

**Central Puget Sound
Regional Transit Authority**

**May 31, 1996
Board Meeting Minutes**

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:07 p.m. by Chairman Drewel. It was held in the sixth floor conference room of the Puget Sound Regional Council, 1011 Western Avenue, Seattle, WA.

Attendance

Chair

(P) Bob Drewel, Snohomish County Executive

Vice Chairs

(P) Paul Miller, City of Tacoma Councilmember

(P) Greg Nickels, King County Councilmember

(P) Martha Choe, City of Seattle Councilmember

(P) Dave Earling, City of Edmonds Council President

(P) Mary Gates, City of Federal Way Councilmember

(P) Jane Hague, King County Council Chair

(P) Ed Hansen, City of Everett Mayor

(P) Ann Kirk Davis, City of Lakewood Councilmember

(P) Gary Locke, King County Executive

(P) Rob McKenna, King County Councilmember

(P) Sid Morrison, WSDOT Secretary

(P) Norm Rice, City of Seattle Mayor

(P) Dave Russell, City of Kirkland Councilmember

(P) Bill Stoner, Pierce County Councilmember

(P) Cynthia Sullivan, King County Councilmember

(P) Doug Sutherland, Pierce County Executive

(A) Jim White, City of Kent Mayor

The Board Administrator announced there was a quorum of Board members present.

Regional Outreach Committee Final Report

Mr. Drewel explained that he was moving this item up on the agenda, and asked Mr. Dick Ford, chair of the Regional Outreach Committee (ROC), to present the committee's final report.

Mr. Ford extended his appreciation to members of the RTA Board as his committee completed its work. He expressed his gratitude to the members of ROC, who worked very hard to understand the public transportation problem and to develop recommendations for the Board. He also thanked the RTA staff and people in the community who have an interest in mobility issues. He reminded the Board that the committee's written report had been distributed the prior week.

Mr. Ford explained that the committee report included a majority and a minority opinion. The majority of the committee believes that the Board's draft plan is commendable and should go forward to the public for a vote to consider this plan as a part of the total requirement to meet the mobility needs of the region. A minority of the committee believes the plan represents a misplaced priority and other things should be addressed first.

He expressed that the mobility problem is a diverse problem that requires diverse solutions, including high-capacity transit (HCT) and improved roads. This plan assumes the state will complete the high occupancy vehicle (HOV) system to be an integral part of an HCT system. The majority of the committee believes that the region must develop regional transportation solutions and this is a good start.

Public Comment

The following individuals offered comments, which are on file with the Board Administrator.

Mr. Paul W. Locke, Seattle

Mr. Robert Whalen, Kent

Mr. Larry Fogdall, Seattle, speaking on behalf of the University Presbyterian Church and adjacent properties near the proposed University District (UD) RTA station

(Board members McKenna and Davis arrived at this time.)

Mr. Jorgen Bader, President of Seattle Community Council Federation

(Board member Hague arrived at this time.)

Ms. Shirley Meshner, Roanoke Park Association and Duwamish Area

Mr. Warren Yi, Washington Association of Rail Passengers and the Greater Duwamish Community Council

Mr. Bill Svensson, Chair of the Puget Sound Light Rail Transit Society

Mr. Rick Blake and son, Seattle

Ms. Rosemary Ives, Mayor of Redmond

Ms. Nancy McCormick, representing the ETP Steering Committee

Mr. Mark Dublin, Ballard

Mr. Douglas Tooley, Seattle

Mr. Maynard Arsove, Montlake, read into the record a letter from the "No Expansion of 520" organization

Mr. Chris Lehman, Eastlake

Report of the Chair

Mr. Drewel expressed his appreciation to those who have participated in the development of a new regional transit system plan. He thanked the Board members for their courage, hard work and efforts in bringing a proposed plan forward. He noted that the state legislature, in crafting the original legislation, had given the Board an opportunity to provide for the region's future in a way that very few other organizations have had. It is an opportunity to play a vital role in shaping the future of the state and the country.

He stated that there would be no Executive Director report.

Resolution No. 72

Mr. Drewel explained that Resolution No. 72 declares that the adoption of financial policies to govern the financing and implementation of any regional transit system plan constitutes a major decision that requires a two-thirds vote of the Board and adopts financial policies, as recommended by the RTA Finance Committee, for the implementation of the Ten-Year Regional Transit System Plan.

It was moved by Ms. Choe, seconded by Mr. Rice and carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present that Resolution No. 72 be approved unanimously.

It was unclear to Board members how Amendments FP1s and FP2 to Resolution No. 72 would be addressed, resulting in the following motion:

It was moved by Mr. McKenna, seconded by Ms. Hague and carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present that the adoption of Resolution No. 72 be reconsidered.

It was moved by Mr. McKenna and seconded by Ms. Choe that Amendment FP1s be approved, including deleting subparagraph c) (extension of the construction completion time period), and adding clarifying language indicating that bonding capacity is subject to the financial policies.

The motion to adopt Amendment FP1s was carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present.

It was moved by Mr. McKenna, seconded by Ms. Choe and carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present that Amendment FP2, be approved as presented.

Amendment FP2 revises subsection c) by adding language to ensure implementation of the fare integration program.

It was moved by Mr. Morrison, seconded by Mr. Miller and carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present that Resolution No. 72, as amended, be approved as presented.

Resolution No. 73

Mr. Drewel explained that Resolution No. 73 adopts a Ten-Year Regional Transit System Plan, together with related Appendices and the Regional Transit Long-Range Vision, and rescinds Resolution No. 40.

It was moved by Mr. Morrison and seconded by Ms. Choe that Resolution No. 73 be approved.

It was moved by Mr. Morrison and seconded by Mr. Miller that the consent agenda for Resolution No. 73, as shown on the meeting agenda, be adopted.

In response to Mr. Hansen's request, Mr. Drewel announced that Amendment #17 would be removed from the consent agenda and acted upon by a separate motion.

The motion to approve the consent agenda amendments to Resolution No. 73, with the removal of Amendment #17, was carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present.

Proposed Amendments to Ten-Year Regional Transit System Plan

Mr. Drewel explained that he would ask each amendment's sponsor to make a motion, then call for debate and then a vote on the amendment. He reminded the Board that action on the proposed amendments requires a simple majority vote and that action on the ten-year system plan requires a super-majority vote.

It was moved by Ms. Gates and seconded by Ms. Choe that Proposed Amendment #3, the extension of light rail to SeaTac Airport, be approved.

Ms. Gates explained that the amendment responds to citizen involvement during the public hearings. The extension fits within the tax requirements and the 10-year system completion timeframe.

Mr. McKenna asked staff for ridership data for the Boeing Access Road to SeaTac segment.

Mr. Bob Harvey responded that an independent modeling exercise of the segment exclusively between Seattle, SeaTac and the University District had not yet been undertaken in that the amendment was only recently proposed. He explained that the analysis would take approximately three weeks.

Mr. McKenna noted that during a recent meeting with a newspaper editorial board, he was asked what would be given up for the SeaTac extension. He told the editorial board that he would analyze the situation further with the King County Joint Review Team. That analysis was performed based on the RTA's numbers. The analysis shows light rail boardings at about 4,000 per day. The team then looked at regional express bus routes and eliminated the least productive. In doing that, the team found the bus routes would have carried 7,000 passengers per trip per day. The team's analysis showed a ridership loss from Boeing Access Road to SeaTac.

Secondly, the team looked at re-deployable bus hours. The proposed extension would reduce those hours by almost half.

Thirdly, the team looked at the impact of deleting direct access improvements. Two are being proposed for deletion: one at I-5 and SR-516 and at Industrial Way. Those improvements received the highest ranking by DOT in terms of transit travel time savings. The lack of facilities serving SeaTac will slow bus travel times to the SeaTac rail head. DOT gave the Industrial Way ramp the highest ranking, and the loss of that facility means buses will lose time into Seattle. The greatest impact will be on Metro and Pierce Transit, since RTA services will be terminated at SeaTac.

He urged Board members to vote against Amendment #3.

Mr. Nickels commented that Mr. McKenna's analysis is reason for pause. If transit ridership is being lost, it is something the Board should think seriously about. He went on to say that he, however, had a sense that not only would the RTA hold its own, but would see a substantial increase in ridership with a light rail system that is more regional in scope. He asked staff for a sense of the SeaTac extension ridership.

(Board member Sullivan arrived at this time.)

Executive Director White responded that while a ridership model result couldn't be given until an independent modeling exercise had been completed, professional judgment, based on experience with prior modeling, suggests this segment would carry about 10,000 riders daily.

The operating cost savings would be achieved by eliminating trips. Based on previous analyses, it is believed that this segment would be quite productive, compared to the other light rail investments being made in the United States.

Mr. Nickels replied that based on this information, he would support the motion. He reminded the Board that he had voted no on the draft plan because the proposed segment of light rail did not include SeaTac.

The motion to adopt Amendment #3 was carried by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Board members Hague and McKenna voted in the minority.)

It was moved by Ms. Gates and seconded by Mr. Miller that Amendment #3a be approved as presented.

It was moved by Mr. Nickels, seconded by Ms. Sullivan and carried by the majority vote of all Board members present that action on Amendment #3a be postponed until the Board concluded its action on Amendments #19 and #10.

It was moved by Mr. Nickels and seconded by Ms. Choe that Amendment #19S, extending light rail to SeaTac and Northgate be approved.

Mr. Nickels described the difficulty of balancing the commitment to ensure subarea equity and a provide a regional system. He expressed the need to extend light rail to both Northgate and SeaTac to create a truly regional transit system. Amendment #19S proposes increasing the MVET rate from 0.3% to 0.5%, to fund the north extension.

The motion to approve Amendment #19S failed by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Choe, Ms. Sullivan, Mr. Locke, Mr. Rice and Mr. Nickels.)

It was moved by Ms. Choe and seconded by Ms. Sullivan that Amendment #10a, including an electric light-rail segment between the University District and Northgate conditioned on available construction funds after the initial lines between Seattle and SeaTac and Seattle and the University District have been built, be approved.

Ms. Choe explained that this amendment indicates that light rail will be built in three segments. Construction on the third segment would take place when funding has been identified and guaranteed.

The motion to approve Amendment #10a was carried by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Mr. Drewel, Mr. Miller, Mr. Stoner, Ms. Davis, Mr. Earling, Mr. Hansen, Ms. Hague and Mr. McKenna.)

Ms. Choe withdrew proposed Amendment #10b, authorizing preliminary engineering for a light rail segment between the University District and Northgate that will be built if a higher than expected federal funding appropriation is available.

It was moved by Mr. McKenna and seconded by Mr. Miller that Amendment #10d be approved as presented.

Amendment #10d would insert the following into the section heading "Electric light rail:"

"Before selecting a preferred alternative, alternative alignments will be evaluated to determine which maximize ridership, minimize capital and operating cost per passenger trip and create the greatest economic net benefit. In particular, special attention must be paid to which alignment generates the most new ridership as opposed to riders simply shifting from one type of transit to another.

If a preferred alignment uses the downtown Seattle transit tunnel, some or all buses will be displaced to Seattle surface streets. The RTA will not begin building an electric light-rail line that uses the downtown

Seattle transit tunnel until a plan for both tunnel and street-level transit operation in downtown Seattle has been adopted by the RTA Board, the City of Seattle and King County.”

Ms. Choe stated that the language in the second paragraph suggests one of the entities may inadvertently have veto power over the other, and construction of the light rail system couldn't begin until an agreement was completed. She asked Mr. McKenna if he'd accept revised language that states that the RTA will work with Seattle and King County for a plan for transit operations that would take effect when the system begins operating.

Mr. McKenna asked Ms. Choe if her concerns would be satisfied if the wording were changed to “would not begin operating.”

Ms. Choe responded that she preferred language stating that the RTA, Seattle and King County will work together to reach an agreement. She expressed concern about the implication that a system could not be built until an agreement was reached.

Mr. McKenna explained that Amendment #10d has two parts. One of the issues deals with the tunnel; the other issue is applying the same level of analysis to light rail that will be applied to express busses and commuter rail.

Ms. Hague suggested the Board consider action on each of the paragraphs separately.

Mr. McKenna accepted the divided question.

It was moved by Mr. McKenna, seconded by Ms. Hague and defeated by the majority vote of all Board members present that the first paragraph of proposed Amendment #10d be approved. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Hague, Mr. McKenna and Mr. Hansen.)

It was moved by Mr. McKenna, seconded by Mr. Hansen and defeated by a majority vote of all Board members present that the second paragraph of proposed Amendment #10d be approved as presented. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Hague, Mr. McKenna and Mr. Hansen.)

It was moved by Ms. Choe and seconded by Mr. Earling that the following substitute language be provided for paragraph 1 of Amendment #10d: Delete “selecting” and insert “supporting construction of...” The rest of the language would remain the same.

The motion was carried unanimously.

It was moved by Ms. Sullivan and seconded by Ms. Choe that Amendment #10c be approved as presented.

Ms. Sullivan described Amendment #10c, which states that “One of the first tasks of a citizen committee for the north light-rail line will be to consider and to help identify an alternative northern route which can be evaluated against the preferred alternative during environmental review and preliminary engineering stages. At a minimum, the evaluation will include performance criteria such as ridership, cost, cost-effectiveness, compatibility with local community plans, direct service to the University District, speed and capacity, and impacts to existing transportation capacity in the corridor. The time and resources devoted to the task of identifying an alternative northern route shall be established at the beginning of the citizen process.”

The motion was carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present.

Mr. Drewel announced that the Board would now consider Amendment #3a.

It was moved by Ms. Gates and seconded by Mr. Miller that Amendment #3a be approved as presented.

Ms. Gates explained that the passage of Amendment #3 changes the federal funding assumption for the North King County subarea. Amendment #3a proposes the allocation of those funds:

- ◆ Maintain the Boeing Access Station, \$15 million, within the North King County subarea budget;
- ◆ The federal funding assumption increases the North King County subarea budget by \$52 million. \$26 million will be used to extend light rail toward Northgate or for other North King County subarea capital investments.
- ◆ The remaining \$26 million represents the North King County subarea's contribution to regional commuter rail and bus service operations that cross subarea boundaries. It will be allocated to the other four subareas in proportion to the subareas' percentage share of total RTA local taxes collected and projected.

The motion to approve Amendment #3a was carried by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Sullivan, Mr. Locke, Ms. Choe, Mr. Nickels and Mr. Rice.)

It was moved by Mr. Russell and seconded by Ms. Hague that Amendment #4a be approved as presented.

Mr. Russell explained that this amendment would reduce the \$10 million previously set aside for an SR-520 HCT feasibility study to \$3 million which was the Eastside Transportation Program's (ETP) unanimous recommendation.

The motion to approve Amendment #4a failed by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Mr. Sutherland, Mr. Miller, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Russell, Mr. Stoner, Ms. Choe and Ms. Hague.)

It was moved by Ms. Choe and seconded by Ms. Sullivan that Amendment #4b be approved as presented.

Ms. Choe explained that this amendment would delete funding for the SR-520 study. In her opinion, SR-520 represents a serious transportation problem, and while the RTA needs to be a partner in resolving it, it is not appropriate for the agency to be perceived to be in the lead position. Some of the alternatives, such as a full replacement bridge, are beyond the RTA's authority.

Mr. McKenna indicated that he believes in the necessity of addressing SR-520 in Phase I. This is a product of the subarea process, and has been given a great deal of thought by the ETP. The failure to address the SR-520 corridor, not just the bridge, has been a glaring omission back to the days of the Joint Regional Policy Committee.

The motion to approve Amendment #4b was carried by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Hague, Mr. Hansen, Mr. McKenna and Mr. Russell.)

It was moved by Ms. Choe and seconded by Mr. Morrison that Amendment #25 be approved as presented.

Ms. Choe explained that this amendment would place the \$10 million removed from the SR-520 study (Amendment #4b) into the innovation fund, which would be used to look at innovative technology.

The motion to approve Amendment #25 failed by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Mr. Drewel, Ms. Sullivan, Ms. Choe, Mr. Locke, Mr. Nickels, Mr. Earling and Mr. Morrison.)

It was moved by Mr. Miller and seconded by Ms. Davis that the savings from the deletion of the SR-520 study be put into a fund to be used in conjunction with the State of Washington for analysis of HCT elements within all corridors within the RTA boundaries.

Mr. Miller indicated that, on the advice of the Executive Director, he would withdraw the motion and ask that the Board put the \$10 million in savings from the SR-520 study into Phase II planning, which then can be identified for those same purposes in terms of corridor studies but any funds not used would remain in the regional fund.

It was moved by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Russell that the \$10 million in savings from the deleted SR-520 feasibility study be put into Phase II planning.

Mr. Morrison registered his concern that those on the Eastside would like to see some investment made in looking at better east/west movement. He stated that funds are potentially available for this kind of evaluation in the North Lake Washington area.

The motion to put the \$10 million in savings from the SR-520 feasibility study into Phase II planning was passed by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Sullivan, Ms. Choe, Mr. Locke, Mr. Rice and Mr. Nickels.)

It was moved by Ms. Gates and seconded by Mr. Stoner that Amendment #1a, deleting RTA funding of HOV lanes, be approved as presented.

Mr. Hansen questioned the purpose of Amendment #1a in light of Amendments #1b and #1c being passed on the consent agenda.

Mr. Gunter suggested that the Board consider the next amendment so that he could determine whether action on Amendment #1a would be necessary.

It was moved by Mr. Russell and seconded by Mr. Stoner that Amendment #2 be approved with the following changes: change the phrase, "similar to the state Transportation Department's..." to "...similar to the state Transportation Commission's...."

Amendment #2 would amend the paragraph concerning conditions for the RTA's investment in the state Transportation Department's HOV system to read as follows:

"The RTA will negotiate an agreement with the state Transportation Department and the Puget Sound Regional Council similar to the state Transportation Department's existing Statewide Freeway High-Occupancy Vehicle Policy to specify mutually acceptable speed and reliability standards, and how those standards will be monitored and maintained. In negotiating this agreement, the RTA will seek to specify how it will be compensated if those standards are not maintained and the advantages to transit created by its investment are reduced."

The motion to approve Amendment #2 with the language change was carried unanimously.

Mr. Gunter asked Executive Director White to clarify the earlier question regarding Amendment #1a. Executive Director White explained that there had been a series of three amendments identified as Amendment #1. Those amendments were separated into #1a, #1b and #1c. The Board adopted #1b and #1c as part of the consent agenda. The original intent was Amendment #1a would have been passed and then #1b and #1c would be acted on.

Executive Director White suggested that the Board either pass Amendment #1a or delete Amendments #1b and #1c to avoid a conflicting statement.

The question was called on Amendment #1a, and it was passed by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Mr. McKenna voted in the minority.)

It was moved by Mr. Earling and seconded by Ms. Gates that Amendment #7a, calling for the establishment of partnerships for funding commuter rail investments, be approved as presented.

The motion to approve Amendment #7a was carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present.

Mr. McKenna withdrew Amendment #7b.

It was moved by Ms. Choe and seconded by Mr. Miller that Amendment #24, adding a provisional commuter rail station in Georgetown, be approved as presented.

It was requested by Mr. Hansen and Mr. Miller that the amendments adding provisional commuter rail stations in Georgetown (Amendment #24) and in Ballard (Amendment #17) be considered as one. Ms. Choe agreed to that request.

Mr. Hansen questioned funding for the stations.

Ms. Choe responded that the stations would be funded within the Seattle/North King County subarea budget.

Mr. Hansen asked for clarification of the costs that would be included.

Mr. Drewel responded that all costs would be assumed by the North King County subarea.

Ms. Hague asked if Ms. Choe would accept an amendment adding language after "funding available" that said "and approval of ridership studies."

Ms. Choe did not accept Ms. Hague's proposed amendment.

The motion to approve Amendments #17 and #24 was carried by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Ms. Hague and Mr. McKenna voted in the minority.)

It was moved by Ms. Choe and seconded by Ms. Gates that Amendment #16, annexing new areas and extending RTA services, be approved as presented.

Ms. Choe explained that Amendment #16 provides incentives for areas not included in the first phase to annex into the RTA.

The motion was carried by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Mr. Hansen and Ms. Hague voted in the minority.)

Mr. Miller asked to delay action on Amendments #5 and #9, as Mr. McKenna had exited the room.

It was moved by Mr. Nickels and seconded by Mr. Rice that Amendment #18 regarding the RTA investment in park-and-ride lot capacity be approved as presented.

Mr. Nickels indicated that this amendment states the RTA's intent to encourage people to access transit through means other than the usage of single-occupancy vehicles (SOV's).

Ms. Gates stated her intent to support this amendment with a couple of friendly changes. She proposed changing the word "investment" to "demand for" in the first paragraph. In addition, she proposed that in the fourth bullet, the language be changed to "allow park-and-ride lots to be converted to other uses when transit- and pedestrian- friendly development patterns make specific site inappropriate for continued park-and-ride use."

Mr. Nickels accepted those proposals as part of his motion.

Mr. Hansen indicated that he was concerned because the park-and-ride lots function differently in Snohomish County. In addition, the Metropolitan Transportation Plan calls for significant increases in park-and-ride lot capacity. Park-and-ride lots in Snohomish County are already operating at capacity.

Mr. Drewel responded that the amendments recognize those differences.

Amendment #18, including the language change suggested by Ms. Gates, was passed by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Hague, Mr. McKenna and Mr. Hansen.)

It was moved by Mr. Miller, seconded by Mr. McKenna and carried unanimously by all Board members present that Amendment #5a, adding language to assure that the regional bus service implemented will be productive, be approved with a change incorporating the phrase "or capital facilities" in the first sentence of the second paragraph, after the phrase, "In areas where existing transit markets..."

Mr. McKenna withdrew Amendment #5b.

It was moved by Mr. McKenna, seconded by Mr. Miller and carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present that Amendment #9a regarding HOV Expressway alternatives be approved as presented.

It was moved by Ms. Sullivan and seconded by Mr. Sutherland that Amendment #9b, which amends #9a to include participation by local jurisdictions and citizen committees, as well as an assessment of ridership and the possibility of implementing other innovative programs, be approved as presented.

In response to Mr. McKenna, Ms. Sullivan agreed to withdraw the phrase "or by implementing other innovative programs."

The motion to approve Amendment #9b, with the deletion of the phrase "or by implementing other innovative programs" was carried unanimously by all Board members present.

It was moved by Mr. McKenna and seconded by Mr. Russell that Amendment #21, calling for a deferment of specific park-and-ride lot improvements where additional study is needed, be approved as presented.

Mr. McKenna explained that the amendment addresses issues regarding specific investments. Instead of identifying a Star Lake park-and-ride lot, the language would refer to "Federal Way park-and-ride lot capacity improvements."

Ms. Gates asked if Mr. McKenna would accept language referring to "Star Lake park-and-ride, Federal Way-320th or other Federal Way area park-and-ride lots".

Mr. McKenna agreed to the language proposed by Ms. Gates.

The motion to approve Amendment #21, including the language change suggested by Ms. Gates, was carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. McKenna and seconded by Ms. Gates that Amendment #22, clarifying that a portion of the re-deployable bus hours may be invested in existing park-and-ride lots impacted by the RTA, be approved as presented.

Mr. McKenna indicated that the amendment clarifies that a portion of the re-deployable bus hours might be invested in something other than bus service. It indicates that park-and-ride lot capacity is one option of where resources might be redirected.

The motion to approve Amendment #22 was carried by majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Davis, Ms. Sullivan, Mr. Rice and Mr. Nickels.)

It was moved by Mr. McKenna and seconded by Ms. Hague that Amendment #27, establishing criteria for park-and-ride lot investments, be approved as presented.

The motion to approve Amendment #27 was carried unanimously.

It was moved by Mr. Nickels and seconded by Ms. Choe that Amendment #23, indicating that the RTA will explore the possibility of providing special event service to a new ballpark and other potential sports complex improvements in the Kingdome area using commuter rail and electric-light rail service, be approved as presented.

Mr. Hansen questioned the economic implications of the amendment.

Mr. Nickels responded that the amendment commits only to exploring the possibilities of special event service.

The motion to approve Amendment #23 was carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present.

It was moved by Mr. Miller, seconded by Mr. Rice and carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present that Amendment #26 be approved as presented.

Amendment #26 adds the following to the Financial plan framework section:

- ◆ “The proposal to be placed before the voters will be a ten-year construction plan financed in part by long-term bonds. As elements are completed, they will begin operating during that ten-year period. After the ten-year period, the RTA’s tax revenues will be used to continue transit operations and pay for debt service. Any portion of tax revenues used for further capital expansion will be subject to voter re-approval.”
- ◆ “Because transit facilities provide benefits over a long span of time, it is reasonable to finance their construction over a period that extends beyond the ten-year system plan construction timeframe.”

It was moved by Mr. McKenna and seconded by Ms. Hague that Amendment #1, establishing criteria for electric light-rail extension to other subareas in future phases, be approved as presented.

Mr. McKenna proposed adding the following change to the last sentence: “...with the transportation priorities and comprehensive plans of local jurisdictions...”

Mr. Earling, referring to the second paragraph, proposed the following change: delete the words “into the East King County, Snohomish or Pierce County subareas” and replace the word “must” with the word “will”.

Mr. Miller said that the amendment does not clarify whether those local jurisdictions are even served by the light rail.

Ms. Sullivan indicated that all service must be consistent with Vision 2020.

Mr. McKenna pointed out that each jurisdiction has its own comprehensive plan.

Mr. Hansen questioned whether passage of this amendment would bind a future Board.

The motion to approve Amendment #1 failed by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Hague and Mr. McKenna.)

Mr. McKenna distributed a new Amendment #5c, which would amend #5b (copy on file).

It was moved by Mr. McKenna and seconded by Ms. Hague that Amendment #5c be approved as distributed.

Mr. McKenna explained that this amendment deals with the cost allocation of regional express bus service. The amendment would state in the future there would be compensation for regional bus routes that cross subarea boundaries from subareas that are not sharing the cost of those services in the first phase. If this compensation was calculated it would take into account the re-deployable bus hours.

Mr. Nickels expressed that while the amendment offers some excellent ideas, the proposal should be given the study it deserves instead of being voted on without prior review by the Board. He suggested it be referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. McKenna proposed that the principle should be adopted as part of the plan, and that the Finance Committee can further discuss the details.

The motion to approve Amendment #5c was defeated by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Mr. McKenna and Ms. Hague.)

Mr. Miller indicated that he agreed with the intent of the amendment and that he would encourage the Finance Committee to discuss it further.

It was moved by Mr. McKenna and seconded by Mr. Hansen that Amendment #1 to Resolution No. 73 be approved as distributed (copy on file).

Amendment #1 would insert the following as Section 5 of the Resolution: "The Board of the RTA shall achieve subarea equity by investing the RTA tax revenues and related bond revenues generated by each subarea in facilities, projects and services within such subarea."

Mr. Nickels expressed that all subareas within the boundaries of the RTA will benefit from the improvements made. Future boards should be given flexibility and the ability to judge how those benefits and expenditures are to be made.

Ms. Gates pointed out that the plan already discusses the financial policies and the equity issues among the subareas.

Mr. Gunter pointed out that the Board cannot completely set the equity principles so that subsequent boards can't modify them. Pursuant to RCW 81.112, the major decisions of the Board shall be made by a two-thirds vote. Regardless of the language inserted, the Board retains discretion to modify the plan.

Mr. Miller called for the question.

The motion to approve Amendment #1 to Resolution No. 73 failed by the majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Hague, Mr. McKenna, Mr. Russell and Mr. Hansen.)

It was moved by Mr. McKenna and seconded by Mr. Hansen that Amendment #2 to Resolution No. 73 be approved as distributed (copy on file).

Amendment #2 would insert the following as Section 6 of Resolution No. 73: "The Board of the RTA shall complete the System Plan within the budget and ten-year timeframe set forth in Exhibit A unless a budget increase or time extension is authorized by a vote of the RTA district on a revised ballot measure.

Mr. Gunter indicated that the RTA is authorized to cause elections for taxing authority, but in no other instances. The Board does not have the authority to cause a specific vote on a modified budget or time extension. It is implied that the RTA may hold advisory elections on issues assuming the cooperation of election officials.

Mr. McKenna stated that he would amend the amendment to authorize an "advisory" vote.

Mr. Miller called for the question.

The motion to approve Amendment #2, as amended by Mr. McKenna, was defeated by a majority vote of all Board members present. (Those voting in the minority were Ms. Hague, Mr. McKenna and Mr. Hansen.)

Mr. Miller called for the question on the motion to approve Resolution No. 73.

Mr. Morrison stated that he had made the original motion to put this action before the Board. He complimented the Board and the staff for the public involvement undertaken. He expressed his hope that the Board would adopt Resolution No. 73 and that the public would approve the RTA proposal in November.

Mr. Nickels indicated that he had voted no the draft plan. He expressed that he was not pleased with every aspect of the plan before the Board, and had struggled trying to decide whether he would vote for or against Resolution No. 73. The voters expect the RTA to put the best plan possible before them. The RTA has made a commitment to extending light rail to SeaTac and slightly beyond, and to Northgate. Despite some misgivings, he acknowledged that there will be benefits for his constituency, and indicated that he would vote in favor of this plan.

Mr. Miller indicated that there is no doubt about the need for improvements. The RTA proposal represents an extremely important part of the solution. The Board has worked hard for over a year to respond to the citizens. It is essential to the region's economy to move forward with these investments. It is not a system that is meant to address only Seattle and settled King County. The outlying regions of Snohomish County, East King County, Pierce County and South King County will benefit as much or more than Seattle. He urged his colleagues to support the proposal. Given the requirement of two-thirds approval of this measure, he suggested a roll-call vote.

Ms. Choe expressed her appreciation to Mr. Drewel for his leadership, as well as to the Board, Executive Director White and the staff of the RTA. She extended her thanks to Governor Lowry for drafting the important compromise and language to gain approval from the environmental community.

She stated that the proposed plan is smaller, cheaper, and reflects the priorities articulated by different areas. If it does not succeed, the region will not see any significant transportation solutions for 10 to 15 years. Ms. Choe indicated that the Seattle area is lauded in magazines for its success. The one thing mentioned in those articles is the traffic and transportation gridlock. It is affecting the region's economy and livelihood. She pledged to work very hard for the success of the RTA proposal.

Mr. Locke extended his appreciation to Mr. Drewel, Mr. White and the staff. He indicated that the region needs to move forward with this starter plan. Every year of inaction only aggravates the gridlock and hurts the economic vitality and environmental quality of life in the area.

Mr. Rice indicated approving the RTA proposal is an expensive decision, but it is a step the region needs to take. The region must plan for the future and moving goods and commuters and still be economically viable. This proposal is not just for Seattle, but the entire State of Washington. This plan would cost 28 cents per day per family. He stated that he would support it and would work hard for its passage. He concluded by thanking Mr. Drewel and staff.

Mr. McKenna added his thanks to Mr. Drewel and staff, in particular to Executive Director White, Mr. Matsuoka and Mr. Johnathan Jackson.

He expressed his agreement that congestion is an issue and the economy demands good transportation. It is because of those facts that the region should make sure its investments are most cost effective. He stated his view that the proposal is not the most cost effective option. He disagreed with the decision to ignore SR-520 and to remove a guarantee of HOV funding. He indicated that the proposal does not represent the best transit plan and would not reduce congestion, and that he would not support it.

Mr. Russell indicated that the system is balanced and cost effective. It is critically needed and will be even more so in 10 years. The region needs a reliable alternative form of transportation, which this plan would provide.

Mr. Earling reported that 40,000 people have moved into the area since the failed March 1995 ballot proposal. It won't be too long before a city the size of Portland moves in to the Puget Sound Region. He indicated that he would ask the political leaders and other local leadership to step forward and to support this issue.

Mr. Drewel acknowledged the work of staff, the Board members, and added his thanks to Governor Lowry.

He stated that the Board has been responsive to citizen input. On behalf of all Board members he expressed his appreciation to the public. He also acknowledged Mr. Bruce Laing for his work in the past.

He expressed his intent to work very hard to get the measure approved.

The results of the roll call vote on Resolution No. 73 were as follows:

Ayes

Ms. Choe
Ms. Davis
Mr. Earling
Ms. Gates
Mr. Hansen
Mr. Locke
Mr. Miller
Mr. Morrison
Mr. Nickels
Mr. Rice
Mr. Russell
Mr. Stoner
Mr. Sutherland
Ms. Sullivan
Mr. Drewel

Nays

Ms. Hague
Mr. McKenna

The vote was 15 to 2 in favor of adopting Resolution No. 73.

Motion No. 15--Authorizing Staff to Revise the Language in the Ten-Year Regional Transit System Plan, the Long-Range Vision and the Financial Policies to be consistent with the amendments adopted by the Board

It was moved by Mr. Morrison seconded by Mr. Miller and carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present that Motion No. 15 be approved as presented.

Resolution No. 74--Setting Forth a Future Legislative Program

It was moved by Mr. Morrison, seconded by Mr. Miller and carried by the unanimous vote of all Board members present that Resolution No. 74 be approved as presented.

Next Meeting


The next Board meeting is scheduled for Friday, June 14 at 1:30 p.m.

As there was no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.



Bob Drewel
Chairman of the Board

ATTEST:



Marcia Walker
Board Administrator

dam