

## King County Bridges and Roads Task Force Meeting Summary

Meeting #2

September 16, 2015, 3:00 – 6:00 p.m.

King Street Center – 201 S. Jackson St., Seattle, WA 98104

### Welcome and Introductions

---

Bob Wheeler (facilitator) called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m., and the King County Bridges and Roads Task Force (Task Force) did a round of introductions.

The Task Force then heard opening remarks from Harold Taniguchi, Director of King County Department of Transportation, and King County Executive Dow Constantine. Mr. Taniguchi welcomed Task Force members to the meeting. He explained the meeting's focus on KC Roads Finances. He thanked Councilmember Kathy Lambert and Executive Dow Constantine for their presence. Mr. Taniguchi then introduced Executive Constantine.

Executive Constantine thanked Task Force members for their participation. He believes the Task Force will pave the way for a better future for King County bridges and roads by taking on this vexing challenge. King County has been successfully implementing the Growth Management Act (GMA); however, this has caused significant funding challenges for King County Road Services Division (RSD). The County has taken on a lot of challenges since he came into office, particularly in light of the Great Recession, but this challenge of bridges and roads funding will require a community-wide effort.

Over the next quarter century, 72 miles of roadway and 35 bridges may need to be restricted or closed unless something changes. With the Task Forces' help, we can create a regional solution to keep our communities connected. A million people use County roads each day including both incorporated and unincorporated residents as well as people from outside of King County. Businesses, school children, and first responders all rely on King County roads. Right now, King County government cannot handle this problem on its own or by simply raising taxes. If unincorporated King County residents alone were tasked with funding the current roads deficit it would amount to \$1000 per unincorporated resident. We need to consider how to design our road system and funding model as if it were designed from scratch. The Task Force will also need to address how to implement recommendations it identifies.

Executive Constantine closed by thanking Councilmember Kathy Lambert – noting that King County is excited about setting sail on its journey to address bridges and roads challenges.

### Agenda Review, Interview Summary, and Actions

---

#### *Agenda Review*

The facilitator briefly reviewed the agenda – noting the meeting's focus on the current King County bridges and roads financial situation. He explained that this would be the last Task Force meeting with substantial information-sharing from King County and that future meetings would be focused around the development of Task Force recommendations. He emphasized that 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.

### *Task Force Interview Summary*

The facilitator briefly mentioned the summary of interviews, developed by Triangle Associates, based on interviews with Task Force members in July and August 2015 – with one more interview left to complete. Later interviews mentioned the desire for a small number of Task Force recommendations.

### *Review and Acceptance of the August 12, 2015 Draft Task Force Meeting Summary*

The Task Force reviewed the August 12, 2015 draft Task Force meeting summary and accepted it without any changes. The Task Force was OK with the level of detail in this summary.

### *Review and Acceptance of the Task Force Operating Protocols*

The Task Force reviewed the slightly updated Task Force charter, charge, and operating protocols and accepted them with one update – changing the charge to read “local and regional economic development...” instead of “regional and local”.

The Task Force had the following comments and questions about the Task Force operating protocols:

- Is it OK for Task Force members to share the operating protocols and other materials with their constituencies or organizations?
  - As this is a public process, all materials can be part of the public record – so it is OK to share materials.

The Task Force accepted the operating protocols by consensus.

## **Presentations: Understand Challenges & Facts – Funding, Revenues, Expenditures 101**

---

### *Presentation of RSD's Financial Needs:*

Michael Hodgins of Berk and Associates gave an overview of its assessment of RSD financial analysis. This presentation is available online on the Task Force webpage, <http://kingcounty.gov/depts/transportation/roads/roads-task-force.aspx>. Berk was hired to review the basis of funding scenarios outlined in RSD's 2014 Strategic Plan for Road Services. Berk looked at how the numbers were derived including data used, methodology, and assumptions. Michael gave an overview of financial data that was included in the Strategic Plan including actual expenditures, quantity, type, and condition of facilities, subject matter expertise, and a definition of current needs. This basis of data was turned into different funding scenarios. Berk aimed to ensure that the numbers lined up. He also noted that Berk did not try to account for some of the unknowns – such as natural disasters.

Mr. Hodgins recapped the charts about RSD's funding needs model shared at the first Task Force meeting. Berk concluded that estimates were based on reasonable assumptions and generally used the best information available, that assumptions were based on actual costs, that the degree to which the County understood current conditions varied across the system, and that the scenarios reasonably reflected planning-level costs.

Through this process, Berk identified a handful of different areas where it makes sense for King County to tweak its bridges and roads cost estimates. For example, there were some gaps in factors considered and there was not a perfect picture of current conditions. Berk adjusted some of the cost variables and identified a more realistic estimate of RSD needs – factoring in a range of conditions and thus reflecting a range of estimates. Instead of thinking about the estimates of a single number, RSD should understand the range of severity of the funding gap – given a lack of a full understanding of current conditions.

Berk concluded that RSD's need estimate is reasonable but it should be thought of as a range rather than a specific amount. This is due to a wide range of uncertainties. Also, the Strategic Plan estimates are a reasonable basis to support policy-level funding discussions.

Berk shared a few additional slides showing RSD spending for three different funding scenarios. These included minimum, mid-level, and high-level scenarios. At the minimum level, most spending could go toward fixed costs, maintenance, and debt service while only a small share could go toward capital improvements. Capital improvements could be an increasingly large share of total spending and could increasingly fund the capital projects backlog under the mid and high-level scenarios. Berk additionally compared King County to other jurisdictions. At a high level, factoring in population differences between areas, Berk found that King County roads expenditures have remained fairly steady since 2003, as they have in Pierce and Snohomish County, while the City of Seattle's expenditures have increased dramatically. Berk also noted that, nationwide, a lot of infrastructure was built in the post-war era and is coming due for replacement.

*Comments and questions about this presentation:*

- Could you elaborate on the minimum funding scenario?
  - Based on what funding is available today, the County can only provide 80 percent of its minimum funding requirement – although that percentage varies year to year.
- Why did the County not account for natural disasters?
  - Berk tried to deal with the programmatic requirements to keep the system going. Natural hazards are another layer to consider on top of the cost estimates shared. Keep in mind that the estimates shared are averages and they change within a range.
  - The County, as is the case for most local governments, would likely rely on federal funding after a natural disaster. Local governments are not able to put aside the amount necessary to factor in significant natural disasters.
  - One Task Force member explained they are not aware of any local or state agencies that consider this.
- These estimates are based on conditions today. The further you wait to address preventative maintenance, the larger the funding gap will become. So if money came at the end of the cycle this would greatly increase costs.
  - Berk agreed and explained that deferred maintenance will increase costs in the future. Even at the mid-level of funding, there will be some deferred maintenance. Only the high funding scenario fully addresses deferred maintenance.
- Has there been any similar financial analysis in Snohomish or Pierce County and how does this factor into a potential regional response to this problem?
  - Berk was asked to look at this. All counties are looking into these same issues – although possibly at different levels of detail. Pierce, for example, is under intense financial pressure in every budget cycle and is not able to keep up with even basic maintenance.
- Will the Task Force be hearing from PSRC or other regional transportation agencies?
  - A Task Force member from PSRC explained there are over \$1 billion of need among PSRC counties. However, King County in particular has seen a significant population shift out of unincorporated areas.

*Presentation on the King County Road Funding Structure:*

Dwight Dively, King County Budget Director, gave an overview of the County's funding structure for bridges and roads. This presentation is available online at the Task Force website, <http://kingcounty.gov/depts/transportation/roads/roads-task-force.aspx>. King County's total budget is

almost \$9 billion over two years. RSD is only two percent of the total budget. Mr. Dively gave a further breakdown of the County budget including:

- **General Fund Expenditures:** Justice and safety are the biggest general fund expenditures in King County – as is the case for most Counties. The next biggest share is health and human services. There is very little debt and very little in the physical environment such as code enforcement, transfers for the agricultural program, etc. General fund revenue comes primarily from property taxes, intergovernmental payments and internal charges for services. Thirty percent is charges to other governments and agencies. Outside of that, most revenue sources are property tax and sales tax. Very little money comes from the state and federal government.
- **RSD Revenue:** Almost 80 percent of RSD funding comes from property taxes from unincorporated areas. Only eleven percent comes from the gas tax – which is set up to support rural counties which have little tax base. Washington State’s tax structure comes out of the Great Depression and includes property, sales, and excise taxes. However, our economy has changed since that time. Within this structure, the County has property, sales, utility, and business taxes. Counties only get property and sales taxes. King County is particularly disadvantaged from this tax system because there is almost no commercial activity in unincorporated areas – less than four percent – unlike other counties. Other areas have more taxable activity in unincorporated areas. Also, if a sale occurs in the unincorporated area, only 1 percent of this goes to the general fund. If the sale occurs in cities the King County’s general fund only gets 0.01 percent. These low percentage sales taxes are further impacted because there are not high value commercial properties in unincorporated areas. The takeaway is that there is not a tax base in unincorporated areas largely due to how King County has implemented the GMA.
- **Property Taxes:** In Washington there are different limitations to property taxes including how much growth can be taxed. For RSD, the unincorporated area is the only relevant tax base. However unincorporated areas are capped at one percent growth of tax revenues plus the two percent of the value of new construction and there has been very little new construction in unincorporated areas in recent years. RSD can levy, and is levying at the maximum tax rate of \$2.25 per \$1000 of property value. Regarding the maximum tax rate limit of \$2.25, these tax limitations have had a significant long-term impact. In 1990, 0.4 percent of incomes supported the King County general fund. Today, it is closer to 0.3 percent or possibly even lower. This suggests that as a share of income, payments made to the King County general fund have steadily declined. Revenue growth limitations have done what their authors intended them to do. This limit on property tax revenue growth has significantly reduced the amount of revenue RSD could potentially bring in without such limitations.
- **Sales tax:** The taxable sales to income ratio is declining. In King County, residents only spend about 35 percent of personal income on items subject to the sales tax – a decrease from approximately 50 percent in the mid-1990s. This is due to permanent changes in spending patterns including 1) more online spending which is more difficult to tax, 2) a growing income gap, and 3) young adults who are buying fewer taxable items like homes, cars, furniture, and appliances – choosing to rent or forego them instead.

*Comments and questions about this presentation:*

- What is the six percent Property Tax Revenue Growth Limit column in the Property Tax Revenue Growth Limit chart?
  - Prior to 1998, property tax revenue was limited to six percent of growth per year rather than the current one percent. This chart shows what the budget would have been at six percent. Most likely, King County would not have actually raised taxes six percent per year. But if it had, there would now be \$680 million dollars in King County revenue instead of \$420 million.

- Why does the chart show that King County is restricted in using its general fund for roads?
  - King County has a road district levy that is highly restricted in the way King County can use it. For many years RSD has levied a maximum tax rate of \$2.25 per \$1000 of assessed value. At around six from now, the one percent growth limit will kick in. King County can provide a chart showing this.
- Unincorporated, rural areas do not want growth. Looking at the commercial property tax and how few commercial businesses are in the County, has King County looked at the 2020s and how bad the funding situation could be?
  - Without changes, the funding situation in the 2020s looks even worse. There is also expected to be a significant detrimental impact to future RSD revenue from expected annexations, if they occur. These expected annexations are already built into the revenue projections.
- When you package this picture together, what does the end game look like ten years from now?
  - Some of this forecasting has been done. Under the current taxation system, the County's general fund budget is never sustainable – even in this strong economy. RSD has no revenue growth and there is further loss with more annexations. Other programs have significant difficulties including the public health fund. This is partly also due to there being no growth in funding from state and federal sources.
- Are Snohomish and Pierce Counties expecting to fully implement the GMA?
  - Mr. Dively has not sensed as much urgency on this.
- What is the connection between the roads fund, the general fund, and traffic enforcement?
  - Under state law, roads funds can be sent to the general fund for traffic enforcement. For several years, King County reduced that transfer to \$4 million a year. In the last biennial budget, it has been increased to the maximum amount of \$6 million a year.
- Has any thought been given to a sound bite from King County to sway public opinion on this issue?
  - Voters have been generally supportive of levies like the parks and veteran services levies. They did not support a transit funding measure last April. Residents are more supportive of funding services in areas they live and less likely to support funding in other areas. City residents will tax themselves but do not consider King County roads their responsibility. Rural residents often do not want to raise taxes. Even if unincorporated residents wanted to raise taxes, under state law there is little authority for this to happen. There is a license fee that could be enacted, but no higher property tax. There could possibly be a sales tax, but there is no tax base.
- Will presentations get on the Task Force website?
  - Yes.
- Are car tab fees a potential revenue source?
  - The motor vehicle excise tax (MVET) was removed by initiative I-695. It was a primary funding source for public health and transit – less-so roads.
  - Another initiative eliminated the vehicle license fee that had been going to roads. This was about \$6 million per year. King County had to cut significant capacity as a result of this.
- Why did King County encourage annexations?
  - The County's leadership focus was on the County's general fund and at the time these annexations were beneficial for the general fund, although annexations were adverse for the roads fund. In other words, the County was not evenly focused across programs. It also depends on the point of time you are talking about.
- I would like to see a chart or narrative showing the impact of each initiative on King County bridges and roads funding so people understand their individual impacts. If this can be demonstrated, then maybe people will think twice before signing initiatives.

- Show how Snohomish County has handled its revenue challenges differently than King County – particularly following the recession.

## Actions RSD has Taken to-Date to Address the Deficit

---

### *Presentation on Direct Efforts RSD has Taken:*

Jay Osborne from RSD gave a presentation on what King County RSD has done so-far to address its funding challenges. This presentation is available online at the Task Force website, <http://kingcounty.gov/depts/transportation/roads/roads-task-force.aspx>. Over the last ten years King County has focused on core services, reduced or reorganized staff, consolidated facilities, decreased overhead, leveraged technology, implemented process improvements, formed partnerships, and reduced road inventory.

- **Focus on core services:** Stakeholders across King County worked to identify what a core service is. First and foremost, King County aimed to prevent and respond to immediate operational life safety and property damage hazards, followed by meeting regulatory requirements, maintaining the network, enhancing mobility, and addressing capacity. RSD is primarily funding life safety, regulatory, and maintenance preservation efforts. In terms of what King County delivers, it is focused on financial stewardship, enhancing risk assessment, etc. King County has reduced contract work, is no longer offering as many services, and has eliminated less essential services (such as planning and litter pick up).
- **Staff reductions:** RSD has reduced its workforce by 45 percent including downsizing from seven sections to three, and has realigned teams, adjusted classifications, working with unions, adjusting work schedules, and providing critical training but also greatly reducing it.
- **Consolidation:** King County consolidated staff from different maintenance shops (see map on slide 8). RSD also looked at travel times for service deliveries in factoring in consolidations. However, this consolidation has also caused concerns about disruptions from certain access points being removed. RSD also has a successful partnership with WSDOT.
- **Decreased overhead:** RSD has consolidated office space. It currently only takes up half of a floor in King Street Center and moved its records storage. RSD also reduced its fleet inventory by more than 20 percent, reduced radios, computers, phones and other equipment, converted street lighting to LEDs to save electricity, and sold surplus properties.
- **Leveraged technology:** RSD implemented an asset management system, automated vehicle location, standardized software, and other technology to find efficiencies. These efficiencies have been well received.
- **Process improvements:** RSD is a data-driven agency. RSD went through a Lean process to improve data collection and for permit consolidation, traffic counts, and road closure alerts.
- **Partnerships:** RSD has found partnerships with other public and private entities around street waste removal by working with WSDOT on snow and ice response, regional drainage, and shared facilities.
- **Reducing road inventory:** RSD has transferred orphaned road segments, vacated rights of way, and limited new roads. For vacated rights of way, Jay explained that vacated roads are no longer a County responsibility.
  - Orphaned roads: King County is working these orphaned roads out of its inventory. King County also went through a detailed analysis of this. RSD still has issues with short segments of roads that are half city and half county-owned. Of the 65, there are 19 agreements to transfer orphaned roads out of its ownership.
- **Next steps:** RSD is:

- Creating cross training opportunities with labor. 45 percent of RSD staff is eligible for retirement in the next five years. King County is looking for training opportunities for existing staff.
- Increasing use of Lean.
- Increasing productivity through mobile technology
- Facility projects that create more efficient services

*Comments and questions about this presentation:*

- There is a perception that other counties downsized faster during the recession than King County and that this contributed to the funding crisis.
  - In downsizing, King County went through 13 rounds of layoffs based on quarterly changes in revenue forecasts. King County closed three maintenance facilities and re-drew boundaries. Each layoff and closure has an organizational cost in terms of restructuring crews and working with nine different unions. The unions were cooperative partners, but it is still a lot of process. There are also seven annexations taking place during this layoff period.
  - Staff was continually moved to different positions during this layoff period. It was very disruptive to service delivery so RSD aimed for a budget to put RSD in a more stable position. It was a rough ride down to this stable level. Just the layoff process alone was significant time and effort.
- When you vacate a right-of-way, are you selling it?
  - That depends on what the issues are. In some cases, for historical reasons, King County has a road that only benefits one property, so they can sometimes show that it is a public benefit to vacate the road.
- What is RSD doing with roads where there is a city on one side, unincorporated area on the other, and where the County only owns half of the road?
  - This is where RSD is working to transfer roads. RSD is working with the cities that own the other halves to clarify ownership.
- Is RSD is looking for opportunities around unused easements?
  - King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks has taken a lot of these properties. With the Parks levy, they purchased many for the park's system.
- Are new developments and new roads expected in unincorporated areas?
  - There is not a lot of development in unincorporated areas and most happened several decades ago. For example, Skyway does not see a lot of new development that constructs new road infrastructure. Some developments were built over several years and some roads are in the King County inventory and others are not. Most roads on Vashon are privately owned. King County has added 1.8 miles of road in the last few years.
- While RSD has tried to stabilize, is it trying to be more proactive in addressing its service delivery issues?
  - RSD has worked closely with County policymakers to ensure its facilities and equipment are adequate and in the right locations given their service areas. RSD is working hard to address immediate service delivery needs. It has a facility master plan that is helping with this. RSD is planning to leave one facility and co-locate with WSDOT at another, for example.
- Can you speak to the deficits in maintenance and operating infrastructure and how that factors into the problem before the Task Force?
  - RSD has hired a consultant to look at the facilities it is keeping and determine how much it will cost to invest in those. It also has a site planning consultant for the two facilities it is moving. RSD dedicates the funds from its property sales towards maintenance and operations. The current capital program contains facility work and a planning study for full facility costs is completed.

- What do these four facility closures, 45 percent staff reduction, and 20 percent fleet cutbacks equate to in real dollars in terms of the difference between the 2010 and 2015 budget?
  - It's about \$70 million dollars less now than if things had stayed the same, roughly a third of the budget was cut.
- Thank you for this presentation – what RSD went through was not easy and it looks like you made significant progress. RSD should consider marketing programs that it does offer, such as bridge inspections. There may be revenue opportunities around working with cities, especially if RSD is starting to specialize in certain areas.
  - RSD has moved away from selling itself to cities. Cities, as clients, also have faced revenue challenges from the recession. That meant that some commitments from cities had to change while RSD was already planning to provide services to them. For highly specialized services, selling County services does make sense.
- It does look like RSD has made significant progress right-sizing itself for the budget it has and the budget projections. More information about actual dollars would be helpful.
- Some city councils do not trust King County. As these processes move forward, there might be some city organizations that would benefit greatly by hearing even more detailed RSD presentations with actual numbers. If RSD does specific outreach to cities and city organizations, then real progress could be made.
  - RSD has these numbers and can provide them.
  - The facilitator explained that the next three meetings will be focused on recommendations, and this idea is a specific one that the Task Force might want to consider.
- The Task Force has significantly discussed efficiencies but less about infrastructure. Is King County doing a benefit-cost analysis on reducing its road system as a whole? Is this a tool for the Task Force to consider? It seems to make sense to proactively close parts of the system.
  - RSD has not done these analyses yet. It could think about these, but it would be an extraordinary policy question to set a limit on overall miles of roads and drawing the line. There are already 1300 miles of privately owned roads in King County. Rethinking who is responsible for which roads is a significant consideration.
  - The transportation needs report outlines the needs that would/should stay with King County versus other jurisdictions. RSD has looked at this issue of scalability.
  - The facilitator explained that recommendations from this Task Force could consider infrastructure.
  - A Task Force member noted that RSD does have data that delineates road tiers from 1-5. This is a policy and political issue. It is up to the Task Force to identify such recommendations.
- The Task Forces' challenge is being the canary in the coal mine for areas that have not yet had their urban areas incorporated. The Task Force can spell out where the challenge is. In terms of policy issues, the Task Force will also need to look at shrinking the network as well as potentially looking at funding sources beyond unincorporated residents. King County is in an unusual situation with a funding structure set up more like a rural county.
- Can the Task Force see a breakdown of money RSD spends for each tier?
  - Yes, RSD can do this.
- Are there Tier 5 roads where, if closed, people could get there a different way?
  - Yes, RSD has to maintain alternative access to residents. If a Tier 5 road is closed and another road becomes the sole access to a property, the remaining road becomes a Tier 4 and RSD's policy is to preserve those roads.
- Has RSD done any analysis of the overall road network to identify areas for strategic closures?
  - RSD has not done this kind of analysis of the overall road network but it could.

## Final Report Structure, Responses to Information Requests, and Task Force Discussion on Recommendations

---

### *Review of Final Task Force Report Structure:*

The facilitator shared and briefly reviewed a proposed draft structure for the final recommendations report that will capture Task Force recommendations and the process it followed. This will be a concise report focused on recommendations.

### *Responses to Task Force Information Requests:*

The facilitator briefly reviewed RSD's answers to questions posed by the Task Force at its August 12 meeting.

### *Discussion on Task Force Recommendations*

The facilitator shared a draft template for capturing all Task Force recommendations. He explained that this could be used to come up with a shorter list of more substantive recommendations focused on big ideas and levers that will make the most substantial impact on King County's bridges and roads financial situation. Too many recommendations would be difficult to manage. The facilitator explained the hope that the Task Force could use this table to pre-fill out this template and list a brainstorm of ideas it has for recommendations. Task Force members should send their brainstorm ideas back to Evan Lewis by October 5. The hope for the next meeting is to focus in on recommendations that make the most sense to move forward. The focus, again, will be on big ideas and levers. Task Force members can let Triangle or King County know if it has questions or comments about this.

### *Comments and questions about the Task Force Recommendations template:*

- Task Force members should also provide an explanation along with any pros or cons associated with this recommendation.

## Public Comments

---

The following public comment was given by Jacki Perigee in Carnation. There is a highway that is a regional road linking highways 2 and I-90. There's a lot of truck traffic. She has photos of trees that have come down over power lines and vehicles. A lot of people are bypassing I-405 and using highway 203; it's a lot of quicker. There has been decades of tunnel vision on these road repair issues. There are not shoulders proportionate to the roadways between Carnation and Duvall. These roads are lined by a primitive electrical grid. When trees fall on power lines, it shuts down roads and is dangerous. Is there any possibility that there are any funds available to address this problem?

She is happy to see there has been some combining of resources between the County and State DOT.

No further public comments were received on paper, electronically, or orally.

### *Comments and questions about public comments:*

- How does the Task Force get these comments?
  - Public comments are captured in the meeting minutes, and the meeting minutes will be posted on the Task Force website.

## Assignments and Next Steps

---

### Assignments

The facilitator reminded the Task force about receiving a table for brainstormed recommendations and to fill it out with any additional recommendations and return it to Evan Lewis with Triangle Associates by October 5.

### Future Meetings

Due to scheduling conflicts, the next two Task Force meetings, on October 14 and October 28, will take place from 2:30 – 5:30 p.m. Also, the October 14 meeting will take place in the 8<sup>th</sup> floor conference center of King Street Center and then all subsequent meetings will take place in the Mercer Room of the Mercer Island Community and Events Center. The Task Force will see updated calendar invitations with these changes soon.

## September 16 Task Force Meeting Action Items

---

Group	Action	Due Date
Task Force members	Email any additional Task Force recommendations for consideration to Evan Lewis with Triangle Associates ( <a href="mailto:elewis@triangleassociates.com">elewis@triangleassociates.com</a> ) on the template provided.	Monday, October 5, 2015
King County	Add the date of meeting number one to the questions and answers list (request during the break from a TF member)	ASAP
King County	<p>Answer questions posed by the Task Force today.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide a chart showing how long Roads expects to levy a maximum tax rate of \$2.25 per \$1000 and when it will again be bound by the 1 percent revenue growth limits.</li> <li>• Provide a chart or narrative showing the impact of each initiative on King County bridges and roads funding so people understand their individual impacts.</li> <li>• Show how Snohomish County has handled its revenue challenges differently than King County – particularly following the recession.</li> <li>• Provide dollar amounts for the savings from the steps that RSD has already taken to respond to the funding crisis.</li> <li>• Consider providing more detailed RSD presentations to city organizations (such as the Snoqualmie Valley Governments Association and Sound Cities Association), with full supporting numbers, showing what RSD has done to address its funding challenges.</li> <li>• Show a breakdown of RSD spending for each road tier.</li> </ul>	October 14 Task Force Meeting

## Attachment 1: Task Force Meeting Attendees

---

### Task Force Members

Name	Affiliation	Attended?
Van Anderson	King County Boundary Review Board	No
John Bloomer	Enumclaw Fire Department/King County Fire District #28	Yes
Josh Brown	Puget Sound Regional Council	Yes
Peter Eberle	Four Creeks Unincorporated Area Council	Yes
Joe Fain	Washington State Legislature—47 <sup>th</sup> District	No (represented by proxy, Noah Ullman)
Ashley Glennon	Fall City Community Association	Yes
Michael Gonzales	Teamsters Local 174	Yes
Bob Harrison	City of Issaquah	Yes
George Irwin	King County Agricultural Commission	Yes
Janet Keller	Keller Dairy	Yes
Duana Koloušková	Transportation Concurrency Expert Review Panel	No
Andra Kranzler	Skyway Solutions	Yes
Matt Larson	City of Snoqualmie	Yes
Hank Lipe	Vashon Island Fire & Rescue	Yes
Ceci Mena	Professional & Technical Employees Local 117	Yes
Louise Miller	Former King County Councilmember and State Representative	Yes
Louis Moscoso	Washington State Legislative—1 <sup>st</sup> Legislative District	Yes
Amy Ockerlander	City of Duvall	Yes
Ron Paananen	Parsons Brinckerhoff	Yes
Blake Trask	Washington Bikes	Yes
Noah Ullman	Executive Assistant to Senator Fain (proxy)	Yes
Bryce Yadon	Futurewise	Yes

### Meeting Organizers

Name	Affiliation
Brenda Bauer	Road Services Division, King County
Jay Osborne	Road Services Division, King County
Susan West	Road Services Division, King County
Bob Wheeler	Triangle Associates
Evan Lewis	Triangle Associates

### Other Meeting Attendees

Name	Affiliation
Jason Hennessy	Berk, Inc.
Jacki Perrigoue	City of Carnation resident
Alan Painter	King County Community Service Areas
Kathy Lambert	King County Council

<b>Name</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>
April Sanders	King County Council Staff
John Resha	King County Council Staff
Lise Kaye	King County Council Staff
Tricia Davis	King County Department of Natural Resources and Parks
Harold Taniguchi	King County Department of Transportation
Peter Heffernan	King County Department of Transportation
Stephanie Pure	King County Department of Transportation
Brandy Rettig	King County Department of Transportation
Dow Constantine	King County Executive
Chris Arkills	King County Executive Office
Ivan Miller	King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget
Lauren Smith	King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget
Shelley Davis	King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget
Dwight Dively	King County Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget
Jeremy Ferguson	King County Roads Services Division
Susan Oxholm	King County Roads Services Division
Jenna Kaluza	Oakpointe Communities
Ellie Wilson-Jones	Sound Cities Association
Charles Prestrud	Washington Department of Transportation