPs were updated (2012 Countywide Planning Policies) to take into account changes that had occurred over the 20 years since their initial adoption and to reflect the regional direction established in VISION 2040. The CPPs were restructured into six chapters mirroring VISION 2040: Environment, Development Patterns, Housing, Economy, Transportation and Public Facilities and Services. City comprehensive plans are required to be consistent both with VISION 2040 and the Countywide Planning Policies.

It is one policy from the Housing Chapter of the CPPs that is the subject of this memo. The purpose of the Housing Chapter is to “provide a framework for all King County jurisdictions to plan for and promote a range of affordable, accessible, and healthy housing choices for current and future residents.” The 18 housing policies are included as Attachment A.

The affordable housing policies were substantially revamped as part of the 2012 CPP amendment. A major change in policy came in response to concerns from a number of South King County cities – the main concern being that the policies did not take into account differences in affordability throughout the County; for example, the existing affordable housing stock in a city was not counted towards meeting affordable housing targets for that city. Prior to the 2012 amendment, cities had to plan for a targeted percentage of new housing to be affordable to low income households. South King County cities successfully argued that their existing affordable housing stock should count toward meeting their housing targets. The 2012 CPPs set out a countywide need for affordable housing based on area median income:
0-30% AMI  12% of total housing supply
30-50% AMI  12% of total housing supply
50-80% AMI  16% of total housing supply

Cities are required by the CPPs to address the countywide need for affordable housing but how they address such needs are currently left to each jurisdiction to determine based on local needs, conditions and opportunities.

The Growth Management Act and the CPPs require that each city develop an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs as part of a comprehensive plan. That work forms the basis for a city’s development of effective housing policies and programs. Each city’s policies and programs are tailored to that city’s specific circumstances. For example, some cities in South King County have sufficient housing for residents making between 30-80% of the area median income (AMI). Those cities may choose to enact policies to retain such affordable housing as opposed to creating new housing. Some cities in Northeast King County may have less affordable housing and may choose policies that result in an increased housing supply. Such policy development is within the purview of each city.

**Current Proposal to Amend CPPs**
The proposal from Seattle would result in a CPP that expressly states that jurisdictions consider mandatory programs in the development of housing policies and strategies:

> H-8: Tailor housing policies and strategies to local needs, conditions and opportunities, recognizing the unique strengths and challenges of different cities and sub-regions. Consider the full range of programs, including mandatory programs, that will assist in meeting the jurisdiction’s share of the countywide need for affordable housing.

Due to the unusual grammatical structure of the CPPs, it is somewhat unclear what the effect of this amendment would be. Does the amendment mean that jurisdictions “should” consider mandatory programs, or “shall” consider mandatory programs? Is there a meaningful distinction between the two readings in this context, given that the requirement is only to “consider” mandatory programs? There are no requirements for cities to report programs considered under the CPPs, and no definition of how cities must “consider” programs. Such consideration could happen at the staff, planning commission, or city council level.

As SCA’s Interjurisdictional Team (IJT) members have noted, cities are already considering a full range of policies as they develop comprehensive plans. These IJT staff members have expressed no concerns with the proposed policy. Under their analysis, the policy would not obligate any jurisdiction to do anything, it just provides another option (“mandatory solutions”) for cities to consider and many cities would likely consider those options anyway. IJT members note that when cities are drafting affordable housing policies and regulations, they typically consider a wide variety of options for achieving their goals and move forward with the options that work best for their community. Cities already often use the [Puget Sound Regional Council’s Housing](#)
Innovations Program Toolkit, a Toolkit that includes inclusionary zoning as one of its options, as they are researching options for local policies and regulations.

Several SCA cities (including Sammamish, Issaquah, Newcastle, Redmond and Kirkland) already have some form of inclusionary zoning within their cities. Other cities have requirements for provision of affordable housing in the context of master planned developments, or require an affordable housing component to achieve height or density bonuses. SCA staff has conferred with staff from several of these member cities. While they do not necessarily share Seattle’s concerns regarding the need for explicitly stating that mandatory housing program be considered, they have not raised objections to the change proposed by Seattle.

**Timing of Proposed Changes**
Seattle’s reason for moving the proposed policy amendment forward in an expedited manner is due to the extended process for CPP amendment approval and ratification. The GMPC meets quarterly and typically introduces a proposal at one meeting and acts on it at a following meeting. After GMPC approval, amendments go through a King County Council approval process and then are sent out for ratification to cities. The entire process can take several months or more. It should be noted that it is possible for the King County approval process to be expedited in addition to or in lieu of a not following typical GMPC protocol for policy amendments. If the GMPC used their usual protocol for considering the amendment, the GMPC would hear about the proposed change in November and then take action on it at their next meeting, likely in February 2016.

**Next Steps**
This item will be discussed at the November 6, 2015 GMPC meeting. Feedback from the PIC will help provide guidance to SCA GMPC members who will be asked to decide whether they support moving the policy forward and if so, whether the policy should be adopted in an expedited fashion, or whether it should come back in the normal course to the next GMPC meeting.

**Attachment**
A. King County Countywide Housing Planning Policies
The Countywide Planning Policies provide a framework for all jurisdictions to plan for and promote a range of affordable, accessible, and healthy housing choices for current and future residents. Within King County, there is an unmet need for housing that is affordable for households earning less than 80 percent of area median income (AMI). Households within this category include low-wage workers in services and other industries; persons on fixed incomes including many disabled and elderly residents; and homeless individuals and families. A high proportion of these households spend a greater percentage of their income on housing than is typically considered appropriate. This is especially true for low and very low income households earning 50 percent or less (low) and 30 percent or less (very-low) of area median income. The county and all cities share in the responsibility to increase the supply of housing that is affordable to these households.

While neither the county nor the cities can guarantee that a given number of units at a given price level will exist, be preserved, or be produced during the planning period, establishing the countywide need clarifies the scope of the effort for each jurisdiction. The type of policies and strategies that are appropriate for a jurisdiction to consider will vary and will be based on its analysis of housing. Some jurisdictions where the overall supply of affordable housing is significantly less than their proportional share of the countywide need may need to undertake a range of strategies addressing needs at multiple income levels, including strategies to create new affordable housing. Other jurisdictions that currently have housing stock that is already generally affordable may focus their efforts on preserving existing affordable housing through efforts such as maintenance and repair, and ensuring long-term affordability. It may also be appropriate to focus efforts on the needs of specific demographic segments of the population.

The policies below recognize the significant countywide need for affordable housing to focus on the strategies that can be taken both individually and in collaboration to meet the countywide need. These policies envision cities and the county following a four step process:

1. Conduct an inventory and analysis of housing needs and conditions;
2. Implement policies and strategies to address unmet needs;
3. Measure results; and
4. Respond to measurement with reassessment and adjustment of strategies.

The provision of housing affordable to very-low income households, those earning less than 30% of AMI, is the most challenging problem and one faced by all communities in the county. Housing for these very-low income households cannot be met solely through the private market. Meeting this need will require interjurisdictional cooperation and support from public agencies, including the cities and the county.
**Overarching Goal:** The housing needs of all economic and demographic groups are met within all jurisdictions.

**H-1** Address the countywide need for housing affordable to households with moderate, low and very-low incomes, including those with special needs. The countywide need for housing by percentage of Area Median Income (AMI) is:

- 50-80% of AMI (moderate) 16% of total housing supply
- 30-50% of AMI (low) 12% of total housing supply
- 30% and below AMI (very-low) 12% of total housing supply

**H-2** Address the need for housing affordable to households at less than 30% AMI (very low income), recognizing that this is where the greatest need exists, and addressing this need will require funding, policies and collaborative actions by all jurisdictions working individually and collectively.

**Housing Inventory and Needs Analysis**
The Growth Management Act requires an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs as part of each jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan housing element. Assessing local housing needs provides jurisdictions with information about the local housing supply, the cost of housing, and the demographic and income levels of the community’s households. This information on current and future housing conditions provides the basis for the development of effective housing policies and programs. While some cities may find that they meet the current need for housing for some populations groups, the inventory and needs analysis will help identify those income levels and demographic segments of the population where there is the greatest need. Further guidance on conducting a housing inventory and analysis is provided in Appendix 4.

**H-3** Conduct an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs of all economic and demographic segments of the population in each jurisdiction. The analysis and inventory shall include:

a. Characteristics of the existing housing stock, including supply, affordability and diversity of housing types;

b. Characteristics of populations, including projected growth and demographic change;

c. The housing needs of very-low, low, and moderate-income households; and

d. The housing needs of special needs populations.

**Strategies to Meet Housing Needs**
VISION 2040 encourages local jurisdictions to adopt best housing practices and innovative techniques to advance the provision of affordable, healthy, sustainable, and safe housing for all residents. Meeting the county’s affordable housing needs will require actions by a wide range of private for profit, non-profit and government entities, including substantial resources from federal, state, and local levels. No single tool will be sufficient to meet the full range of needs in a given jurisdiction. The county and cities are encouraged to employ a range of housing tools to
ensure the countywide need is addressed and to respond to local conditions. Further detail on the range of strategies for promoting housing supply and affordability is contained in Appendix 4.

Jobs-housing balance, addressed in H-9, is a concept that advocates an appropriate match between the number of existing jobs and available housing supply within a geographic area. Improving balance means adding more housing to job-rich areas and more jobs to housing-rich areas.

H-4  Provide zoning capacity within each jurisdiction in the Urban Growth Area for a range of housing types and densities, sufficient to accommodate each jurisdiction’s overall housing targets and, where applicable, housing growth targets in designated Urban Centers.

H-5  Adopt policies, strategies, actions and regulations at the local and countywide levels that promote housing supply, affordability, and diversity, including those that address a significant share of the countywide need for housing affordable to very-low, low, and moderate income households. These strategies should address the following:
   a.  Overall supply and diversity of housing, including both rental and ownership;
   b.  Housing suitable for a range of household types and sizes;
   c.  Affordability to very-low, low, and moderate income households;
   d.  Housing suitable and affordable for households with special needs;
   e.  Universal design and sustainable development of housing; and
   f.  Housing supply, including affordable housing and special needs housing, within Urban Centers and in other areas planned for concentrations of mixed land uses.

H-6  Preserve existing affordable housing units, where appropriate, including acquisition and rehabilitation of housing for long-term affordability.

H-7  Identify barriers to housing affordability and implement strategies to overcome them.

H-8  Tailor housing policies and strategies to local needs, conditions and opportunities, recognizing the unique strengths and challenges of different cities and sub-regions.

H-9  Plan for housing that is accessible to major employment centers and affordable to the workforce in them so people of all incomes can live near or within reasonable commuting distance of their places of work. Encourage housing production at a level that improves the balance of housing to employment throughout the county.

H-10 Promote housing affordability in coordination with transit, bicycle, and pedestrian plans and investments and in proximity to transit hubs and corridors, such as through transit oriented development and planning for mixed uses in transit station areas.

H-11  Encourage the maintenance of existing housing stock in order to ensure that the condition and quality of the housing is safe and livable.
**H-12** Plan for residential neighborhoods that protect and promote the health and well-being of residents by supporting active living and healthy eating and by reducing exposure to harmful environments.

**H-13** Promote fair housing and plan for communities that include residents with a range of abilities, ages, races, incomes, and other diverse characteristics of the population of the county.

**Regional Cooperation**
Housing affordability is important to regional economic vitality and sustainability. Housing markets do not respect jurisdictional boundaries. For these reasons, multijurisdictional efforts for planning and adopting strategies to meet regional housing needs are an additional tool for identifying and meeting the housing needs of households with moderate, low, and very-low incomes. Collaborative efforts, supported by the work of Puget Sound Regional Council and other agencies, contribute to producing and preserving affordable housing and coordinating equitable, sustainable development in the county and region. Where individual cities lack sufficient resources, collective efforts to fund or provide technical assistance for affordable housing development and preservation, and for the creation of strategies and programs, can help to meet the housing needs identified in comprehensive plans. Cities with similar housing characteristics tend to be clustered geographically. Therefore, there are opportunities for efficiencies and greater impact through interjurisdictional cooperation. Such efforts are encouraged and can be a way to meet a jurisdiction’s share of the countywide affordable housing need.

**H-14** Work cooperatively among jurisdictions to provide mutual support in meeting countywide housing growth targets and affordable housing needs.

**H-15** Collaborate in developing sub-regional and countywide housing resources and programs, including funding, to provide affordable housing for very-low, low-, and moderate-income households.

**H-16** Work cooperatively with the Puget Sound Regional Council and other agencies to identify ways to expand technical assistance to local jurisdictions in developing, implementing and monitoring the success of strategies that promote affordable housing that meets changing demographic needs. Collaborate in developing and implementing a housing strategy for the four-county central Puget Sound region.

**Measuring Results**
Maintaining timely and relevant data on housing markets and residential development allows the county and cities to evaluate the effectiveness of their housing strategies and to make appropriate changes to those strategies when and where needed. In assessing efforts to meet their share of the countywide need for affordable housing, jurisdictions need to consider public actions taken to encourage development and preservation of housing affordable to households with very low-, low- and moderate-incomes, such as local funding, development code changes,
and creation of new programs, as well as market and other factors that are beyond local government control. Further detail on monitoring procedures is contained in Appendix 4.

**H-17** Monitor housing supply, affordability, and diversity, including progress toward meeting a significant share of the countywide need for affordable housing for very-low, low, and moderate income households. Monitoring should encompass:

a. Number and type of new housing units;
b. Number of units lost to demolition, redevelopment, or conversion to non-residential use;
c. Number of new units that are affordable to very-low, low-, and moderate-income households;
d. Number of affordable units newly preserved and units acquired and rehabilitated with a regulatory agreement for long-term affordability for very-low, low-, and moderate-income households;
e. Housing market trends including affordability of overall housing stock;
f. Changes in zoned capacity for housing, including housing densities and types;
g. The number and nature of fair housing complaints and violations; and
h. Housing development and market trends in Urban Centers.

**H-18** Review and amend, a minimum every five years, the countywide and local housing policies and strategies, especially where monitoring indicates that adopted strategies are not resulting in adequate affordable housing to meet the jurisdiction’s share of the countywide need.
**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 October 14, 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 Center(^2)</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 Algonia 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.

The 2015 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.” In response to the County Council’s budget proviso, the County Executive transmitted an ordinance. The Executive’s Office later submitted a revised proposal regarding the makeup and role of the committee (Attachment A). Directors of the 9 non-Seattle, non-King County 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 (Attachment B).

As noted at the last PIC meeting (see September 9, 2015 PIC minutes), members of the SCA caucus of the Regional Policy Committee (RPC) developed a proposal that attempted to reconcile key differences between the PSAP Directors’ proposal, and the Executive’s proposal (Attachment C). At the September 9, 2015 RPC meeting, the issue was continued to the October meeting in order to give County and Seattle representatives on the RPC time to evaluate this new proposal.

Additional background on this issue can be found in materials from the September PIC meeting (see September 9, 2015 PIC Packet, page 102).

**Current Proposal**
Following the September RPC meeting, County Council staff met with representatives from the 9 PSAP coalition, the City of Seattle, and the Executive’s Office to attempt to build consensus. Council staff drafted a new proposal, which was submitted to RPC members for review on October 5, 2015 (Attachment D).

This proposal from Council staff contained many of the concepts in the earlier proposal from SCA members. The proposal also contained additional detail on a proposed scoping process, and timeline. The proposal drafted by Council staff reflected many areas of commonality between the various stakeholders, but noted some areas where there was not yet clear consensus, and sought feedback and guidance from the elected officials moving forward.

The SCA caucus of the RPC met on October 6, 2015 to discuss the proposal, and to give the requested feedback. SCA staff prepared a summary of the SCA caucus recommendations, which was provided to Council staff on October 7 (Attachment E). This was also shared with Seattle staff.

The Council staff proposal included an E911 System Strategic Plan Scoping Committee (SC), which would in turn be comprised of 3 subcommittees:
• Project Coordination Team (PCT)
  o Under this proposal, this staff group would be charged with developing draft
    agendas for Program Working Group (PWG) and Leadership Group (LG)
    consideration, and identifying the resources needed to support LG and PWG
    deliberations
• Program Working Group (PWG)
  o Under this proposal, this staff group would be charged with transmitting
    recommendations and/or options to the Leadership Group (LG) for
    consideration
• Leadership Group (LG)
  o This group was proposed to be similar to the King County Regional 9-1-1
    Emergency Number Program Steering Committee (REPSC) previously proposed
    by the PSAP Directors and the SCA caucus of the RPC, and the PSAP Committee
    previously proposed by the Executive
  o A key difference between these earlier proposals was that the SCA and PSAP
    proposals included both elected officials and PSAP Directors on the committee,
    while the Executive proposal did not include PSAP Directors
  o The Council staff proposal did not resolve the issue of whether this group should
    contain PSAP Directors

In addition to these committees, Council staff recommended the formation of two additional
staff groups:
• Consultant Selection Committee (CSC)
• Interim E911 Advisory Group (IAG)
  o The IAG would provide a formal structure for PSAPS to advise and consult with
    the E911 office regarding technology, financial and system operational issues
    through the completion of an E911 System Strategic Plan process and
    implementation of a governance system. The IAG replaces the existing informal
    PSAP managers meeting convened by the E911 Office. The IAG shall be informed
    by, and provide comment and recommendations to, the County's E911 Office
    2017-2018 Budget Proposal, and E911 system financial, capital and operating
    issues, and any technology prioritization as issues emerge.

In general, the SCA caucus of the RPC was concerned that the proposed structure with multiple
staff committees with overlapping membership would be challenging to administer. They felt
that the process could be streamlined by combining some of the staff committees. They were
also concerned about the makeup of some of the proposed committees. They wanted to ensure
a balanced structure where stakeholders were evenly represented, and that would encourage
decision-making by consensus.

To that end, the SCA caucus of the RPC made the following recommendations:

• They agreed with the recommendation to form an Interim Advisory Group (IAG), and
  proposed makeup of the group
They recommended that the remaining 3 staff groups (Consultant Selection Committee, Project Working Group, and Project Coordination Team) be consolidated into a single group: **Project Coordination Team (PCT)**

- They recommended that the group have 6 members total:
  - 4 PSAP Members
    - 1 representative from large PSAPs (NORCOM or Valley Com), to be selected by those PSAPs
    - 1 representative from other PSAPs (Bothell, Enumclaw, Issaquah, Port of Seattle, Redmond, University of WA, or Washington State Patrol), to be selected by those PSAPs
    - 1 representative from the Seattle PSAPs
    - 1 representative from the King County Sheriff’s Office PSAP
  - 1 Council Staff Member
  - 1 Member from Executive Office or the E911 Office

- The group felt that having an even number of members will ensure that the group is working by consensus
- The group agreed that the PCT should be tasked with the roles previously specified for the 3 groups, and in addition should be tasked with “reviewing materials to be provided to Leadership Group”

They recommended the following makeup for the **Leadership Group (LG)**

- 14 total members (all voting):
  - 3 County Council Members
  - 2 Seattle elected officials
  - 3 non-Seattle elected officials, to be appointed by SCA
  - The Executive or his designee
  - The King County Sheriff or his designee
  - 1 elected official appointed by the County Council
    - Council staff have indicated that the Council is considering appointing a fire district commissioner to the committee
  - 1 representative from “large” PSAPs (NORCOM or Valley Com), to be selected by those PSAPs
  - 1 representative from “small” PSAPs (Bothell, Enumclaw, Issaquah, Port of Seattle, Redmond, University of WA, or Washington State Patrol), to be selected by those PSAPs
  - 1 Seattle PSAP representative

- This recommendation balances the interests of the various stakeholders

They agreed that the legislation should require that the Executive transmit a Strategic Planning Process report by July 30, 2016 if no report is transmitted by the Scoping Committee by May 31, 2016
• They recommended that the following language be inserted to clarify the role of the committees, and the structure of the E911 system in King County:

_The E-911 system in King County is comprised of two distinct and separate elements; the routing of a 911 call to the appropriate Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) and the dispatch of the police, fire and/or EMS agency(ies) having jurisdiction. The call routing functionality is funded by E-911 surcharge taxes collected throughout the County and is the responsibility of the King County E-911 Program Office. The PSAP, of which there are 12 in King County and operate under local authority, is responsible for the subsequent interview and dispatching of first-responders. A portion of the E-911 surcharge tax is distributed to the local PSAPs by the King County E-911 Program Office to support technology decision applications and impacts relative to call routing, however, the majority of PSAP funding is provided by their stakeholders and sources other than the E-911 surcharge tax._

_The King County E-911 Program Office is facing a number of financial, strategic and technological challenges with the implementation of the Next Generation E-911 technology. The King County Council desires to establish a King County E-911 Strategic Plan that will address system priorities for King County E-911 Program Office and guide the ongoing process for decision making, funding and implementing those priorities. As such, Council Staff have been meeting with PSAPs and Executive staff to identify stakeholder interests._

**Section I**

_A. The King County call routing system is funded by E-911 surcharge taxes collected throughout the County. The County’s stewardship of this part of the overall system should balance the role of the E-911 Program Office with the role and responsibility of the local PSAP contributors in the delivery of 911 interview, dispatch and related services._

The SCA caucus of the RPC agreed that it was important to include this language (drafted by Lora Ueland of Valley Com) to clarify the separate and distinct elements of the E911 system: the call routing function (performed by the County E911 program office) and the dispatch role performed by the PSAPs. The language is also important in that it clarifies that PSAPs operate under local authority, not authority of the County.

**Next Steps**

The SCA Caucus of the RPC transmitted their recommendations to Council staff on October 7, 2015. They, along with SCA staff, are also conducting outreach to Seattle and the Executive’s office in an attempt to build consensus on a proposal. This proposal may be further refined based on feedback from those stakeholders, and/or the PSAPs. SCA staff will provide additional
information to PIC members as it becomes available. The RPC will be discussing and possibly taking action at its meeting on October 14, 2015.

Attachments

A. Executive’s Revised Proposal
B. PSAP Directors’ Proposal
C. SCA Caucus of RPC Initial September Proposal
D. County Council Staff Proposal
E. SCA Caucus of RPC Feedback on County Council Staff Proposal
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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.
Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Committee: Purpose, Processes and Role

**Background:** King County Enhanced 911 (E911) program funding and operations have been heavily affected 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 Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) have worked together to implement Next Generation 911 (NG911) technology over the last decade. 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 and decreasing 911 funding from wireless and VoIP technology, necessitates a collective recommendation by stakeholders for a service-driven, sustainable, 10-year vision, preferred governance model and strategic plan for the NG911 system in King County.

King County E911 is in agreement with the King County Auditor’s recommendation to temporarily suspend implementation of new NG911 technology until a detailed E911 and NG911 strategic plan is completed. King County E911 also agrees with the Auditor’s 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.

**Phased Approach to Reach Recommendations for Implementation, Governance & Operations for E911 & NG911 for King County.** In order to move rapidly to a strong strategic plan framework and to ensure that the system has a strong foundation with a regional vision, strategic plan, and governance model from which to operate, the PSAP Oversight Committee (hereinafter “PSAP Committee”) will be convened. The PSAP Committee, with support of a strong facilitator, will identify a proposed path forward for the E911 system and implementation of NG911 in King County — recommendations for a regional vision, strategic direction, and governance model, including roles and duties of the permanent governance model. This work will be accomplished in Phase I and the proposed model transmitted by the King County Executive and approved by the King County Council. After the Phase I work is complete, the PSAP Committee will dissolve and the new governance structure will be established in a Phase II. In Phase II, the strategic plan will be developed and implemented by the governance structure within the future governance model. The workplan for Phase I (October 2015-April 2016), including the roles and responsibilities of the PSAP Committee, is included below.

**Phase I: Regional Vision, Strategic Direction, and Governance Recommendations for E911 & NG911**

**Milestone:** Complete by April 30, 2016

**Purpose/Role of PSAP Committee.** The PSAP Committee called for by the Ordinance is a high-level policy body convened to recommend a strategic plan for the implementation, governance and operation
of NG911 in King County. To accomplish this work, the PSAP Committee will develop and recommend a regional vision, strategic direction, and governance model for E911 and NG911, and produce and submit to the King County Executive and Council a report that includes these recommendations and a draft strategic plan framework for the implementation, governance and operation of the E911 and NG911 system in King County.

**PSAP Committee work:** The PSAP Committee will make recommendations on the following:

**Regional Vision and Strategic Direction**
- **Vision and Mission Statement** for King County E911, including NG911;
- **Guiding Principles** for the King County E911 system, including NG911;
- **Goals** of the King County E911 system, including NG911 implementation;

**Governance Structure**
- **Governance** for the regional organizational model for the E911 system;
- **Proposed Infrastructure and Operating Rules/Bylaws** for the E911 system, including possible supporting bodies such as a technical advisory committee and a financial subcommittee;
- **Roles and Duties** of the recommended governance model;

and,

**Strategic Plan Framework/Timeline**
- **Strategic Plan development framework/components/implementation** steps, timeline or other recommendations.

**PSAP Committee Processes:** The PSAP Committee will work with a consultant/facilitator, who will be charged with supporting the group to reach the recommendations listed above. The PSAP Committee will also benefit from the technical expertise of a Technical Advisory Committee comprised of all PSAP Directors or their designees and any other stakeholders that wish to participate. A Project Coordination Team will work to assure that the project is on schedule and on budget, and assist the facilitator and the PSAP Committee to assure development of key agenda items and background information, including governance models. The PSAP Committee will adopt a Charter (and Bylaws as needed) to govern its decision-making for Phase I.

To accomplish this work, the **PSAP Committee** will be oriented to the following:
- The 2015/2016 budget proviso;
- 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 for King County E911, including NG911; and,
The most recent work by the King County Auditor’s Office, which included a financial review and a technical audit of E911.

Phase II: (Future Governance Model) Develop and Implement 10-Year Strategic Plan for a Sustainable E911 System and NG911 Implementation in King County

Milestone: Complete by December 31, 2016

The new preferred governance model as recommended by the PSAP Committee, transmitted by the King County Executive and adopted by the King County Council, would then produce and submit to the Executive and Council a recommended strategic plan for a sustainable E911 system and implementation of NG911. It is anticipated that the strategic plan could include, but is not limited to:

- System operating rules
- NG 911 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 PSAP Committee in Phase I may address components of these issues to be included in a proposed strategic plan framework.
Description of Roles and Responsibilities: PSAP Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, Facilitator, Project Coordination Team and Project Manager

PSAP Oversight Committee (Established by ordinance with membership approved by the King County Council): The PSAP Committee (hereinafter “PSAP Committee”) is responsible for recommending a preferred governance model and the policy direction/framework for the components of a strategic plan for the governance and operation of a sustainable E911 system, and implementation of NG911 in King County. The PSAP Committee will also propose operating rules and infrastructure for countywide Enhanced 911 (E911) operations. The PSAP Committee may also convene other sub-committees as needed to provide additional technical advice, and receive input from the Technical Advisory Committee (see below), which is open to all PSAP stakeholders.

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) (Open to all PSAP Directors or their designees and other interested stakeholders): The TAC will be a resource to the PSAP Committee and will be facilitated by the project Facilitator. The TAC will have the opportunity to meet at least one week before PSAP Committee meetings, review and comment on PSAP Committee agendas, minutes, and provide technical expertise upon request of the PSAP Committee. If the TAC wishes to provide a technical report to the PSAP Committee, the TAC report shall be provided to PSAP Committee members in advance and time at each Committee meeting will be reserved at the PSAP Committee meeting for Facilitator presentation of the TAC report.

Facilitator (A non-voting committee member selected through a competitive process – PSAP representatives will be included in the selection process): The Facilitator will have the overall responsibility for working with PSAP Committee members, laying the process foundation, building the framework for consensus and guiding the PSAP Committee towards producing a recommended preferred governance model and the policy direction for the framework/components of a strategic plan as directed by the proviso. The Facilitator will also work with the TAC and any other subcommittees convened by the PSAP Committee to accomplish the scope of work. The Project Manager will be responsible for managing the contract with the Facilitator.

Project Coordination Team and Project Manager: The Project Coordination Team is comprised of King County staff from the Executive and Council branches, and up to four members of the PSAP Technical Advisory Committee. The role of the Project Coordination Team and the Project Manager is to provide input to and support of the Facilitator. The Project Manager is primarily responsible for ensuring the Facilitator has support for a successful process and for leading the Project Coordination Team. The Project Manager will report to the Department of Executive Services.
## Phase I: PSAP Committee Workplan (to be complete by April 2016)

### Developing Regional Vision, Strategic Direction, Governance Model, Strategic Plan Framework Recommendations for NG911

The purpose of Phase I is to develop and recommend a regional vision, strategic direction, and governance model for E911 and policy direction for the framework/components of a strategic plan. The Facilitator contract will include optional services for continuation to Phase II. The Workplan below includes roles and responsibilities of the PSAP Committee, as well as the Facilitator, Project Coordination Team and Project Manager, who will help to ensure successful outcomes of the project.

### PSAP Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>PSAP Committee</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Project Coordination Team &amp; Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lay the Process Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participate in initial interviews with Facilitator and:</td>
<td>Assist with developing interview script to be used by Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Express opinions, perspectives, and interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Identify possible solutions</strong> that might be proposed during the meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Conduct initial interviews</strong> with PSAP Committee members and:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand their opinions, perspectives, and interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Learn of possible solutions that they may propose during the meetings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ensure members are comfortable with and supportive of the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet with Technical Advisory Committee to receive input</td>
<td></td>
<td>Meet with Technical Advisory Committee to receive input</td>
<td>Convene Technical Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Project Manager to develop a detailed work plan, budget and schedule.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Project Manager to develop a detailed work plan, budget and schedule.</td>
<td>Project Manager - Work with facilitator to develop a detailed work plan, budget and schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review draft materials</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Project Coordination Team to define topics that will be a part of the PSAP Committee process to identify preferred governance models and vision,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>PSAP Committee</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Project Coordination Team &amp; Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft and finalize the letter that invites the PSAP Committee members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a memo that summarizes general themes of the interviews.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with Project Coordination Team to brief, review, provide input on, and organize a background notebook of information for committee members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>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></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support Facilitator in identifying overall schedule, agenda topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with Project Coordination Team to determine composition of meeting agendas, materials and presentations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Manager: Prepare agendas for meetings with Project Coordination Team, in consultation with the Facilitator. Assist facilitator with creating meeting materials and presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>PSAP Committee</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Project Coordination Team &amp; Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build the Framework of Consensus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend seven – eight Committee meetings. Meetings are anticipated to be three hours each.</td>
<td>Prepare for, convene, facilitate and follow up on committee meetings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend additional meetings as needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish PSAP Committee operating Charter and bylaws/ground rules</td>
<td>Propose PSAP Committee Charter, bylaws/ground rules (and additional procedures, as needed) and finalize those with members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicate as needed with Facilitator between meetings.</td>
<td>Build positive working relationships with PSAP Committee members 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></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schedule PSAP Committee meetings and subcommittee meetings, if any.</td>
<td>Support Facilitator in obtaining and providing relevant materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide all materials and logistic support for meetings. Provide logistic support for all PSAP 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 (background notebooks, briefing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>PSAP Committee</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Project Coordination Team &amp; Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials and all hard copy materials)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide refreshments, as appropriate, and any necessary audio/visual aids.</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></td>
<td>If meeting summaries are prepared from the Project Coordination Team meetings, they will be prepared by County staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordination Team will be responsive to requests for information and analysis from PSAP 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>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Edit meeting summary, if needed, then re-distribute the finalized summary of the meeting with the draft agenda for the next session.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose and help committee evaluate potential recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attend Project Coordination Team meetings with King County staff.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend and support Project Coordination Team meetings with Facilitator.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>PSAP Committee</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Project Coordination Team &amp; Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with King County staff as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>PSAP Committee</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Project Coordination Team &amp; Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft and Finalize the Recommendations for a Regional Vision, Strategic Direction, Governance Model and Policy Direction for a Proposed Strategic Plan (Framework/Components, Implementation Steps and Timeline) for E911 and NG911 Implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and strive to reach consensus on recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate effective process leading to recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Prepare a summary report that documents the process, information provided to the PSAP Committee, Committee discussion summaries and the consensus-recommended preferred vision, governance model, and policy direction for a proposed Strategic Plan, implementation steps and timeline.  
  - Circulate the draft report to all participants and stakeholders, and solicit comments.  
  - Include dissenting comments, if any | | | |
<p>| Support preparation of a summary report that documents the process, information provided to the PSAP Committee, Committee discussion summaries and the consensus recommendations. | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>PSAP Committee</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Project Coordination Team &amp; Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve final report</td>
<td>In conjunction with Project Coordination Team, produce the final consensus report to be presented to the PSAP Committee for approval</td>
<td>Work with Project Coordination Team to prepare presentation materials and messaging pieces</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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Technical Advisory Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Technical Advisory Committee</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
<th>Project Coordination Team &amp; Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assure Technical Participation from PSAPs</td>
<td>Attend facilitator-led TAC meetings (to be scheduled approximately one week before PSAP Committee meetings)</td>
<td>Create TAC meeting agendas Facilitate TAC meetings</td>
<td>Project Manager Assist Facilitator with creation of TAC meeting agendas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review/comment on proposed PSAP Committee agendas/materials</td>
<td>Support PSAP Committee in identifying areas for TAC research/input Solicit TAC meeting agenda items from TAC</td>
<td>Project Coordination Team Support Facilitator in identifying key themes for report-outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare TAC report(s) on specific PSAP Committee agenda items (by request or TAC-initiated)</td>
<td>Provide TAC report at each PSAP Committee meeting, as requested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Phase I: Facilitator Deliverables, Milestones

The table below outlines the tasks involved in supporting the PSAP Committee, and tentative deliverables milestones, pending approval of the report by Council by end of September and final scope of work/contract with the consultant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Deliverables</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lay the Process Foundation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare &amp; reach agreement on scope of work and schedule</td>
<td>Final scope of work, budget and schedule</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>November 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final invitation letter to committee members</td>
<td>Project Coordination Team (PCT)</td>
<td>October 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial communication with PSAP Committee Members</td>
<td>Initial interviews w/committee members</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>December 3, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memo that summarizes members interests</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>December 3, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement of key findings and mutual interests</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>December 3, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up PSAP Committee meetings and framework</td>
<td>Schedule meetings for Committee, and Project Coordination Team</td>
<td>PCT*</td>
<td>November 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*First meeting by approx. Nov 19</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Remainder of meetings</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 PSAP Committee</td>
<td>Create draft background notebook</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>November 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and shape background notebook</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>November 15, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Materials for PSAP Committee Meetings</td>
<td>Work with Project Coordination Team to prepare and establish PSAP Committee meeting agendas</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</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 presentations</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks</td>
<td>Deliverables</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>Milestones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build the Framework of Consensus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate PSAP Committee meetings</td>
<td>Prepare for, facilitate and follow-up on PSAP Committee meetings</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>1-2 times per month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare draft Charter/bylaws, ground rules</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>November 19, 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>Ongoing communication with PSAP Committee members</td>
<td>Build relationships with PSAP 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>Facilitate Sub-Committee meetings (if needed)</td>
<td>Facilitate and support sub-committees as needed</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication w/ Staff</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finalize the Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Final Report</td>
<td>Draft final report</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare final report</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>March 31, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Framework/Components of 10-Year Strategic Plan for King County E911 &amp; Implementation of NG911</td>
<td>Draft outline of draft recommended strategic plan, to be attached to final report</td>
<td>Facilitator/Project Coordination Team</td>
<td>March 1, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare final outline of recommended strategic plan</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>March 31, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in Briefings and updates of Executive, Council and Other Stakeholders</td>
<td>Prepare presentation materials summarizing committee work</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>March 31, 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentations to stakeholders as needed</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase I: Proposed Schedule

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Potential Committee Meeting Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Overview, introductions, role, scope, schedule, ground rules, charter for Phase I, background (work to date)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>December</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>January</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of governance models

Additional background (examples of best practices), discuss vision, mission, principles and goals

Additional background (incl infrastructure needs & investments), review & discuss possible governance models, roles and duties of governance model, pros/cons
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>February</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>April</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Optional meeting - continue discussion of governance models
- Select recommended preferred alternatives (governance models); discuss potential recommendations for components of strategic plan
- Strategic plan components - develop recommendations
- Review / approve strategic plan outline; draft report to Council
- Optional meeting - Review/approve strategic plan outline; revised draft report to Council
- Approve final report

Committee meetings
Project Coordination Team meetings
**PSAP Project Coordination Team: Members and Responsibilities**

Project Coordination Team (PCT): This team is comprised of King County staff and up to 4 representatives of the TAC. The team’s role is to assist the facilitator with planning and preparation of materials and agendas for upcoming meetings and debriefs of past meetings. The PCT plans to meet the Friday after each PSAP 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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hitchcock</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Facilitator &amp; Project Support</td>
<td>Dept. of Executive Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lise Kaye</td>
<td>Senior Legislative Analyst</td>
<td>County Legislative Policy Liaison</td>
<td>Central Council Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jody Woodcock</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
<td>Emergency Management Policy Expertise</td>
<td>Emergency Management</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>Diane Carlson</td>
<td>Director Regional Initiatives</td>
<td>Executive Office Strategic Direction</td>
<td>Executive’s Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAC Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technical Advisory Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PSAP Committee Membership

PSAP Oversight Committee (hereinafter PSAP Committee) membership was specified in the P1 proviso. Two additional members are being recommended by the Executive: One position to allow for a fire representative to serve on the PSAP Committee and a second position allowing for an E911 independent technical expert to serve as a non-voting member of the Committee. The E911 independent technical expert is expected to be selected from outside of the King County E911 system, in order to provide an external perspective. In addition, the Facilitation Consultant will serve as a non-voting member, per the Proviso.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position/Representation</th>
<th>Designated by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Chair</td>
<td>Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair Regional Coordination</td>
<td>Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair Law Safety Justice Committee</td>
<td>Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive or designee</td>
<td>Executive per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Elected Official</td>
<td>Appointed by Seattle Mayor per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elected Official other jurisdiction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Large PSAP North)</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Large PSAP South)</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Small PSAP)</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Cities Association (SCA) Representative</td>
<td>Appointed by SCA per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Representative</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Recommended additional position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Representative</td>
<td>Appointed by King County Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-voting Members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation Consultant</td>
<td>Selected by Executive per Proviso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Technical Representative (outside of King County PSAP system)</td>
<td>Recommended by Executive, Appointed by Council</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.

Purpose: Pursuant to audits and the overall intent of the council authorized by Ordinance 17941, and keeping with the best interests of the public 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 best practices, collaborative models, and national standards to ensure that the lives of citizens, property, and our first responders are protected; 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).

B. Mission and Purpose: The purpose of the REPSC will be to execute the specific requirements and intent of the 2015-2016 King County budget proviso, including defining the processes and role of the committee as it relates to developing and implementing a strategic plan for the collaborative, regional design and implementation of NG 911 technology and services in King County. To meet the proviso objectives, the scope of the committee’s role and responsibilities shall include but not be limited to working jointly with the King County Executive, King County Council, and all E-911 PSAPs and beneficial stakeholders to provide critical oversight of the operations, technology, management and administration of the Enhanced 911 Fund for the purposes and mission set forth in this ordinance. Such oversight and critical planning processes shall continue until such time as the REPSC and King County are able to establish a permanent regional governance structure for NG 911 in King County. Pursuant to Chapters 39.34 and 24.06 of the Revised Code of Washington, such a permanent body may be known as the Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Oversight Board (RENOB), assuming all powers, duties and obligations of the REPSC.

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 PSAPs in King County
   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. E-911 Liaison to King County Council
   9. Such other liaisons as the REPSC may determine as needed 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 REPSC shall develop its own work plan and time-table as it determines for the completion of its work. The REPSC 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. In cooperation with the County Executive, 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 continue as described here until such time as an Ordinance for permanent E-911 oversight authority is adopted by King County Council and all other required governmental signatories as required 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. 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 PSAPs in King County.
B. The REPSC shall transmit recommendations to the county council and the executive related to annual distributions to the PSAPs of E-911 taxes collected by King County.
C. In cooperation with King County, the REPSC shall be responsible for reviewing and forwarding its recommendations related to all participation agreements that specify the distribution of E-911 taxes to King County PSAPs.
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.

Purpose: Pursuant to audits and the overall intent of the council authorized by Ordinance 17941, and keeping with the best interests of the public 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 best practices, collaborative models, and national standards to ensure that the lives of citizens, property, and our first responders are protected; 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).

B. Mission and Purpose: The purpose of the REPSC will be to execute the specific requirements and intent of the 2015-2016 King County budget proviso, including defining the processes and role of the committee as it relates to developing and implementing a strategic plan for the collaborative, regional design and implementation of Next Generation 911 (NG 911) technology and services in King County. To meet the proviso objectives, the scope of the committee’s role and responsibilities shall include but not be limited to working jointly with the King County Executive, King County Council, and all E-911 Public Safety Answering Points (PSAPs) and beneficial stakeholders to provide critical oversight of the operations, technology, management and administration of the Enhanced 911 Fund for the purposes and mission set forth in this ordinance. Such oversight and critical planning processes shall continue until such time as the REPSC and King County are able to establish a permanent regional governance structure for NG 911 in King County. Pursuant to Chapters 39.34 and 24.06 of the Revised Code of Washington, such a permanent body may be known as the Regional 9-1-1 Emergency Number Program Oversight Board (RENOB), assuming all powers, duties and obligations of the REPSC.

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 ensure 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. Four elected officials from other King County jurisdictions, recommended by the Sound Cities Association
7. A non-elected, sworn and certified representative of a law enforcement agency in King County not otherwise represented by membership on the REPSC
8. A sworn and certified representative of a King County fire agency not otherwise represented by membership on the REPSC
9. A large PSAP representative selected from NORCOM and Valley Communications
10. A small PSAP representative selected from Redmond, Issaquah, Enumclaw, Bothell, Port of Seattle and the University of Washington

E. **Project Coordination Team:** In addition to the REPSC, there shall be a Project Coordination Team (PCT) comprised of King County staff and 3 representatives of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The PCT’s role is to manage the work to be conducted, including selecting the facilitator and any consultants and oversight of their work. They shall also assist the facilitator with technical advice, planning and preparation of materials and agendas for upcoming meetings, and debriefs of past meetings. The PCT plans to meet the Friday after each REPSC meeting and one or two weeks prior to the next REPSC meeting in order to set the REPSC meeting agenda. The PCT reports to the REPSC and will remain in effect until the REPSC’s work is completed. Membership shall include:
   1. A representative of the King County Executive’s Office chosen by the executive
   2. King County Council staff chosen by the council
   3. A representative of the King County Auditor’s Office chosen by the Auditor, or a representative of the King County Office of Emergency Management chosen by the executive
   4. A member of the TAC representing Seattle public safety
   5. A member of the TAC representing large PSAPs
   6. A member of the TAC representing small PSAPs

F. **Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)** (Open to all PSAP Directors or their designees and other interested stakeholders): The TAC will be a resource to the REPSC and will be facilitated by the project facilitator. The TAC will have the opportunity to meet at least one week before REPSC meetings, review and comment on REPSC agendas and minutes, and provide technical expertise upon request of the REPSC. If the TAC wishes to provide a technical report to the REPSC, the TAC report shall be provided to REPSC members in advance and time at each REPSC meeting will be reserved for facilitator presentation of the TAC report.

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

H. **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. With the advice of the PCT, the REPSC shall develop its own work plan and time-table as it
determines for the completion of its work. The REPSC 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.

I. **Funding:** Funding for the REPSC shall come from E-911 Program Office funds.

J. **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.

K. **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 Chair until a Chair 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, the PCT, and the King County E-911 Program Office.
   4. A Chair and Vice-Chair 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 Chair and Vice-Chair must be selected from voting members of the REPSC.
   5. Any voting member of the REPSC is eligible to be nominated and serve as Chair or Vice Chair. 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 Chair and Vice Chair shall be filled by a majority vote of the REPSC.
   6. The RESPC shall not conduct business unless a quorum is present. A quorum is defined as a majority of appointed members, excluding vacant seats.

L. **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 Chair 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.

M. **Duties of the REPSC:**
   1. The duties of the REPSC shall continue as described here until such time as an Ordinance for permanent E-911 oversight authority is adopted by King County Council and all other required governmental signatories as required herein.
   2. Complete the Purpose and Mission of the REPSC.
   3. Provide 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. Provide periodic reports to the King 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 PSAPs in King County.
B. The REPSC shall transmit recommendations to the King County council and the executive related to annual distributions to the PSAPs of E-911 taxes collected by King County.
C. In cooperation with King County, the REPSC shall be responsible for reviewing and forwarding its recommendations related to all participation agreements that specify the distribution of E-911 taxes to King County PSAPs.
Attached please find a draft approach to support and develop the process for conducting strategic planning for the E911 system. This memo includes description of the structures that could be deployed to support this process, including:

- An Interim Advisory Group
- A Consultant Selection Committee, and
- Strategic Plan Scoping Committee, including
  - A Project Working Group,
  - A Leadership Group, and
  - A Project Coordination Team to support the Leadership Group and the Project Working Group

A flow chart is included showing the scoping process and timeline.

This draft proposal reflects the many areas of commonality among the stakeholders, however, there are 3 remaining significant issues:

1. How the Project Working Group should advise the Leadership Group (always transmit a single recommendation or develop options when consensus cannot be achieved).
2. Whether to include Project Working Group (non-elected) representatives on the Leadership Group.
3. If yes to #2 above, whether Project Working Group representatives on the Leadership Group serve in a voting or a non-voting capacity.

It is important to note that Stakeholders have expressed different approaches to each of the above issues. As such, staff is seeking Council and RPC member guidance.

There is one additional policy question for guidance:

4. Should the legislation require that the Executive transmits a Strategic Planning Process report by July 30, 2016 if NO report is transmitted by the Scoping Committee by May 31, 2016?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iterim Advisory Group</td>
<td>Consultant Selection Committee</td>
<td>SC Project Coordination Team</td>
<td>SC Program Working Group</td>
<td>SC Leadership Group</td>
<td>KC Council/RPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attachment D to the October 14, 2015 PIC Agenda Item 10
**Interim E911 Advisory Group (IAG)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role / Charge:</th>
<th>The IAG would provide a formal structure for PSAPS to advise and consult with the E911 office regarding technology, financial and system operational issues through the completion of an E911 System Strategic Plan process and implementation of a governance system. The IAG replaces the existing informal PSAP managers meeting convened by the E911 Office. The IAG shall be informed by, and provide comment and recommendations to, the County's E911 Office 2017-2018 Budget Proposal, and E911 system financial, capital and operating issues, and any technology prioritization as issues emerge. The Advisory Group may create subcommittees and/or working groups as needed.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration:</td>
<td>November 2015 – March 2018 or approval of Strategic Plan, whichever comes first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>Recommendations made by consensus to the extent possible; in the absence of consensus, voting as per membership (see approach below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Notice and rationale transmitted via letter to King County Council and IAG at least two weeks prior to implementing any actions contrary to an IAG voted recommendation or impasse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Supporting Functions</td>
<td>Independent Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC E911 Office – No vote (recipient of advice and recommendations)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSO PSAP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Fire and Police PSAPs (representatives from both PSAPs may attend)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell, Enumclaw, Issaquah, NORCOM, Port of Seattle, Redmond, Valley Communications, University of WA, and Washington State Patrol PSAPs <em>(all may attend)</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Consultant Selection Committee (CSC)

| Role / Charge: | The CSC is intended to ensure that selection of independent advisors and facilitator(s) meets the diverse needs of stakeholders to support the E911 Scoping, Strategic Planning and Interim Advisory committee processes. The committee shall:  
- In response to initial drafts prepared by the E911 Office, provide comment and recommendations on scopes of work and requests for proposals; and  
- Review consultant proposals and recommend selection of consultants to support the above processes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration:</td>
<td>As needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>Recommendations made by consensus to the extent possible; in the absence of consensus, voting as per membership (see approach below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Notice and rationale transmitted via letter to King County Council and Interim Advisory Group at least two weeks prior to implementing any actions contrary to a CSC voted recommendation or impasse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Supporting Functions</td>
<td>King County Procurement (Note: Any consultant selection shall be subject to the King County Code and King County Procurement Rules, Policies and Procedures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Representative of the E911 Office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Representatives of Bothell, Enumclaw, Issaquah, NORCOM, Port of Seattle, Redmond, Valley Communications, University of WA, and Washington State Patrol PSAPs (<em>all may attend</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Representative of Seattle PSAPs (attendance is open to both Seattle PSAPs)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Representative of KCSO PSAP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 KC Council Staff Representative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Project Manager (as designated by the KC Executive)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Role / Charge:

Develop and recommend a Strategic Planning Process Report for transmittal to the County Council and Regional Policy Committee by May 31, 2016.

1. The SC working groups shall develop a report for the County Council that:
   a. Establishes a King County E911 Strategic Planning Process;
   b. Identifies the organizational structure for the strategic planning process, and
   c. Identifies a timeline and milestones, a regular reporting process, work group(s) and/or team(s), and other issues as identified by the committee for the strategic planning process

2. The Strategic Planning Process Report shall, at a minimum, address the planning processes needed to:
   a. Define the role, vision, and measurable goals of the countywide E911 system;
   b. Integrate with the State E911 system and the responsibilities of local jurisdictions in their delivery of 911 dispatch services;
   c. Articulate a 10-year technology investment strategy with tactics for adapting to evolving technology and service conditions;
   d. Articulate a 10-year sustainable financial plan for the system; and
   e. Define an ongoing decision making and/or governance structure for implementing and achieving the goal and vision, including a conflict resolution process.

3. The SC shall be implemented through:
   a. A Project Coordination Team (PCT);
   b. A Program Working Group (PWG); and
   c. A Leadership Group (LG)

### Duration:

### Accountability
- A progress report shall be transmitted electronically to the King County Council by March 31, 2016
- A Final Report shall be transmitted by May 31, 2016 to the King County Council and RPC

### Possible Supporting Functions

**Independent Facilitator**

**Independent Strategic Planning Advisor**

**Independent Technical Advisor** that has expertise in National Emergency Number Association standards for governance, NG-911 technology and PSAP Operations, National, State and Regional authorities such as the Federal Communications Commission, and the International Association of Public Safety Communications Officials (APCO) experience
### SC Project Coordination Team (PCT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role / Charge:</th>
<th>The PCT is charged with developing draft agendas for LG and PWG consideration, and identifying the resources needed to support LG and PWG deliberations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duration:</td>
<td>Through May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>Recommendations made by consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Appointments to the PWG by notification to the King County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Supporting Functions</td>
<td>Independent Facilitator and/or other consultants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>1 representative of the E-911 office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 representatives of the Bothell, Enumclaw, Issaquah, NORCOM, Port of Seattle, Redmond, Valley Communications, University of WA, and Washington State Patrol PSAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 representative of Seattle Fire and Seattle Police PSAPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 representative of KCSO PSAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 representative of KC Council Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Project Manager as designated by the KC Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Role / Charge:
The PWG is charged with transmitting recommendations and/or options to the LG for consideration - See Policy Question below

#### Policy Question 1

**A. Should the PWG be charged with transmitting recommendations for agenda items that LG is considering?**

**OR**

**B. Should the PWG be charged with transmitting recommendations for agenda items that LG is considering only when consensus is achieved and otherwise charged with transmitting options for LG consideration?**

#### Duration:
Through May 2016

#### Decision-Making
Recommendations made by consensus to the extent possible; in the absence of consensus, voting as per membership below

#### Accountability
Appointments to the PWG by notification to the King County Council.

If charged with participation (voting or non-voting) in the LG, the PWG shall select three PWG members to be representatives to LG.

#### Possible Supporting Functions
Independent Facilitator and/or other consultants

#### Membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-911 office</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell, Enumclaw, Issaquah, NORCOM, Port of Seattle, Redmond, Valley Communications, University of WA, and Washington State Patrol PSAPs (all may attend)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle Fire and Seattle Police PSAPs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCSO PSAP</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of Fire Chiefs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of Police Chiefs</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC Council Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC Executive Staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project manager</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role / Charge:</td>
<td>The LG is charged with making the recommendations to be included in the SC report to the King County Council and the Regional Policy Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration:</td>
<td>Through May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-Making</td>
<td>Recommendations made by consensus to the extent possible; in the absence of consensus each member shall have one vote (see Policy Questions below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Appointments to the LG by action of the King County Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible Supporting Functions</td>
<td>Independent Facilitator and/or other consultants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Note:</strong></td>
<td>The independent facilitator would be charged with bringing recommendations and/or options from the PWG and be responsible for a fair representation of the PWG’s deliberations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership:</td>
<td>NOTE: In the designation of LG membership, the County Council should consider and strive to balance the geographic distribution of members, including specific representation for King County Unincorporated Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 King County Councilmembers designated by County Council</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 City of Seattle Councilmembers designated by Seattle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Elected Officials designated by the Sound Cities Association</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Elected Officials designated by the King County Council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Elected Official representing the King County Sheriff’s Office designated by County Council</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PWG members - <strong>See Policy Questions below</strong></td>
<td>3 or 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Question 2</td>
<td>Should representatives of the PWG be members of the LG?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Question 3</td>
<td>If representatives of the PWG are members of the LG, then should they be voting or non-voting members?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10/6/2015 SCA Caucus of the RPC Feedback on 10/5/2015 Draft Approach to the E911 Strategic Plan Scoping Process:

- Agree with recommendation to form an **Interim Advisory Group (IAG)**, and proposed makeup of the group
- Recommend that the remaining 3 staff groups (Consultant Selection Committee, Project Working Group, and Project Coordination Team) be consolidated into a single group:
  
  **Project Coordination Team (PCT)**
  - 6 total members:
    - 4 PSAP Members
      - 1 from large PSAPs (NORCOM or Valley Com), to be selected by those PSAPs
      - 1 from other PSAPs (Bothell, Enumclaw, Issaquah, Port of Seattle, Redmond, University of WA, or Washington State Patrol), to be selected by those PSAPs
      - 1 Seattle PSAP
      - 1 KCSO PSAP
    - 1 Council Staff Member
    - 1 Member from Executive Office or E911 Office
  - Having an even number of members will ensure that the group is working by consensus
  - The PCT should be tasked with the roles previously specified for the 3 groups, and in addition should be tasked with “reviewing materials to be provided to Leadership Group”

- Recommend the following makeup for the **Leadership Group (LG)**
  - 14 total members (all voting):
    - 3 County Council Members
    - 2 Seattle elected officials
    - 3 non-Seattle elected officials, to be appointed by SCA
    - The Executive or his designee
    - The King County Sheriff or his designee
    - 1 elected official appointed by the County Council
    - 1 representative from “large” PSAPs (NORCOM or Valley Com), to be selected by those PSAPs
    - 1 representative from “small” PSAPs (Bothell, Enumclaw, Issaquah, Port of Seattle, Redmond, University of WA, or Washington State Patrol), to be selected by those PSAPs
    - 1 Seattle PSAP representative
• Agree that legislation should require that the Executive transmits a Strategic Planning Process report by July 30, 2016 if no report is transmitted by the Scoping Committee by May 31, 2016
• Recommend that the following language be inserted to clarify the role of the committees, and the structure of the E911 system in King County

START:

The E-911 system in King County is comprised of two distinct and separate elements; the routing of a 911 call to the appropriate Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) and the dispatch of the police, fire and/or EMS agency(ies) having jurisdiction. The call routing functionality is funded by E-911 surcharge taxes collected throughout the County and is the responsibility of the King County E-911 Program Office. The PSAP, of which there are 12 in King County and operate under local authority, is responsible for the subsequent interview and dispatching of first-responders. A portion of the E-911 surcharge tax is distributed to the local PSAPs by the King County E-911 Program Office to support technology decision applications and impacts relative to call routing, however, the majority of PSAP funding is provided by their stakeholders and sources other than the E-911 surcharge tax.

The King County E-911 Program Office is facing a number of financial, strategic and technological challenges with the implementation of the Next Generation E-911 technology. The King County Council desires to establish a King County E-911 Strategic Plan that will address system priorities for King County E-911 Program Office and guide the ongoing process for decision making, funding and implementing those priorities. As such, Council Staff have been meeting with PSAPs and Executive staff to identify stakeholder interests.

Section I

A. The King County call routing system is funded by E-911 surcharge taxes collected throughout the County. The County’s stewardship of this part of the overall system should balance the role of the E-911 Program Office with the role and responsibility of the local PSAP contributors in the delivery of 911 interview, dispatch and related services.

END
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 Service Guidelines Task Force Final Report is expected to be complete at the final meeting of the Task Force on October 7, 2015, reflecting changes to the principles and to the recommendations regarding the service guidelines (target service levels, service types), Metro’s planning process, alternative transit services, and the Long Range Plan. Updates to Metro’s Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines are expected to be transmitted to the King County Council in December 2015. At the October meeting, SCA staff will provide an update to the PIC on how the Final Report addresses questions and concerns raised by SCA member cities. PIC members will be sent the Final Report of the Service Guidelines Task Force upon completion.

Background
In November 2014, the King County Council established the King County Metro Transit Service Guidelines Task Force. By way of background, service guidelines help Metro “make decisions about adding, reducing and changing transit service to deliver productive, high-quality service where it is needed most.”

The Council charged the Service Guidelines Task Force with “reviewing and making recommendations regarding:

1. How transit service performance is measured as specified in the Metro Service Guidelines to reflect the varied purposes of different types of transit service
2. Approaches to evaluating how the goal of geographic value is included in the Metro Service Guidelines, including minimum service standards
3. Approaches to evaluating how the goal of social equity is included in the Metro Service Guidelines
4. Financial policies for purchase of additional services within a municipality or among multiple municipalities
5. Outline guidelines for alternative services implementation.” (Ordinance 17941, adopting the 2015/2016 King County Biennial Budget)
King County Executive Constantine appointed 31 members of the Service Guidelines Task Force to include representatives of a variety of organizations and constituencies across the county and of diverse perspectives. More information on the Service Guidelines Task Force, including materials and summaries from each Task Force meeting, can be found here.

The Service Guidelines Task Force held its first meeting on March 4, 2015, with their final meeting on October 7, 2015. A Service Guidelines Task Force Final Report will capture areas of agreement and will help influence the development of both Metro’s Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines update, scheduled to be transmitted to the King County Council by December 2015. Recommendations by the Task Force will also influence Metro’s Long Range Plan, scheduled to be transmitted to the King County Council by mid-2016.

**Draft Principles and Recommendations Overview**
The seventh full meeting of the Task Force was held on September 17, 2015 with three primary focus areas:
1. Review changes in target service level analysis;
2. Overview of a new service types option; and
3. Identify areas of potential consensus in the movement toward Task Force recommendations (reflected in the draft Principles and Recommendations in Attachment A).

**Target Service Levels**
Target service level is a goal amount of service Metro assigns each of 112 corridors in the All-Day and Peak Network, based on the following measures:
- Productivity - using public tax and fare dollars as effectively as possible to provide high-quality service that gets people where they want to go.
- Social Equity – ensuring transit serves areas that have many low-income and minority residents and others who may depend on transit.
- Geographic Value - responding to public transportation needs throughout the county.

Metro analysis compares the target service levels to existing service to determine whether a corridor is below, at, or above the target levels. If a corridor is below its target service level, it is identified for investment need.

By way of background, 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 scale for evaluating social equity and geographic value scoring. Additionally, SCA members have expressed interest in expanding the Alternative Services program to help meet target service levels.

The following table reflects how SCA member requests are reflected in the draft Principles and Recommendations (a final version will be distributed to PIC members as soon as available):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCA-Member Priority: Target Service Levels</th>
<th>Task Force Principles and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Use better evaluation methods to meet social equity objectives, including how to better serve transit-dependent riders** | Recommendation to revise Metro’s point system to allow for scaling:  
  - Below average boardings in low income or minority census tracts (0 points)  
  - One-half standard deviation below average boardings in low income or minority census tracts (3 points)  
  - Average or above boardings in low income or minority census tracts (5 points)  

Recommendation that, when making investments in the transit network, Metro will consider social equity impacts.  

Recommendation to identify potential new community partnerships that would support transit options for low income workers. |
| **Incorporate the Regional Transit Task Force definition of social equity to include youth, students, and elderly** | Recommendation for Metro to include a larger population using a revised definition of low-income, consistent with ORCA LIFT. New criteria evaluates at 200% of the federal poverty level.  

Recommendation to use the planning process to explicitly address needs of youth, disabled, and elderly populations. |
| **Use better evaluation methods to meet geographic value objectives, which recognizes the importance of connecting centers throughout the county** | Recommendation to revise Metro’s point system to allow for scaling to place more value on centers. 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.  

Recommendation that Metro use the planning process to better understand the origin and destination of current and potential riders, including frequency of service.  
  - Metro is exploring the utilization of a data base that includes social service destinations (as defined by the Crisis Clinic) when they talk with communities about potential changes in service.  
  - Develop and implement a mobility metric (more below).  

Principle that when reducing service, Metro should consider the relative impacts to all areas of the county and work to minimize or mitigate significant negative impacts in any one area.  

Recommendation that when making investments in the transit network, Metro will consider geographic value. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCA-Member Priority: Target Service Levels</th>
<th>Task Force Principles and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Define a minimum level of service standard for each service type | Recommendation that service will have no less than 60 minute headways.  
Recommendation that Metro should attempt to mitigate the loss of service if it does not meet threshold. Metro will consider redesigning and reallocating services and/or alternative services to preserve mobility in individual communities. |
| A measurement should be added for the value of park-and-rides (both owned and leased) | Recommendation that park-and-ride scoring includes all lots along corridors in Metro’s system regardless of size.  
Recommendation to develop and implement a strategy which utilizes park-and-ride resources more effectively and adds capacity. Develop plans for future investments in new or expanded park-and-ride capacity in concert with other partners |
| Develop a mobility metric to evaluate the time it takes a rider to connect to center | Recommendation that Metro develop and implement a mobility metric to assess how well connected centers are to the jobs and households across King County, and the time it takes to travel to/from households to centers. Use this metric to enhance the connectivity of the transit network over time. |
| Enhance the Alternative Services program | Recommendation to significantly increase new funding support to plan and deliver more alternative services where fixed-route service is not cost effective.  
Recommendation that alternative services be used to 1) replace poorly performing, fixed route services under certain circumstances, 2) provide better connections between centers, 3) server rural communities, and 4) serve emerging markets to “seed” potential new routes.  
Recommendation to create a new metric for measuring performance of alternative services and differentiate the types of alternative service in evaluating their performance.  
Recommended changes outline opportunities for partnership and circumstances what would enable an alternative service to transition into fixed-route services. |
Service Types
Service types are categories of transit service based on chosen criteria. Metro’s current service types are Seattle Core (routes that serve downtown Seattle, First Hill, Capitol Hill, South Lake Union, the University District, Uptown) and Non-Seattle Core (routes that operate only in other areas of Seattle and King County).

By way of background, 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 assessed a new service types option that was compared to outcomes of the current service types during reduction scenarios in a document that can be found here.

The new service type option presented by Metro on September 17 is the “Peak Policy Emphasis.” This new option has the effect of identifying fewer peak-only routes for cuts in a reduction scenario, spreads reductions more evenly across the county, and includes the lowest percentage of hours cut in low-income and minority areas in a reduction scenario than any of the other options. SCA members of the Task Force coalesced around the new “Peak Policy Emphasis” for several additional reasons. The new option:

- Introduces a nomenclature for service types that is regionally focused and inclusive;
- Protects regional connections to centers;
- Provides additional protection for Dial-a-Ride Transit services and community shuttles; and
- Provides additional protection for peak-only service that tends to travel farther distance to start routes and has more deadhead trips.

At the meeting on September 17, a majority of Task Force members – including SCA members – said they supported or could accept the “Peak Policy Emphasis” option.

Additional SCA Priorities
SCA members of the Task Force continued to advocate for issues raised previously at PIC, which garnered the following Task Force recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add’l SCA-Member Priorities</th>
<th>Task Force Principles and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metro should address how Service Guidelines will interact and be implemented with the Long Range Plan.</td>
<td>Recommendation to develop a policy proposal to integrate the values of the Service Guidelines into the Long Range Plan process and resulting plan. The Long Range Plan should reflect productivity, social equity, and geographic value principles identified by the Task Force. It should also describe how Service Guidelines investment priorities interact with the expansion of the transit network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add'l SCA-Member Priorities</td>
<td>Task Force Principles and Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metro should better reflect access to the regional system through ongoing transit integration efforts.</strong></td>
<td>Recommendation that, when making investments in the transit network, Metro will consider regional planning efforts, changes to the transportation network, geographic value, and social equity impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Metro must engage jurisdictions and local communities on a regular basis to better understand transit needs.** | Recommendation to increase transparency of Metro’s process and help jurisdictions plan for the future by conduction regular outreach throughout the county.  
Recommendation that when making investments in the transit network, Metro will consider regional planning efforts and changes to the transportation network.  
Recommendation to work with jurisdictions to create investments that improve service, attract transit riders, and achieve land use goals that support transit services. |

**Next Steps**
The last meeting of the Service Guidelines Task Force is on October 7, 2015 to finalize the Task Force Principles and Recommendations. These principles and recommendations will be incorporated into the Service Guidelines Task Force Final Report. Based on these recommendations, updates to Metro's Strategic Plan and Service Guidelines are expected to be transmitted to the County Council in December 2015.

On October 21, Metro will provide a briefing on the recommendations of the Service Guidelines Task Force to the King County Regional Transit Committee.

SCA staff will continue working with SCA Task Force members, Regional Transit Committee members, and Metro staff to ensure that the service guidelines recommendations are consistently implemented to reflect SCA priorities.

Additionally, Metro is developing a Long Range Public Transportation Plan to consider what the transit system should look like in 2040. Many issues raised in the Service Guidelines Task Force are part of the Long Range Plan process, including how the transit network will connect centers in the county, where future service investments should be made, how new markets should be seeded, and what funding and partnerships are needed to develop a robust transit network. SCA staff will remain an active member on the Long Range Plan Technical Advisory Committee and will ensure that SCA member cities are aware of the critical connection between the service guidelines and the Long Range Plan.

**Attachment**
A.  Service Guidelines Draft Principles and Recommendations (Revised Draft 10/05/15)
Service Guidelines Draft Principles and Recommendations

Draft Principles

During the course of task force deliberations, members have discussed a number of potential changes to the Service Guidelines and the process Metro uses for making service decisions. The group’s discussions have also identified several broad principles that frame the more specific recommendations, and will provide guidance to Metro as it works to implement the task force recommendations. The following draft principle statements will guide the development of policy changes to the Service Guidelines, Strategic Plan, and other Metro planning efforts:

- **Different parts of the county have different travel demands**: The Service Guidelines Task Force recognizes that transit mobility needs take different forms throughout King County and acknowledges that a different structure of services types may help align transit service solutions with these needs. This will require a more refined recognition of the different land use patterns in the county and the purposes of that transit service.

- **Measure performance of routes against similar services**: The current guidelines have two service types, and all services within those two service types are evaluated equally against each other. However, the cost and demand characteristics of different types of service are inherently dissimilar.

- **Right-size service and seed new markets**: Consider the range of service types to enhance services to lower density communities and seed new markets. Some greater emphasis in alternative services could be placed on supporting new markets where land use patterns, job and population growth, infrastructure investments suggest opportunities for an emerging transit corridor.

- **Create better connections between centers**: Transit services should help support mobility between non-Seattle centers and to connect people to jobs, particular for low-wage job centers throughout King County. To accomplish this goal there needs to be a better understanding about the origins and destinations of both current and potential riders.

- **Maintain and improve services that meet productivity objectives**: Making adjustments to the Service Guidelines will create some tradeoffs in the level of service provided throughout the system. Changes to the Guidelines must continue to focus on making each of the different service types more productive. Productivity will result in higher ridership and fare revenues, and lower cost per rider.

- **Maintain and improve services that meet social equity objectives**: Social equity should be a key consideration in maintaining, improving, and allocating service. Access to transit is a crucial determinant in economic opportunity, health outcomes, and affordable housing choices. King County Metro should find opportunities to better serve traditionally underserved, transit-dependent and isolated communities, such as those with limited English proficiency, low-income and no income populations, people of color,
people with disabilities, seniors, and those with limited transportation options (within the context of applicable federal laws, such as Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and others).

- **Maintain and improve services that meet geographic value objectives.** Each part of the county should feel value for the transit services it receives. Those services will not always be in the form of fixed route scheduled service. Metro may deploy a variety of service types to create value throughout the county. **When reducing service, Metro should consider the relative impacts to all areas of the county and work to minimize or mitigate significant negative impacts in any one area.**

- **The demands for transit service far outweigh current available resources.** There are considerable unmet needs across the transit system – both as defined by the Service Guidelines in the near term and as identified by the PSRC and addressed in the King County Metro Long Range Plan now under development.

- **Value all forms of partnerships, including direct financial support, improved transit speed and reliability, and with cities that make land use and infrastructure decisions that would support transit access and ridership.** Land use and traffic operations are critical to transit success, and jurisdictions control both. Jurisdictions should incorporate transit-supportive land use and transit operating priorities in planning and development. Metro/King County should emphasize partnership opportunities and consider funding to incentivize those opportunities.

### Draft Recommendations

Therefore, the Service Guidelines Task Force recommends that Metro:

- Make changes to the Service Guidelines: *(Note: Additional analysis of likely outcomes will be completed on service type alternatives, minimum service levels, and creating a scaled point system before the task force reaches a recommendation.)*
  - Modify service types to create a peak policy emphasis creating greater protection in future reduction scenarios for peak-only services—express category; create a new alternative services—service type category for Dial-a-Ride (DART) and Community Shuttle services; and change the names of the other categories of service to Urban and Suburban categories (that may include DART); and to consider different service types (e.g. express, rural, suburban).
  - Develop minimum service standards for each service type.
  - Better reflect geographic value and social equity when reducing service and making service investments per in the service guidelines analysis.
    - Revise the point system to allow for a scaling of points for geographic value to place more value on centers.

---

1 Centers refers to PSRC designated regional growth centers, PSRC designated regional manufacturing/industrial centers, and Metro identified transit activity centers. See the Glossary in Final Report for further definition.
Revise the point system to allow for a scaling of points for social equity. Maintain the value of social equity corridors to the system.

- Add consideraton for all park-and-rides into the analysis.
- Develop minimum service standards for each service type.

- Make changes to the planning process:
  - Use the service planning and community engagement process to more thoroughly and explicitly address issues regarding origin and destination, including frequency of service. Discussions about origins and destinations should be part of ongoing community outreach (see recommendation below), not just when service reductions or additions are being planned.
  - Develop and implement a mobility and accessibility metric to assess how well connected centers are to the jobs and households across King County, and the time it takes to travel to/from households to centers. Use this metric to enhance the connectivity of the transit network over time.
  - Use the planning process to better identify the needs of transit riders and potential riders, including traditionally isolated or disadvantaged communities, such as those with limited English proficiency, low-income and homeless populations, people of color, people with disabilities and Access users, elderly people, and those who are currently unserved or underserved by transit.
  - Use the planning process to explicitly address needs of youth, disabled and elderly populations.
  - Increase transparency of Metro’s process and help jurisdictions plan for the future by conducting regular outreach throughout the county and integrating the Service Guidelines with Metro’s Long Range Plan.
  - Better communicate the schedule or timeline for when Metro will be making changes in different areas of the county, well in advance of those anticipated changes. This schedule could be established as part of the implementation of an approved Long Range Plan.
  - When making investments in the transit network, Metro will consider regional planning efforts, changes to the transportation network and geographic value and social equity impacts.

- Enhance the alternative services Program:
  - Since Metro has a broad suite of products and services, and is an industry-leader in its alternative services program, and has demonstrated that alternative services cost less to provide than fixed route services; the alternative services program should be expanded to better meet mobility needs of King County. The recent budget action adding new resources for alternative services for 2015/16 was a good start. Alternative services may be used to address several system needs not being met by current transit services: 1) replace poorly performing, fixed-route services under certain circumstances, 2) provide better connections...
between centers, 3) serve rural communities and 4) serve emerging markets to “seed” potential new routes.

- **Metro will consider redesigning and reallocating services and/or When making reductions, using restructures and alternative services to preserve mobility in individual communities; this approach should be used when looking for efficiencies with the network and prior to or in connection with reducing service. This will help as a way to By using this approach, Metro will attempt to mitigate the loss of service to communities where possible.**

- **Use the alternative services community planning process to better identify the needs of transit riders and potential riders, including traditionally isolated or disadvantaged communities, such as those with limited English proficiency, low-income and homeless populations, people of color, people with disabilities and Access users, elderly people, and those who are currently unserved or underserved by transit (within the context of applicable federal laws, such as Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and others).**

- **Significantly increase new funding support to plan and deliver more alternative services where fixed-route service is not cost effective. The range of alternative services could include Dial-a-Ride (DART), community shuttle, van pool, TripPool, car pool, ride share, bikeshare, partnerships with private transportation providers.**

- **Enhance the planning for alternative services by facilitating discussions between municipalities, employers and residents to identify unmet needs and opportunities for alternative services and partnerships.**

- **Create a new metric for measuring performance of alternative services and differentiate the types of alternative service in evaluating their performance.**

- **Explore opportunities to further integrate private service providers as a way to augment the Metro-provided alternative services.**

- **Expand and enhance the van pool program as part of the Alternative Services program, specifically the TripPool component of Alternative Services. Consider modifications to increase the subsidy for TripPool services that extend transit services. Metro should explore whether a lower fare could increase the demand for TripPools. Increase promotional efforts including short term fare incentives to expand TripPool program.**

- **Make changes to partnerships and land-use initiatives:**

  - **Metro will actively collaborate with private parties and communities to explore public - private partnerships that: 1) are mutually beneficial to the agency and customers, 2) extend service in complementary ways to current fixed route service, 3) extend mobility benefits to communities that have corridors below their target service level, 4) enable more service hours, or extend service efficiencies. Examples could include (but are not limited to) integrated planning**
for private employer shuttle services, incentives for ORCA distribution to
disadvantaged populations, lease agreements for private service access to public
P&R’s.

- Identify potential new community partnerships that would support transit options
  for low income workers. Work with employers to identify service options.
- Develop and implement a strategy which utilizes Park and Ride resources more
effectively and adds capacity. Increase management of Park and Rides, including
better utilization of current facilities through parking permit programs, increasing
enforcement, as well as making modest near-term investments (e.g. re-striping
and/or evaluating effectiveness of current leased parking lots/spaces and
considering additional spaces). In addition, develop plans for future investments
in new or expanded park and ride capacity in concert with other partners (FTA,
WSDOT, Sound Transit, local jurisdictions, or private companies).
- Work with jurisdictions to create investments that improve service, attract transit
  riders, and achieve land use goals that support transit services.
- Continue and expand engagement with private transportation operators (employee
  and residential shuttles, transportation network companies, taxis, and other
  commercial transportation entities) to enable complementary use of Metro
  services and facilities with those operators.

- Support new funding, and continued operational efficiencies, and a vision for the future
  of transit service in King County:
  - There is a need for new resources to support the growth of transit services. To
    achieve this goal Metro must continue its work focused on transparency,
    efficiency and accountability.
  - Develop a policy proposal to integrate the values of the Service Guidelines into
    the Long Range Planning process and resulting plan. The Long Range Plan
    should reflect productivity, social equity, and geographic value principles
    identified by the Strategic Plan and the task force. It should also describe how
    Service Guidelines investment priorities interact with the expansion of the transit
    network, as identified in the Long Range Plan. As a result, Metro will be able to
    better prioritize investments in the near and long-term.
**Item 12:**
Farmers Market and Temporary Event Fees

**UPDATE**

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

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

**Discussion Item**
On September 9, 2015, the PIC had an extensive discussion about proposed fee increases for farmers markets and temporary events. The feedback from the PIC at that time was that proposed changes to the permit structure allowing greater flexibility for permittees, particularly vendors who attend multiple events and organizations that host multiple vendors, should be encouraged, but that proposed fee increases for single event permittees were too high. At that time, the Environmental Health Services Division (EHS) of Public Health – Seattle & King County was still adjusting their fee proposal and had yet to announce an updated fees for farmers market coordinators. Following the PIC meeting, EHS staff presented a revised slate of fees to the King County Board of Health, including proposed fees for farmers market coordinators and a reduction to the previously proposed fee for some single event permittees. SCA’s Board of Health Members now seek to update the PIC on those changes to the proposed fee structure.

The Board of Health is scheduled to vote on the proposed fees October 15, 2015.

**Background**
This background section is a summary of information contained in the September 2015 PIC staff report (see September 9, 2015 PIC Packet, page 64). The Environmental Health Services Division (EHS) of Public Health – Seattle & King County oversees permitting of vendors selling prepared foods at farmers markets and temporary events as well as restaurants and other facilities/providers requiring an annual fee and inspection under the Board of Health code. The Board of Health sets permit fees for EHS in accordance with a full cost-recovery model, as required by county policy. As a result, the community value of farmers markets or temporary events are not a factored into the fees charged. Instead, fees are based solely on the costs associated with EHS oversight.

In September 2014, February 2015, and September 2015, the PIC received staff reports detailing the history surrounding a 2013 King County Performance Audit and follow-up rate and time study of EHS, which called into question how well calibrated EHS permit fees were at recouping the cost of EHS provided services. The PIC also received information about earlier proposals from EHS to increase farmers markets and temporary event fees by between 42 and 264 percent, changes that were ultimately rejected by the Board of Health. Instead, the Board
of Health directed EHS staff to develop a new rate proposal that better balanced concerns about the impact to vendors and the need to ensure food safety. It was this new rate proposal that was presented to the PIC in September 2015.

As discussed last month, the current rate proposal makes three structural changes to the existing permitting structure. First, the proposed rates would be based on the risk level associated with the food type and preparation method used by vendors—low, medium, or high. These risk-based categories would replace the current fee breakdowns, which are based on whether or not the foods served fall under an itemized list of “limited” foods developed by EHS. Second, the current rate proposal would allow vendors to apply for a permit for a single event/market, as is currently offered, as well as permits for multiple or unlimited events/markets. Third, EHS proposes a “blanket permit” at a rate of $215 per EHS staff hour for organizations wishing to assume the entire costs of permitting a temporary event, regardless of the number of vendors involved.

PIC Feedback About the Proposed Fee Structure
During the September 9, 2015 PIC meeting, members provided feedback about the then proposed fee structure for farmers markets and temporary events. Environmental Health Fees Subcommittee Chair and Auburn City Councilmember Largo Wales, who attended the PIC meeting, and SCA staff then brought that information forward to the SCA members of the Board of Health. Board of Health Administrator Maria Wood also attended and relayed the feedback to EHS staff.

During the PIC last discussion, several strengths of the proposed fee structure were identified:

- Permitting would be more flexible and cost-effective for vendors who attend multiple events than under the current structure.
  - Permitting costs would be reduced compared to prior proposals and, for some vendors who attend enough events or markets, fees would decrease from their current level.
  - Vendors would be allowed flexibility to change their menu offerings, within a given risk level, from event to event.
- Multi and unlimited event permitting would reward those doing a good job.
  - Vendors with a multi event/market permit that have two successful inspections would be eligible for an unlimited event/market permit. Vendors preparing low risk foods would be immediately eligible for an unlimited permit.
  - Those who have a failed inspection can still earn their way to an unlimited permit through two clean inspections.
- Blanket permit would enhance event organizers ability to attract vendors by reducing vendor permitting obligations.
  - Organizations hosting an event featuring multiple vendors could handle the permitting for all vendors under a proposed blanket permit.
  - The organization would apply for one blanket permit covering all vendors and individual vendors would not need to submit permit applications.

PIC members also identified the following weaknesses and risks for the proposed fee structure:

- The proposal includes large fee increases for single event permittees.
Those vendors who now qualify for a $55 limited food permit would be required to get either a $120 low risk permit or a $290 medium risk permit. This change in particular would impact scout troops and other small not-for-profit vendors and could mean these groups have to discontinue fundraisers and thereby result in lower vendor participation at community events.

- Many vendors are now only close to breaking even, and fee increases could put them out of business.
- Increases would hurt small events where vendors do not see enough revenues to justify permitting costs.

**New Adjustments to Fee Structure**

Last month, the PIC was told that EHS staff were working to adjust two elements of the fee structure for farmers markets and temporary events. First, EHS staff recognized that vendors moving from the old permit category for limited foods into the new medium risk category would have seen a jump from $55 to $320. In response to feedback heard from stakeholders, PIC members, and Environmental Health Fees Committee Chair Largo Wales, EHS have revisited the fee proposal and identified enough cost savings to bring the new proposed fee for medium risk single event vendors down to $290, a $30 reduction from the proposal last before the PIC and a $100 reduction from fees contemplated but ultimately rejected earlier this year. The current fees, the previously proposed and ultimately rejected fee structure, and the proposal now before the Board of Health are summarized in the table below.

*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>$290 (-$30 since 9/15)</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>$850**</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).

The second change since the PIC last reviewed the EHS fees is a newly announced proposal for basing farmers market coordinator fees on market size. Vendors selling prepared foods at farmers markets must get an event permit from EHS. While the fees for farmers market and temporary events are identical, and proposed to stay that way, these are technically distinct permit types and cover differing durations. A temporary event permit covers the duration of an
event, for instance, a one day or several day festival. A farmers market permit, however, covers an entire season for a given market location. Because the farmers market permit covers a longer duration, necessitating greater EHS oversight, each market is also required to have a “farmers market coordinator permit.” The farmers market coordinator assists in ensuring vendor compliance with the Board of Health code.

Currently, the fee is $502 for each market coordinator, regardless of the size of the market or duration of its season. An earlier proposal from EHS would have increased this fee to $1,136 across the board for all markets. However, stakeholders criticized this proposal as being too high of an increase, particularly for small markets, and urged EHS to base fees on market size to more equitably distribute the costs of EHS oversight activities, which are greater for larger markets. In response to that feedback, EHS now proposes the following fees for farmers market coordinators:

- **Small** = 1-5 permitted vendors
  - Current Fee: $502
  - Previously Proposed: $1,136
  - New Proposal for 2016: **$780**

- **Medium** = 6-15 permitted vendors
  - Current Fee: $502
  - Previously Proposed: $1,136
  - New Proposal for 2016: **$960**

- **Large** = 16 or more permitted vendors
  - Current Fee: $502
  - Previously Proposed: $1,136
  - New Proposal for 2016: **$1,200**

**Next Steps**
The Board of Health was first briefed about the proposed fee redesign at its September 17, 2015 meeting and is scheduled to take action October 15, 2015. In preparation for the October 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 13:
Bridges and Roads Task Force

UPDATE

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

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

Discussion Item
SCA staff provided an overview of the work of the Bridges and Roads Task Force at the September Public Issues Committee (PIC). Since August 2015, the Bridges and Roads Task Force has been meeting to identify policy and fiscal strategies to maintain and preserve King County’s rural or unincorporated roads and bridges. The Task Force will next meet on October 14, 2015, the date of the October PIC meeting. At the October PIC meeting, SCA staff will provide an update on the work of the Task Force and report back on questions and issues identified by PIC members and city staff.

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

While SCA does not have a formal role in the make-up of the Task Force, staff are closely monitoring the 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.

PIC members have indicated their support for the Task Force identifying efficiencies and funding strategies for the future of regional road networks, particularly connector roads in unincorporated King County of regional significance to cities. However, not all rural roads are a regional priority. PIC members would like more information on the distinction and financial disparities between regional and rural road networks, which are identified in following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Type of Road</th>
<th>% daily trips</th>
<th>Road miles # Bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>Heavily traveled roads connecting large communities, major services, and critical infrastructure.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>105 mi. 35 bridges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PIC members have expressed that cities and their residents should not be responsible for funding the roads and bridges in unincorporated King County, particularly when unincorporated residents likely rely more heavily on incorporated infrastructure. Cities face their own challenges in funding infrastructure, including roads and bridges in cities. Further, PIC members have stated that if a group is convened to address countywide funding and coordination, it should include representatives from cities throughout the county.

Additional feedback received by jurisdictional staff includes the following recommendations:

- Prior to annexation, better coordination with adjacent to jurisdictions to follow city standards;
- Coordinate maintenance efforts with local municipalities;
- Reduce the County’s road and bridge system; and
- Implement available funding mechanisms.

**Bridges and Roads Task Force Meeting #2**

The second meeting of the Task Force was focused on the current financial situation for King County bridges and roads and what the Roads Division has implemented to date in terms of operational efficiencies. The meeting began with a welcome by King County Executive Dow Constantine, who stated that that King County cannot maintain the approximately 1,500 miles of roads and over 180 bridges in rural or unincorporated areas outside of cities on their own or by simply raising taxes on unincorporated residents. It is possible that over the next 25 years, 72 miles of roadway and 35 bridges may need to be restricted or closed unless solutions can be identified. Therefore, the challenge of funding bridges and roads will require a community-wide effort.

The first of three presentations was by an outside consultant, BERK, Inc., who was hired to review the estimates of financial need which are the basis for the Road Services Division (RSD) Strategic Plan funding scenarios, which can be located here on page 3. BERK concluded that RSD estimates were based on reasonable methods and assumptions, generally used the best information available, and reflect current understanding of asset condition and capital replacement needs. However, BERK suggested several refinements, including: updating unit costs, refinement of how certain programs were annualized, standardization of cost escalation treatment, and refinement of some program estimates and risk assumptions. Ultimately, BERK concluded that RSD’s estimate of financial need, when considered as a potential range, is reasonable to support policy-level funding discussions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 2</th>
<th>Heavily traveled roads serving smaller geographic areas; provide alternate routes to tier 1 roads.</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>163 mi. 34 bridges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>Highly used local roads that serve local communities and large residential areas.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>189 mi. 33 bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 4</td>
<td>Local residential dead-end roads with no other outlet.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>500 mi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 5</td>
<td>Local residential roads that have alternative routes available for travel in case of road closures.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>573 mi. 35 bridges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second presentation was by Dwight Dively, King County Budget Director, who provided an overview of the County’s funding structure for bridges and roads. Dively explained that the RSD budget is two percent of the nearly $9 billion King County total budget (biannually). The County’s largest general fund expenditure is for justice and safety, followed by health and human services. Almost 80 percent of RSD funding comes from property taxes within unincorporated areas; however, with less than 4% of commercial activity in unincorporated areas, the county is at a significant disadvantaged largely due to how King County implemented the Growth Management Act. Dively went on to explain that the cap on property tax revenue of one percent (plus the two percent of the value on new construction), has significantly reduced the amount of revenue RSD could potentially bring in without such limitations. RDS is currently levying at the maximum tax rate of $2.25 per $1000 of property value; however, payments made to the King County general fund have steadily declined. The County could enact a license fee or a sales tax increase (however, the tax base remains minimal).

The final presentation by RSD staff provided an overview of what has been done to-date to address the funding challenges within the Division. Over the last ten years, RSD has focused on the following efficiencies:

- Providing core services aimed to prevent and respond to immediate operational life safety and property damage hazards;
- Staff reductions by 45 percent;
- Consolidation of staff from different maintenance shops;
- Decreased overhead by consolidating office space, reducing fleet inventory by more than 20 percent, and converting street lighting to LED;
- Process improvement through Lean to improve data collection, traffic counts, and road closure alerts;
- Partnerships with the Washington State Department of Transportation on snow and ice response, regional drainage and shared facilities;
- Reducing road inventory by transferring some orphaned road segments, vacated rights of way and limited new roads.

Task Force members made the following recommendations to King County:

- Provide information showing the impact of each initiative on King County bridges and roads funding.
- Show how Snohomish County has handled its revenue challenges differently than King County – particularly following the recession.
- Provide dollar amounts for the savings from the steps that RSD has already taken to respond to the funding crisis.
- Consider providing more detailed RSD presentations to city organizations showing what RSD has done to address its funding challenges.
- Show a breakdown of RSD spending for each of the five road tiers (above) and consider a Task Force recommendation to proactively close parts of the road and bridge system.
**Task Force Timeline**

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

1. Wednesday, August 12: Charge of Task Force and Bridges and Roads 101 (Presentation)
2. Wednesday, September 16: Roads Financial Situation and Action To-Date (Presentations: Outside Assessment of Financial Need, Primer on Roads Finances, Road Services Business Reset)
3. Wednesday, October 14 – King Street Center 8th Floor, 2:30 – 5:30pm
4. Wednesday, October 28 – Mercer Island Community Center, 2:30 – 5:30pm
5. Thursday, November 12 – Mercer Island Community Center, 3 – 6pm
6. Wednesday, January 20 – Mercer Island Community Center, 3 – 6pm

**Next Steps**

The next meeting of the Bridges and Roads Task Force is scheduled for Wednesday, October 14, 2015 where members will focus on identifying - and narrowing - financial and infrastructure recommendations made by Task Force members. The Task Force is being asked to focus on big ideas and levers that will make the most substantive impact on the financial situation for bridges and roads in King County.

SCA staff will continue 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. Ongoing updates by SCA staff will be provided to members of the PIC.
Item 14:
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 -- SCA Cities

<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>Federal Way</td>
<td>Advisory Ballot: Allowing Marijuana-Related Businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Advisory Ballot: Sale, Possession, Discharge of Consumer Fireworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Maple Valley</td>
<td>Advisory Ballot: Sale, Possession, Discharge of Consumer Fireworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Normandy Park</td>
<td>Property Tax Rate for Basic Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential Future Ballot Measures -- Other Cities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Transportation Levy (replacement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Initiative 122: Publicly-financed election campaigns and lobbying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Low-income Housing Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Families and Education Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential Future Ballot Measures -- Countywide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Best Start for Kids (Children, Youth, Families and Communities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Office of Law Enforcement Oversight Charter Amendment</td>
</tr>
<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>
<tr>
<td>~2017</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Cultural Access/Affordable Housing/Mental Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>AFIS Levy (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Medic One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>King County</td>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Potential Future Ballot Measure -- Special Purpose District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Enumclaw Transportation Benefit District</td>
</tr>
<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>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Si View Metropolitan Park District Operations &amp; Maintenance Levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Tukwila Pool Metro Park District Prop - Governing Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County Fire District 2 Multi-year Lid Lift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County Fire District 10 Benefit Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County Fire District 28 Commissioner Increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>South King County Fire &amp; Rescue Bonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>King County Water District 1 Commissioner Decrease</td>
</tr>
<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>Spring</td>
<td>Seattle School District Operation &amp; Capital Levies (renewal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Tukwila Regional Fire Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>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>

**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 15: SCA Issues for 2015

UPDATE

SCA Staff Contact
Deanna Dawson, SCA Executive Director, (206) 433-7170

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

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

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
  - Informational item recapping 9/9/2015 Pre-PIC workshop on the 10/14/2015 agenda.
- 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
  - Identified at 1/14/2015 PIC, discussed at 4/8/2015 PIC
  - A briefing on ST3 will come to PIC as part of the pre-PIC workshop on 10/14/2015 in concert with a briefing on Metro’s Long Range Plan
- Metro Long Range Plan
  - Pre-PIC item on 3/11/2015
  - SCA staff is monitoring
  - Will be discussed as part of the pre-PIC workshop on 10/14/2015
• 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 – to PIC for review

• 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.

• Environmental Health Services – Temporary Event and Farmers Market Fees (Board of Health)
  o Discussed during the 9/10/2014, 2/11/2015, and 9/9/2015 PIC meetings
  o Update during the 10/14/2015 PIC meeting

• Joint Recommendations Committee (JRC) Legislative Agenda
  o Identified by members of the JRC
  o Will discuss at PIC meeting on 11/12/15 meeting

• Low Impact Development
  o Identified during the Executive Committee of the SCA Board, discussed by PIC at September meeting
  o SCA staff will provide a to PIC m briefing to PIC members at a future pre-PIC meeting, likely in November

• Public Records Impacts of Body Cameras
  o Identified by Mayor Law of Renton and the Executive Committee of the SCA Board. Was discussed at the
  o SCA staff is following up with King County Sheriff and other stakeholders
  o This item may come to PIC at a future meeting

• PSRC Economic Development District Board (EDDB) Action Items for 2016
  o Identified by members of the EDDB
  o Will be on the December 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 Deanna Dawson, Deanna@soundcities.org.
Item 16:
Member City Efforts to Address Homelessness

Informational Item

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

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

SCA All Home (Formerly Committee to End Homelessness) Funder Alignment Committee Members
Rob Beem, Shoreline; Karen Bergsvik, Renton; Brooke Buckingham, Redmond

Summary
On September 9, 2015, elected officials and staff from at least 13 member cities gathered for a Pre-PIC Workshop to discuss city efforts to address homelessness. Representatives from Auburn, Burien, Issaquah, Kent, Kirkland, Redmond, Sammamish, Snoqualmie, and Tukwila provided brief summaries about some of the initiatives and investments their city governments and local providers are making to address residents’ needs.

Background
The September 9 Pre-PIC Workshop centered on local efforts to address homelessness. PIC members and other member city representatives were invited to share what their cities and others in their communities are doing to assist residents experiencing homelessness. The goals of September’s discussion were twofold: first, member cities had the opportunity to raise awareness, externally, about their efforts to ensure residents are housed and, second, the discussion allowed member cities to generate ideas for addressing homelessness in their communities. While PIC members are now well-versed in the countywide efforts of the Committee to End Homelessness, recently renamed All Home, and it’s new Strategic Plan, attendees of the Pre-PIC workshop learned that there are many additional innovative projects taking place at the local level.

Presenters each had only a few minutes to speak, so this staff report is not an exhaustive listing of the efforts of local communities but rather a brief sampling of the projects being pursued and common challenges being faced. Member cities are invited to provide additional information about their efforts to address homelessness to SCA Policy Analyst Ellie Wilson-Jones for inclusion in a future briefing providing a fuller picture of city and provider investments and initiatives.

Key themes discussed by each city’s representative are summarized below.
Auburn (Mayor Nancy Backus)

- **Task Force:** Auburn is preparing to launch a Mayor’s Task Force on Homelessness. Following up on the work of the City of Redmond (which recently completed a task force process as described below), the City of Auburn has hired the same facilitator, Karen Reed, to assist in their efforts.
- **Terminology:** Mayor Nancy Backus spoke about the importance of referring to unhoused residents as “people experiencing homelessness” rather than “the homeless” to retain focus on the fact that they are people first and foremost.
- **Suburbanization of Poverty and the Impact on South King County:** There was a 20 percent increase from 2014 to 2015 in people counted as experiencing homelessness in Auburn in the one night count. This is a result of rising rents in Seattle, which have the impact of pushing people further south where housing is more affordable. Rents are rising in the south as well, however, which is resulting in people then becoming homeless there. This is a trend that has also been seen nationally. For instance, a $100 increase in the median rent was found to increase homelessness by 15 percent in metro areas and 39 percent in nearby suburbs and rural areas in a recent national study.
- **Safety:** It is the city’s responsibility to make sure everyone in the community feels safe, including those experiencing homelessness. In Auburn, patrols are making contact with people experiencing homelessness not to arrest them but rather to identify people’s needs and connect them with available services. Code enforcement has also changed their approach and is addressing issues more holistically.
- **Regional Collaboration:** Auburn Mayor Nancy Backus has been appointed by SCA to serve on the new All Home (formerly Committee to End Homelessness) Coordinating Board.

Burien (City Manager Kamuron Gurol)

- **City Investments:** After dedicating 1 percent of the city’s general fund to human services for many years, the city council recently increased the share to 1.25 percent and is directing the new resources to homelessness exclusively. With expanded resources, the city is increasing funding for bus passes, hotel vouchers, and gift cards for necessities. The city is also expanding its partnership with the King County mobile medical and dental vans and working to establish a partnership to provide laundry service. The city also continues to fund street outreach and coordination for youth through Auburn Youth Resources.
- **Local Service Providers:** Burien is home to Hospitality House, a women’s shelter, and Transform Burien, a church-run meal program that utilizes city-leased space. Coordination between providers and the city and broader community has been important, and State Rep. Tina Orwall has been instrumental in coordinating informational meetings with local service providers.
- **Burien Library:** The Burien City Hall is collocated with the Burien Library, which is operated by the King County Library System. As in other communities, the library has been a community focal point for issues associated with homelessness, with people experiencing homelessness utilizing the library as a safe space to be in the daytime and other residents stating that they are now too fearful to go to the library.
- **Homeless Children:** Highline Public Schools serves about 300 students experiencing homelessness in Burien.
- **City and Regional Staffing:** Burien does not have a dedicated staff position for human services so staff time is borrowed from other city departments. Burien is also partnering with other South King
County cities (Kent, Renton, Auburn, Tukwila, Burien, and SeaTac), the Housing Development Consortium, and other organizations to fund a new housing planner position for South King County.

Issaquah (Councilmember Tola Marts)
- **Financial Support and Outreach:** Issaquah provides financial support for services through grants. The city also engages in outreach through a partnership with Congregations for the Homelessness, which provides shelter, case management, and other services.
- **Interdepartmental Collaboration:** The city has established an internal interdepartmental team to continuously evaluate opportunities for better serving residents. For instance, Issaquah recently restructured court fees so that, in some circumstances, individuals are not charged fees they lack resources to pay.
- **Regional Collaboration:** Issaquah Police Chief Scott Berhbaum was recently selected for the new All Home (formerly Committee to End Homelessness) Coordinating Board, and the City of Issaquah is piloting a safe parking program modeled after Kirkland’s program (described below).

Kent (Councilmember Bill Boyce and Human Services Manager Merina Hanson)
- **Police:** Human Services Manager Merina Hanson discussed the futility of trying “arrest your way out of the issue,” which carries costs for the city down the line from arrest to jail to prosecution and public defense services. She said the city has bike patrol officers and occasionally arrests are necessary, but that arrests generally are not the solution.
- **Internal and External Task Force:** The city began with an internal task force of city staff that met monthly and gradually expanded that group to include non-profit and faith-based providers from the community. The task force has been helpful in building relationships between these providers and city bike patrol officers.
- **City Investments:** About 40 percent of all city general fund dollars that are dedicated to human services are spent on services related to homelessness.
- **Local Service Providers:** Many of the shelter options available in Kent rotate through local churches. For instance, the local women’s shelter, which recently expanded to a year-round model will rotate through several churches during the summer months and then be housed at one church in the winter months.
- **Regional Collaboration:** Because people are mobile, efforts to address homelessness must be undertaken at the regional level. As mentioned by other cities, Kent is also part of the partnership funding a new housing planner position for South King County.

Kirkland (Councilmember Shelley Kloba)
- **Shelter Siting:** Kirkland is participating in efforts to create a permanent men’s shelter and permanent women and children’s shelter led by A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH), a partnership of the county and East King County cities. The Kirkland City Council has committed to siting a women and children’s shelter within Kirkland.
- **Outreach:** The city supports an outreach position.
- **Permitted Encampments:** Kirkland has made its encampment permitting process easier for applicants and has been the frequent home to encampments.
- **Regional Collaboration:** Kirkland City Councilmember Doreen Marchione has been appointed by SCA to serve on the new All Home (formerly Committee to End Homelessness) Coordinating Board.
• **Safe Parking**: Kirkland has a safe parking program sponsored by a church that currently provides space for 25-30 families.

• **Housing Discrimination Ordinance**: Kirkland passed an ordinance that disallows housing discrimination based on funding source.

• **Panhandling**: Because panhandling is speech, the city does not pursue complaints against activity that is merely speech.

**Redmond (Council President Hank Margeson)**

• **Redmond Task Force on Homelessness**: Mayor John Marchione created the [Redmond Task Force on Homelessness](#) in spring 2015 in response to community concerns about homelessness. More than 100 people attended the first meeting of the task force and in September 2015, the task force issued its [final report](#). Redmond Police Chief Ron Gibson, who provided staff support to the task force, urged members to understand that the city cannot arrest its way out of homelessness.

• **Local Service Providers**: Redmond works closely with local providers including [The Sofia Way](#), [Congregations for the Homeless](#), [Hopelink](#), [Friends of Youth](#), which operates the young adult shelter [The Landing](#), and other agencies.

• **Library**: After issues emerged at the library, Redmond forged a stronger partnership with the library and developed a communication plan, both of which have been helpful.

• **Unpermitted Encampments**: Redmond has responded to about 20 unlicensed encampments without making arrests.

• **Panhandling**: Panhandling is an issue in Redmond and addressing it will require a coordinated regional approach.

**Sammamish (Councilmember Bob Keller)**

• **Regional Collaboration**: Issaquah and Redmond have great human services commissions and are well developed in their efforts. Sammamish, being a newer city, lacked a human services program and has grown its efforts by supporting existing programs (e.g. food banks in neighboring cities).

• **City Staffing**: Sammamish was significantly impacted when a tent city moved into the still new city. Following that experience, the city has now recently hired a part time human services coordinator who will reach out to Redmond and Issaquah to leverage existing services.

• **Habitat for Humanity**: The city has dedicated land to Habitat for Humanity.

**Snoqualmie (Mayor Matt Larson)**

• **Regional Collaboration**: Snoqualmie is not been impacted by homelessness as much as its neighbor, the City of North Bend, where people experiencing homelessness from the area have tended to gravitate. Because the City of Snoqualmie provides police services for North Bend, the cities work collaboratively to respond to the increase in homelessness. In North Bend, police cleaned up 39 encampments in 2014—nearly twice as many as in the much larger City of Redmond.

• **Lack of services**: There are few social services in the Snoqualmie area to direct residents to, and, with a small police force, it is a burden on resources to transport people to services offered further out.
**Tukwila (Council President Kate Kruller)**

- **Childhood Poverty:** In the Tukwila School District, many children are in poverty. Last school year, 330 students were identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act definition by the Tukwila School District. The city works closely with the schools and others to be aware of residents’ needs.

- **City Investments:** Approximately 12% of Tukwila’s contracted human services budget is allocated to homelessness. Homelessness programs funded by the city include the [Sound Mental Health PATH Program](https://www.soundmentalhealth.org/), which provides outreach to homeless adults; [Auburn Youth Resources](https://www.auburnyouthresources.org/), which provides outreach to homeless youths; shelter and housing provided by [Hospitality House](https://www.hospitalityhouse.org/), [Domestic Abuse Women’s Network (DAWN) Shelter](https://www.dawnshelter.org/), [Multi-Service Center Shelter and Transitional Housing](https://www.mscshelter.org/), and [Way Back Inn](https://www.waybackinn.com/); the [REACH Center of Hope day](https://www.reachcenterofhope.org/) shelter for women and children; and the [King County mobile medical and dental vans](https://www.kingcounty.gov/services/health-dental-care/mobility/).  

- **Regional Collaboration:** Tukwila staff participates in the South King County Housing Action Committee, which is made up of city human service representatives, the Housing Development Consortium, housing authorities, and non-profits. Additionally, city managers and human services staff from Tukwila, Burien, and SeaTac recent started meeting to plan coordinated efforts. As mentioned by other cities, Tukwila is part of the partnership funding a new housing planner position for South King County.