

## Summary of Expenditure Plan Advisory Committee Break-Out Group Discussion – October 23, 2017

### Yellow Group

#### Transit:

- Remove ferry allocation;
- Suggest minor adjustments School Transit (4) and Clean Transit (5) so that Operations can be maintained as close to 37% as possible.
- Outreach to ensure voters know what multi-model services the tax is funding, otherwise they might not vote for the tax measure.
- Institute performance standards
- Less funding for school buses; re-evaluate the program because it hasn't proven itself.
- Re-assess percentages of all programs in 5 – 10 years.

#### Highways:

- Highways: No change because adjustments could be made over time.

#### Local Streets and Roads

- No changes

#### Safe Routes to School

- Concern expressed for public funding for crossing guards at private and religious schools

### Red Group:

#### Transit:

- Define clear criteria and productivity standards that could trigger a change service if criteria are not met
- Maintaining 55% overall will require a very big marketing effort to ensure people understand the benefits of the service
- Allow flexibility, especially considering new technology and the 30-year time frame of the Expenditure Plan. The Expenditure Plan will need to be reevaluated based on new options for mobility services and percentages of the funding should be able to be modified. Transit definition and services need to be able to adapt and be nimble.
- The current plan is more rigid than what will be needed from the future plan with so many unknowns.
- Acknowledge changing demographics for School Bus service and the need for funding may change/decrease

#### Highways:

- No significant comments
- Noted that matching funds are critical to attract funding and that demand management strategy is considered important.
- Support for not including SR 37

## Local Streets and Roads

- Sea-level rise/resiliency and innovative technology categories should assume matching funds from other sources and would assume an ebb/flow of need (ie: funds could roll-over to await projects and may not be expended each year.)
- Overall it was thought that the percentages for these Sea-level rise/resiliency and innovative technology categories would make little difference, but they were retained to attract matching funds.
- Suggest combining these two categories to add value.

## Safe Routes to School

- Increase marketing to ensure people are aware that the sales tax pays for programs, specifically crossing guards.
- This category and school transit should be responsive on projected demographics and the school age population will influence the budget needs.
- More data should be made available during this process since it is a 30-year tax, or include caveats, similar to transit, and the programs should be nimble and responsive to changes.
- Noted that the Crossing Guard Program is necessary, could be expanded and would be a good selling point.

Ms. Nelson noted that the groups are still struggling with transit and suggested the expenditure plan could be reviewed every 10 years, for example. She confirmed that it is not necessary to lock into a plan for 30 years.

## Blue Group:

### Transit

- Reallocate ferry funds to transit funds because transit is local whereas the ferry facilitates people moving through or out of the county.
- Concern expressed that local services could get cut, such as first and last mile from SMART, in favor of higher volume and higher frequency routes. Support to continue providing local services to neighborhoods.

Strategy 2 and 3 – No changes: Discussion on how maintaining local roads and mass transit would facilitate congestion relief, rather than funding highway projects.

Strategy 4 - No changes

## Green Group

### Transit:

- Retain the 55%. There had been previous discussion about reducing transit funding by 10%, but there was concern that this might attract opposition.
- Reallocate the ferry funds and reallocated the 1.5% to school transit.

- Concern continues that transit is just not performing, too many empty buses. Need checks and balances. They suggest TAM re-assess sub-categories and consider re-allocation every three years

#### Highways

- No change and there was support for continuing to fund the TDM program.

#### Local Streets and Roads

- Interest in retaining Safe Pathways at 3.5% (increase from suggested 3%)
- Increased the category to 27% to capture the .5%
- General consensus that Safe Pathways should be separately identified.
- Concern allocating Safe Pathways to this category rather than where it is in the current measure, under Safe Routes to School.

#### Safe Routes to School

- Reduced safe routes education from 4% to 3.5% to increase funding for Safe Pathways.