

King County Bridges and Roads Task Force Recommendations – ROAD SERVICES DIVISION (RSD) RESPONSIBILITY SHORT LIST
DRAFT Version 10/28/15

Key for the ID list below: “E” = “Efficiencies”; “I” = “Infrastructure”; “R” = “Revenues & Funding”; “O” = “Outreach”

SHORT LIST OF RSD-RESPONSIBILITY RECOMMENDATIONS			
ID	Recommendation	Explanation of recommendation	Perceived pros, cons, and further considerations needed about this recommendation
E1	Stop talking about roads and bridges in isolation of transit. The county and Sound Transit (Our regional transportation agency) should be looking at every street and bridge and deciding whether or not the usage warrants investment in fixed rail (Train, commuter rail, street car, monorail)	Having transit separate from roads and bridges seems counterintuitive and will likely continue to find ways to fund these roads with minimal or no revenue.	This will require the County staff to work cross lines which can be very difficult to do in practice!
E2	Work with the unions to determine ways to drive down costs or to have the unions optimize the labor force.	Determine if there are seniority or wage factors keeping costs high; consider tradeoff analysis compared to further workforce reductions	Pro <ul style="list-style-type: none">This exercise may already have been completed. Con <ul style="list-style-type: none">Unions may not like this approach but it may beat further job reductions
E3	Better coordination with development review adjacent to the municipalities to require City standards.		Cities may want to see how the County improves cost-efficiency and accountability before coordination.
E4	The County should increase its inspection of new development to ensure standards are being met.	Often developments administered by King County have poor compaction and inadequate pavement depths, resulting in high long-term maintenance expenses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Costs are reimbursable by development. Reduces maintenance expenses and facilitates annexations.Developers will object to increased costs.
E5	Expand pedestrian connectivity and bicycle parking at transit stops and park and ride lots to increase access to transit.		
E6	Expand and improve service for people who depend on public transportation—older adults, individuals with disabilities, people in rural areas, unincorporated and the poor.		
E7	Use ratings for bridges based on bridge condition reports, ADT, location of bridge, economic considerations	Importance of a bridge to local and regional economy, access and connectivity	
I1	Work with all cities and the bordering County's to see what can be realistically transferred or divided responsibility for maintenance.		
I2	Seriously re-visit and study rail loops or equivalent to move people from major communities to work areas		Pro <ul style="list-style-type: none">Might initially be expensive Con <ul style="list-style-type: none">Could be most cost effective over the long haul
R1	Ask for more revenue from the major employers in the region or in certain areas	Simple and non-creative approach to ask the big congestors to pay more for the problems created	Con These major employers may feel that creating jobs is good enough...why should they pay more?
R2	Rely more on local improvement districts for roads maintenance and repair.	Incorporated cities must have more responsibility	
O1	Establish a pilot program using health impact assessments to evaluate the individual and community health outcomes of transportation projects in urban, suburban, rural, and tribal communities.		