Local Transportation Funding Proposal

Council Decision Agenda

Committee of the Whole
July 17, 2006

Section 1: Non-Levy Funding Sources

Background: Characteristics of Non-Levy vs. Levy Local Transportation Funding Sources

	Business Trans. Tax	Parking Tax	Property Levy
Requires public vote?	No	No	Yes (50%)
Automatically expires?	No	No	No
Limited to transportation purposes by State law?	No	Yes	No
Bondable source that can be used to accelerate projects?	Yes	Yes	No
Principal intended uses in City funding package	Bond funding for bridge repair	Transit match, bond funding for Major Projects.	Maintenance and Bike, Ped. & Safety Programs.
Would encourage non-SOV use?	Yes, via tax exemptions	Somewhat	No
Grows over time? (keeps up with inflation)	No	Yes	Yes, initially. (Limited to 1% plus new construction after 6 years)
Would be paid by non-Seattleites who use our streets?	Yes	Yes	No
Revenue potential	Limited - $5-10 million a year	Limited - $10-15 million a year	Large. $24 million per year for each $100 new property tax on an average house

A. Business Transportation Tax

Three Issues: (1) Magnitude; (2) Exemptions; & (3) Implementation Date

1. ***Magnitude of Tax:*** Mayor has proposed an annual tax of $25 per employee, generating approx. $5.5 M per year. Revenues would be dedicated to transportation and would pay debt-service on bonds used to finance major bridge repairs.

Employers would be given an exemption for employees who take advantage of a transit subsidy. And as noted below, additional exemptions could be offered.

Question 1: Is $25 per employee an appropriate level for this tax?

Yes / No (If no, should another level be considered?)

Considerations:

- Tax has minimal impact on labor costs, but would fall disproportionally on labor intensive businesses.
- Bondable revenue stream supports early implementation of bridge safety projects.

2. ***Exemptions:*** Mayor's proposal provides exemptions for employees who take advantage of a transit subsidy, thus providing an incentive for businesses to offer such programs and perhaps better linking the tax to those non-transit users who more heavily use the City's transportation infrastructure. However, employees who bike, walk, telecommute, car-pool or van-pool, and thus avoid use of single-occupancy vehicles, also help reduce demand for transportation infrastructure.

Question 2: Should exemptions also be provided for employees who walk, ride, telecommute, car-pool or van-pool to work?

Yes / No
(If no, should exemptions be provided for some, but not all of these alternatives?)

Considerations:

- Amending language would leave specific implementation to director rule-making.
- These alternatives also help reduce number of vehicles on roads.
- Enforcement could be challenging and additional exemptions would provide opportunities for evasion (for those willing to mis-represent their commuting choice).
- There would be some negative impact on revenues, perhaps a revenue reduction of $250K or more per year.

3. Implementation Date:
The proposed legislation calls for implementation data of January 1, 2007. However, with minimal impact on overall revenues, this date could be delayed until July 1, 2007. The later date would provide an opportunity to seek authority for alternative user fees during the 2007 State legislation session and before the tax takes effect.

> ***Question 3: Should the implementation of the business trans. tax be delayed until July 1, 2007?***
>
> ***Yes / No (If no, should another date be considered?)***
>
> ***Considerations:***
> - Delaying implementation of the business trans. tax would result in a one-time loss of 6 months revenue, roughly $2.7 M dollars.
> - The delay would provide an opportunity to seek alternative revenue authority during the next legislative session.

B. Commercial Parking Tax

Three Issues: (1) Ramping Up; (2) Magnitude & (3) Implementation Date

1. Ramping Up: Mayor's proposal includes a 10% parking tax that would be implemented at this full amount in January of 2007. The Council Alternative proposes a ramping schedule that would have the tax start 4% in the first year (2007), increase to 6% in the second (2008) and then reach a maximum of 8% in year three (2009) .

> ***Question 4: Should the commercial Parking Tax ramp up, and if so, are timing and size of the increases appropriate?***
>
> ***Yes / No***
> *(If yes to the former and no to the latter, how would you change the Mayor's proposal?)*
>
> ***Considerations:***
> - Starting the tax lower and increasing it as time passes provides a progressive incentive to opponents of such a tax (largely the

business community) to work with the City in Olympia to authorize more palatable alternative local transportation funding sources.

- Changing the tax rate will impose some adjustment costs on parking lot operators.
- Ramping up rather than starting with the final tax rate would have some negative impact on revenues, approximately $8 million over the proposed ramping period at the rates proposed in the Council Alternative.

2. Magnitude:

The Council Alternative proposes a commercial parking tax rate of 8% after the ramping up period. The lower tax rate (8% vs. 10%) initially provides about $2.5 M less revenue per year. (The difference increases over time as total parking tax revenues grow.)

Question 5: Do you support an 8% commercial parking tax rate?

Yes / No

(If no, what rate would you propose instead?)

Considerations:

- The commercial parking tax is one of two – and the larger of the two - proposed revenues sources that can be used to "bond against," that is to enable the City to borrow funds to accelerate critical rehabilitation projects. To do this, the City needs a minimum level of revenue from the commercial parking tax and the business trans. tax.
- The Mayor's proposal directs the additional $2.5 M associated with the 10% tax rate into Bridges and Structures. At this lower rate fewer bridge projects will be completed over the next 20 years.
- 8% is a significant tax which could hurt business downtown and in other Seattle commercial centers by discouraging travel to the businesses, although data from other Cities suggests that such impacts are not necessarily large.
- Alternatively, such a significant tax will encourage the use of transit and non-vehicular travel to already congested parts of Seattle.
- The ultimate tax rate must be large enough to encourage the business community to join the City in seeking authorization for better alternative local transportation funding sources in Olympia.

3. Implementation Date: The Mayor has proposed an implementation date for the commercial parking tax of January 1, 2007. However, with relatively little impact on overall revenues, this date could be delayed until July 1, 2007. The July implementation date would allow time for the Washington State Legislature to authorize an alternative local transportation funding source(s) that might be preferable to the commercial parking tax and that could be used in place of some or all of the commercial parking tax revenues.

> ***Question 6: Is the July 1, 2007 date reasonable for implementation of a new commercial parking tax in Seattle?***
>
> ***Yes / No (If no, should another date be considered)***.

C. "Sun-setting" of Non-Levy Funding Sources

There are two separate but perhaps related questions here:

1. ***Sunset Taxes after 20 Years.*** For both the parking tax and the business trans. tax, provisions could be added the authorizing ordinances to eliminate these taxes after 20 years, the term for which these revenue sources are now planned to be bonded. Alternatively, they could remain in place beyond year 20 and would then be available to fund other transportation projects.

2. ***Review Need for Taxes if Authority for Additional User Fees is provided by Olympia.*** Although both the parking tax and the business trans. tax have some nexus to use of the transportation system, more direct user fees (MVET, VLF, etc.) might become available in the future and could then be substituted for these revenue sources.

   To acknowledge this possibility, and perhaps to create incentives for various interest groups to help the City pursue such alternatives, language could be added to express the intent of the Council to reduce or eliminate the parking tax and the business trans. tax, should the alternative revenue sources become available. This would probably be best done as part of a companion resolution.

Question 7: Should the legislation authorizing the parking tax and business trans. tax 'sunset' these taxes after 20 years?

Yes / No

Considerations:

- Would make it clear that these sources are intended to fund specific projects.
- However, because a portion ($1.5 M) of the parking tax is potentially targeted for Transit O&M, it would leave the long-term funding for transit operations in question.
- Sunsetting could restrict future financing options. The current plan calls for all debt to be paid off in 20 years, but if needs/costs increase, alternative financing structure might be considered.
- Sunsetting would also reduce the future revenues (beyond 20 years) available for transportation, although an affirmative action to re-authorize the taxes by a future Council and Mayor could restore these funding sources.

Question 8: Should the Council indicate its intent to reconsider the parking tax and/or business trans. tax (or at least reduce the magnitude of the taxes), if alternatives become available?

Yes / No

Considerations:

- Language indicating this intent could be included in resolution to accompany ordinances authorizing the taxes.
- Could help build partnerships for pursuing alternatives in Olympia.
- If alternatives become available, might prefer to reduce property tax instead of (or in addition) to reducing the parking tax and business trans. tax.

D. Funding for King Street Station

The Mayor's proposed package would use $2 million a year of the revenue from the business trans. tax and/or parking tax to pay debt service on a $25 million bond issue to partially fund the restoration of King Street Station. $20 M would be used to complete Phase I project, which is projected to cost roughly $38 M. The remaining funding for Phase 1 would come from State and federal sources. The additional $5 M in City funding would be for as yet unspecified Phase II work.

The Mayor's proposal calls for the City to lead the restoration and redevelopment of the Station. However, the current funding decision does not necessarily represent a commitment for such a City role. Even if some other agency were to lead the project, some City funding would likely be needed/expected.

Question 9: Should King Street Station be included among the projects funded from the business trans. tax and parking tax?

Yes / No

Considerations:

- The Station could serve as one of three multi-modal centers in downtown.
- Significant investments are needed to upgrade the facility and some City funding will be needed to complete the project.
- The total costs of the project (including Phase II) are unknown and how much additional City funding will be needed is also not known at this time.
- The $2 million per year needed to fund this project could instead by directed into other transportation needs. Councilmember McIver has recommended that this annual amount be invested in Street Maintenance ($1.5 M) and Urban Forestry ($0.5 M).
- Alternatively, if overall spending were reduced by $2 million, either the business trans. tax or the parking tax could be reduced by an offsetting amount. (For example, the business trans. tax could be reduced from $25 per FTE to roughly $15 per FTE.)

Section 2: Levy Funding

A. Accountability / Oversight

There are two sub-issues here:

1. ***Sunsetting the property tax after 20 Years.*** Per State Law, the levy of the type proposed by the Mayor continues indefinitely. However, as part of the legislative package implementing the Mayor's proposal, the Executive has drafted a resolution stating the City's intent to limit the term of the proposed property tax to 20 years, unless authorized by a subsequent vote of the people.

> ***Question 10: Should the Council adopt legislation establishing the City's intent to 'sunset' the property tax after 20 years?***
>
> ***Yes / No***
>
> ***Considerations:***
> - Voters may be reluctant to approve an "in perpetuity" property tax increase.
> - At any package funding level less than that proposed by the Mayor, the City's transportation maintenance backlog will not be fully addressed within a 20 year levy period.
> - Cost estimates for key rehabilitation projects are very preliminary so that the City risks not being able to accomplish what it proposes within the 20 year planning horizon.

2. ***Program Accountability / Oversight.*** Should the property tax levy pass, the Mayor proposes creating an Oversight Committee comprised of the Chair of the City Council Transportation Committee, the City Director of Finance, 3 stakeholder group representatives and 6 citizens, of which half would be chosen by the Council and half chosen by the Mayor and confirmed by the Council.

   The Committee is charged with reviewing SDOT "program and project priorities, spending and revised financial plans" and advising the Council, Mayor and citizens on same. The Mayor's legislation doesn't require the Committee to advise on the question of whether the property tax should be discontinued before the 20 year duration of the program or put to the voters at 20 years to continue the levy.

Question 11: Should the Oversight Committee be required to advise the Council and Mayor at certain intermediate points, say after 6 and 12 years, on the advisability of continuing to levy the property tax for transportation purposes at the maximum allowable rate?

Yes / No

Considerations:

- Polls indicate voters consider accountability for the use of these funds very important. Mid-course check in points by an impartial oversight group could bolster public confidence in City oversight.
- New, more appropriate local transportation funding sources may become available over the next 20 years. An Oversight Committee could advise on whether any of these should be substituted for all or part of the property tax levy.
- Cost-effective use of the much greater level of transportation funding provided by the levy and accompanying non-levy revenue sources will require a tremendous and rapid expansion of SDOT's project management capability. If this capability is not developed in a timely way, it may be prudent to reduce or eliminate the levy.

B. Use of Levy Funds

Background

- Levy Funds would be principally dedicated to maintenance (of roads, bridges, signs, etc.) and safety (inc. bike & ped. programs).
- As proposed, the authorizing legislation will provide significant flexibility for shifting funding among categories, which may well be appropriate given the potential term of the tax collections.
- An initial spending plan, showing expected levels of funding for initial years could also be included/referenced in the authorizing legislation. . *(Staff is currently seeking sufficient direction to develop such a spending plan.)*
- Actual appropriations of the levy dollars will occur annually with the budget process and will require Council approval each year.
- Annual financial updates and work of Oversight Cmte. will provide mechanism to monitor actual spending and on-going performance.
- Each additional $1 million in annual levy revenues increases the cost to the median home (~$400K) by $4+ per year.

- See the attached chart and discussion that follows for more details about proposed use of Levy funds.

1. Specificity of Funding Allocations

As described above, the proposed levy legislation would provide significant flexibility to move dollars among funding categories. It will likely establish a minimum amount, in percentage terms, to be used for "Maintenance" versus "System Enhancements" and "Operations and Maintenance", but not offer more specificity than that.

Given the potential 20+-year term of the proposed property taxes, such flexibility may be desirable. As balances to this flexibility, the Oversight Committee will have a role in recommending how future allocations are made, and all appropriations will require Council approval. Nonetheless, providing the voters with additional assurances about how the property tax revenues will be spent also may be desirable.

Question 12: How much flexibility should be provided in the Levy authorizing legislation to allow for shifting among categories and sub-categories?

Options:

i. Approve legislation as proposed.

ii. Maintain a level of flexibility comparable to that proposed legislation, but include an initial financial plan, showing expected spending levels, as an attachment to illustrate intended allocations.

iii. Further restrict ability of Council/Mayor to shift funds among categories. *(Once staff has received final versions of the legislation, will be able to offer more specific alternatives.)*

Considerations:

- Future needs are inherently uncertain and flexibility will allow a better match between future resources and priorities.
- Oversight Committee recommendations and Council role in actual appropriations can ensure accountability.
- More specificity will provide voters with greater certainty about how funds will actually be used.
- Past levies have taken a variety of approaches. For example, Families and Education Levy is very flexible, while the Parks Levy has funding levels specified for several large categories.

2. Side-by-side comparison of Mayor's Proposal and the Council Alternative.

Question 13: For each of the sub-categories, and perhaps more meaningfully for the larger categories as a whole, are the proposed funding levels appropriate?

Yes / No

If no, how much more or less funding should be allocated?

a. Funding for Bridges and Structures:

Bridge Rehabilitation Projects (Total Cost = $116+ M)

Sector	Project Name	Project Detail	Project Cost 2006 $ Million	Cumulative Cost
SW	Fauntleroy Expressway	Strengthen crossbeams	$2.0	$2.0
NE	NE 45th St. Viaduct	Replace	$30.0	$32.0
CC	2nd Ave Ext.	Replace portions	$15.0	$47.0
SW	Airport Over Argo	Approaches	$31.5	$78.5
SW	E. Duwamish Waterway Br.	Deck strengthening	$3.5	$82.1
SW	Albro over Airport Way Br.	Repair underdeck & rocker bearings	$3.3	$85.4
NE	15th NE @ NE 105th	Replace	$8.0	$93.4
SE/CE	Jose Rizal Bridge	Repair Underdeck spalling	$1.5	$94.9
SW	West Seattle Highlevel Br.	Seal cracked deck	$1.1	$96.0
NW	Ballard Bridge North Approach	Strengthen or Replace	$15.3	$111.3
CC	Yesler Way over 4th Ave	Replace	$3.9	$115.1
CE	E. Interlaken Blvd	Replace	$1.3	$116.4

Bridge Seismic Projects (Total = $40 M)

Sector	Project Name	Project Detail	Project Cost 2006 $ Million	Cumulative Cost
NW	Ballard Bascule Bridge	Seismic Retrofit	$4.0	$4.0
SW	Fauntleroy Expressway	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$7.0
NW	Fremont Bascule Bridge	Seismic Retrofit	$4.0	$11.0
CC	4th Ave S, Jackson St to Airport Way	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$14.0
CC	2nd Ave Extension	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$17.0
CC	Jackson St., 4th to 5th Ave	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$20.0
SW	Albro over Airport Way	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$23.0
CC	Airport Way, 4th Ave to 5th Ave	Seismic Retrofit	$2.0	$25.0
NE	NE 45th Street Viaduct, East Approach	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$28.0
SW	1st Ave S. over ARGO RR Yard	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$31.0
SW	4th Ave South over ARGO RR Yard	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$34.0
SW	Airport Way over AGRO	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$37.0
SW	Admiral Way Bridge	Seismic Retrofit	$3.0	$40.0

- Mayor's package is intended to fund all these projects. The total cost of these projects is roughly $160 million.
- A significant share of the funding for these projects would come from the business transportation tax and/or the parking tax, not the property tax levy.
- Including both the Levy and Non-Levy funding, the Council Alternative provides funding that roughly 75% of the amount recommended by the Mayor. However, less of the funding in the Council Alternative comes from bondable sources. Once a more detailed spending plan is developed, staff will be able to provide additional clarity about which projects would be delayed/excluded because of the reduced funding.

b. Funding for Street Maintenance:

Road Maintenance

- With 20% match and current funding, Mayor's proposed $19 million would pave an avg. of 50 lane-miles per year, over the 20-year program.
- With same match and funding, the Council Alternative funding of $12+ million per year would pave an average of 34+ lane-miles per year. This is just under 70% of the level proposed by the Mayor.
- If, as recommended by Councilmember McIver, $1.5 million in annual funding were shifted from King St. into street maintenance, funding would reach 75% of the level recommended by the Mayor and an average of 37+ lanes miles could be paved. Alternatively, this same funding level could be achieved by increasing the levy by $1.5 million per year. This would increase the cost per a median home from the current $142 per year to approximately $149 per year.

Sidewalk, Trail, Walkway, Stairwell Maintenance

- With 10% match, Mayor's proposed $2.5 per year would repair an additional 3 miles of sidewalks and 6 stairwells.
- With same match, Council Alternative funding of $2 million would repair an additional 2.5 miles of sidewalks and 5 stairwells (approx).

c. Funding for Traffic Management:

- Mayor's Proposal would fund new street signs to match Fed. guidelines and sufficient funding to reduce backlog of striping/marking work, as well as signal and control repair/replacement.
- Council Alternative provides approximately 40% less funding in this category. Funding levels are not quite sufficient to maintain current condition.
- To give you a sense of scope, consider these examples:
  - The City has roughly 68,000 street signs, and replacement costs about $100 per sign; and
  - The City has 5,200 signal detectors, which cost roughly $1,000 each and need to be replaced every 10 years.

d. Funding for Urban Forestry:

- Issue in Urban Forestry is not really a backlog, but funding needed to support an optimal level of maintenance. For example, the goal for trees is a 7 year pruning cycle.
- With plans to increase the number of street trees, the costs of maintaining this cycle will be increasing.
- Lower funding level in the Council Alternative would not achieve this cycle, but would increase current spending levels (of roughly $600K per year) by $1 million. If it was deemed a sufficient priority, additional General Fund support could help address the remaining backlog.

e. Funding for Bicycle, Pedestrian and Safety Programs:

- Mayor's package includes a total of $5.7 million per: $2 million for bike projects and $3.7 million for Ped. and Safety programs.
- Council Alternative provides a total of $8 million per year, with the additional $2.3 million targeted toward bike and ped. programs.
- As background, the Safety Program includes three sub-programs:
  - *Safe Routes to School;*
  - *School Zone Signage Improvements; and*
  - *High Hazard Reduction (protected left turns, new traffic signals, etc.)*
- To give you a sense of sidewalk costs, $1 million of additional annual funding would build 5-8 blocks per year.

f. Funding for Transit Freight and Ped. Corridors:

- In this category most of the funding comes from the parking tax, not the property tax levy.
- In terms of funding for Major projects and Transit, the Council Alternative matches the Mayor's proposal. *However, there are differing views on the Council regarding the $2 million per year for King Street Station.*
- Levy funding is used only for Corridor Projects. The Council Alternative provides annual funding of $2.75 million, or roughly 70% of the $4 million recommended by the Mayor. The capital investments in the Corridor Projects will provide some share of the City match for Metro's recently proposed Transit Now! Partnership Program (assuming it is approved by County voters).

Major Projects and Corridor Projects

Projects	Major Projects $ M (Partial Funding)	Corridors $ M (Partial Funding)
Bridges and Structures		
S Spokane St Viaduct	$30	
S. Lander St. Bridge	$20	
Transit		
King Street Station	$25	
Multimodal Corridors		
Mercer Corridor	$30	
Aurora Transit, Pedestrian and Safety Improvements		$10
N/NE Northgate Wy Street Improvements - NCTIP		$5
Montlake/23rd/24th Corridor Improvement		$6
Greenwood Ave N Corridor Improvements		$6
West Seattle Corridor (Faunt, Avalon, Alaska)		$10
15th Ave NW & Elliott Ave W Corridor Improvement		$10
Rainier Ave S Corridor Improvements		$10
Total Costs	**$105**	**$57**
Annual Cost (Debt Service on Maj. Proj.,PAYG for Corridors)	**$8.4**	**$4.0**

Descriptions of Corridor Projects

Project / Description	Total Project Cost ($ M)
Aurora Transit, Pedestrian and Safety Improvements	$75.0
Project supports a new level of express transit service in the Aurora Av N (SR99) corridor . Design of segment from 110th to 145th underway. Includes ped safety and access improvements, continuous transit lanes, bus zone amenities, and a TDM program.	
N/NE Northgate Wy Street Improvements - NCTIP	$11.0
Make transit, safety, pedestrian and traffic improvements from Meridian to 15th Ave NE. Would include improvements at intersections, improved sidewalks, transit signal priority and other improvements.	
Montlake/23rd/24th Corridor Improvement	$41.7
Widen Montlake Blvd NE from NE Pacific Place to NE 45th Street approximately 5-feet on both sides for a southbound transit lane. Improve sidewalks, curb ramps and signals throughout the corridor. Reconstruct roadway with concrete from E Jackson St to E Lake Washington Blvd.	
West Seattle (Fauntleroy, Avalon, Alaska) Corridor Improvements	$44.7
Provide transit improvements, potentially including transit only lanes in key locations and bus bulbs at transit stops. Provide transit signal priority at key intersections, emergency vehicle preempt at all signals, detection equipment for traveler info and traffic responsive control, countdown ped signals, Closed Circut TV (CCTV). Spot sidewalk improvements and curb ramps per code.	
Greenwood Ave N Corridor Improvements	$16.2
Phase I is 105-112 and funded. Future phases will include full street improvement north to 145th. Curb, gutter, sidewalk, transit, signal, drainage, lighting upgrades. Project is an opportunity to take advantage of the natural drainage project (Broadview Green Grid) planned in the area.	
Ballard (15th Ave NW & Elliott) Corridor Improvement	$53.3
Provide transit improvements, potentially including transit only lanes in key locations. Spot sidewalk improvements and curb ramps per code. Improve connections to Burke Gilman Trail. Asphalt overlay between Denny and Ballard Bridge; reconstruct in concrete between bridge and NW 85th.	
Rainier Ave S Corridor Improvements	$34.9
Upgrade pedestrian signals and crossings, address left-turn conflicts in Columbia City, Transit Signal Priority, consolidate driveways to reduce crashes. Install CCTV. Reconstruct in concrete from South City Limits to 57th Ave S. Mill and Overlay AC, S Cloverdale St to S Austin St and S Alaska St to S Walden St.	

g. Funding for Neighborhood Services:

The Council Alternative provides no funding for this category. The Mayor's package includes $1.9 million per year.

Section 3: Other Issues

A. "Complete the Streets"

"Complete the Streets" is a national program/movement to ensure that when a new street is constructed or, as is more often the case in Seattle, repaved or reconstructed, opportunities are included for all modes of transportation, not just motor vehicles. Pedestrian improvements might include sidewalks, crosswalks, curb bulbs and street landscaping. Bicyclist improvements would be bike lanes, bike racks and special signaling. Disabled travelers benefit from curb ramps. Transit-oriented improvements range from dedicated rights of way within the street and bus rapid transit corridors, to amenities at transit stops such as shelters and real time information on the arrival of the next bus. While the Mayor's proposal has funding for pedestrian and bicyclist improvements, it does not express support for the "Complete the Streets" concept.

Question 14: Should the Council include support applying "Complete the Streets" principals to any project included in the funding package where feasible, via a resolution?

Yes / No

Considerations:

- Ped., bike and disabled improvements are most cost effectively made as part of larger street reconstruction projects.
- There is organized support in Seattle for implementing "Complete the Streets" through this local funding package. Demonstrable City support for "Complete the Streets" may be crucial to gaining their support of the ballot issue.
- By making it easier for alternative modes of travel in Seattle, vehicle trips could be reduced.
- "Complete the streets" will increase the costs of some projects, by how much is not currently clear.
- The City is drafting Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans this year and next. Adopting the "Complete the Streets" principals now may be putting the cart before the horse.

B. SDOT Staffing Plan

Implementation of the projects to be funded with both the levy and non-levy revenues sources will require a significant increase in SDOT's project management and oversight capabilities. Even if much of the work is let as contracts, oversight and management will be necessary. Even with its proposed reductions relative to the Mayor's proposal, the Council Alternative will still provide nearly $50 M additional dollars to SDOT each year.

The proposed funding plan does include money to hire staff to conduct the necessary project management and oversight. However, whether SDOT will be able to hire the required personnel in a timely manner is an open question, and it will clearly be a challenge to do so.

Question 15: Should Council require that SDOT provide a detailed staffing plan within the first 6 months of 2007 to ensure that near-term project implementation will be feasible?

Yes / No

Considerations:

- Such a plan could be desirable even if the Levy is defeated and only new funding sources are the business trans. tax and the parking tax.