SUMMARY and FISCAL NOTE

Department:	Dept. Contact:	CBO Contact:
SDOT	Bill LaBorde	Aaron Blumenthal

1. BILL SUMMARY

Legislation Title: A RESOLUTION relating to transportation infrastructure improvement and maintenance, in response to Resolution 32137, regarding the establishment and recommendations of a Transportation Funding Task Force to develop policy and funding recommendations for long term transportation infrastructure needs, with specific focus on building out Seattle's sidewalk network, improving existing sidewalks, improving pavement condition, and replacing or rehabilitating aging bridges.

Summary and Background of the Legislation: A Transportation Funding Task Force was originally proposed a component of the Mayor's 2024 Transportation Levy proposal as a means of bringing together a variety of community and transportation stakeholder voices to develop both policy and funding solutions to address what, over the course of developing Seattle's three transportation levy proposals has proven to be among the city's thorniest transportation infrastructure challenges – how to fully build out the historic gaps in the city's missing sidewalk network while also meeting a long term sustainable standard for better maintaining the City's existing sidewalks, bridges and pavement condition. Council endorsed the Task Force concept in passing Resolution 32137 as a complement to the 2024 Transportation Levy Ordinance.

This proposed resolution is consistent with subsection 2.G of Resolution 32137 in the language it uses regarding the planned membership of the Task Force, its scope of work, and the content and due dates for issuing interim and final reports.

2. CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Does this legislation create, fund, or amend a CIP Project? ☐ **Yes** ☒ **No**

3. SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Does this legislation have financial impacts to the City? ☐ **Yes** ☒ **No**

3.d. Other Impacts

Does the legislation have other financial impacts to The City of Seattle, including direct or indirect, one-time or ongoing costs, that are not included in Sections 3.a through 3.c? If so, please describe these financial impacts.
The 2024 Levy Ordinance (Ordinance 127053) would, if passed by voters in November, allocate $5 million for "Durable Infrastructure Solutions. Of this $5 million, approximately $1.5-2.0 million would be set aside for all costs associated with the Transportation Funding Task Force (see Ordinance 127053, Attachment A), including the services of a contracted facilitator and any additional staff and consulting services necessary to allow the Task Force to develop policy and finance proposals. These services could include input from experts from within City departments, as well as out consultants, to advise the Task Force on matters such as finance options available to the City, bond issuance and different approaches to construction contracting and management.

If the legislation has costs, but they can be absorbed within existing operations, please describe how those costs can be absorbed. The description should clearly describe if the absorbed costs are achievable because the department had excess resources within their existing budget or if by absorbing these costs the department is deprioritizing other work that would have used these resources.
As stated above, all costs associated with the Task Force effort would be covered by the "Durable Infrastructure Solutions" component of the 2024 levy. This resolution would be effectuated only if the Levy is approved by Seattle voters in the 2024 general election.

Please describe any financial costs or other impacts of *not* implementing the legislation.
As discussed by the Mayor, SDOT Director, and Councilmembers during the Select Committee deliberations on the 2024 levy proposal, no single levy is capable of building out Seattle's full sidewalk network as presented in the Seattle Transportation Plan, or meeting the standards for long-term sustainable bridge and pavement condition SDOT has long advised and has documented over the last few years in developing a life-cycle cost approach to asset management. While this Task Force may not be able to, by itself, solve these challenges that face nearly all US states and local governments trying to better maintain aging infrastructure, a cross-section of community members, infrastructure experts and stakeholders, can build a consensus among strategies that could allow the City better manage these challenges over the long-term by building consensus around priorities, making policy changes to reduce costs through improved construction management and delivery, more comprehensive private development strategies for filling in sidewalk gaps, and finance approaches that may make it easier to take on more bridge replacement and rehabilitation projects.

4. OTHER IMPLICATIONS

a. Please describe how this legislation may affect any departments besides the originating department.
Other departments, including the Office of City Finance, the Seattle Department of Construction and Inspections (SDCI), Seattle Public Utilities (SPU), and the City Attorney's Office will be asked to provide technical assistance for various Task Force scope elements

and meetings. For example, Law and Finance may be asked to provide information to the task force on bonding, SPU on drainage requirements associated with sidewalk and alternative pathway construction, and SDCI on development standards as it relates to new sidewalk construction.

b. Does this legislation affect a piece of property? If yes, please attach a map and explain any impacts on the property. Please attach any Environmental Impact Statements, Determinations of Non-Significance, or other reports generated for this property.
No

c. Please describe any perceived implication for the principles of the Race and Social Justice Initiative.

i. How does this legislation impact vulnerable or historically disadvantaged communities? How did you arrive at this conclusion? In your response please consider impacts within City government (employees, internal programs) as well as in the broader community.

While pavement condition and bridge conditions are an issue across the city, the largest gaps in the sidewalk network are in portions of the city annexed from unincorporated King County, mostly in the early 1950s – Council District 5 and the southern extents of Districts 1 and 2. While the STP and new 2024 Levy proposal prioritize new sidewalks according to high priority equity index areas, the extent of gaps in the network make new sidewalks a critical RSJI issue to prioritize within the Task Force's work. Additionally, both missing sidewalks and sidewalks with uplifts and other repair needs inhibit the mobility of people with disabilities, especially those who rely on wheelchairs for mobility, or have visual impairments.

ii. Please attach any Racial Equity Toolkits or other racial equity analyses in the development and/or assessment of the legislation.

The Racial Equity Toolkit for the proposed Levy is relevant here and can be found on as a supporting document to the Summary and Fiscal Note for Ordinance 127053 here at: https://seattle.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=13059183&GUID=325BF195-B9BD-43D2-81E0-4B467956DFAB.

iii. What is the Language Access Plan for any communications to the public?

Public communications related to the Task Force will, at a minimum, be translated into Tier 1 languages and likely both Tier 1 and 2 languages.

d. Climate Change Implications

i. Emissions: How is this legislation likely to increase or decrease carbon emissions in a material way? Please attach any studies or other materials that were used to inform this response.

Addressing gaps in the sidewalk network and increasing the rate of sidewalk repair make it easier for the city to support more growth and serve better access to transit, as well as improved access to many daily needs within a 15-minute walk of where most people in Seattle live or work. Additionally, maintaining bridge and pavement

infrastructure can help avert the need for the kind of capital replacement projects that are generally more carbon intensive than maintenance projects.

ii. **Resiliency: Will the action(s) proposed by this legislation increase or decrease Seattle's resiliency (or ability to adapt) to climate change in a material way? If so, explain. If it is likely to decrease resiliency in a material way, describe what will or could be done to mitigate the effects.**
Finding solutions to fund better maintenance of existing assets may also help make much of our bridge and pavement infrastructure more resilient to the impacts of the kinds of heat waves that have become more frequent as a result of climate change.

e. If this legislation includes a new initiative or a major programmatic expansion: What are the specific long-term and measurable goal(s) of the program? How will this legislation help achieve the program's desired goal(s)? What mechanisms will be used to measure progress towards meeting those goals?
The outcomes of the Task Force's work will be determined by the feasibility of the recommendations it ultimately makes to the Mayor and Council for better addressing infrastructure needs.

5. CHECKLIST

☐ **Is a public hearing required?**

☐ **Is publication of notice with *The Daily Journal of Commerce* and/or *The Seattle Times* required?**

☐ **If this legislation changes spending and/or revenues for a fund, have you reviewed the relevant fund policies and determined that this legislation complies?**

☐ **Does this legislation create a non-utility CIP project that involves a shared financial commitment with a non-City partner agency or organization?**

6. ATTACHMENTS

Summary Attachments: None.