

SOUND TRANSIT

RESOLUTION NO. R98-22

Criteria and Process for Revising *Sound Move* BACKGROUND AND COMMENTS

Meeting:	Date:	Type of Action	Staff Contact:	Phone:
Executive Committee	1/16/98	Discussion/Recommend Board Approval Approval	Agnes Govern, Director, Regional Express	684-1673
Executive Committee	5/1/98		Barbara Gilliland, Program Manager, Systems Integration	684-1630
Executive Committee	6/19/98			
Board of Directors	7/23/98			

DISCUSSION TOPIC:

Approval of criteria and a process to be used in making revisions to *Sound Move*.

BACKGROUND:

During the discussion leading to the adoption of the Implementation Guide, staff described how projects and services that are in *Sound Move* could move from one time period to another. In addition to responding to changes in the delivery of the various components in the plan, we will also be faced with potential changes in scope and to the plan itself. Proposed project revisions could include either facilities or services.

As we move forward with the implementation of *Sound Move*, there are a number of ways project revisions could take place. It is likely that conditions could affect the funding and scope of components identified in the plan. In addition, we have already received requests for additions to the plan.

There are three general ways project revisions could occur:

1. Further scoping of the various components in the plan could result in a greater project definition or a more limited one than what was originally thought based on the benefits to transit and/or HOV modes.
2. *Sound Move* projects could receive greater funding support through partnerships, thus reducing Sound Transit's financing assumptions.
3. New needs could be identified as a result of changing conditions such as through major new development or congestion conditions worsening transit's reliability.

The Executive Committee has reviewed and commented on the proposed criteria. At their January 16 meeting, they recommended that the criteria be tested using a couple of proposed projects. The criteria have now been used in evaluating one project in Lynnwood and a proposed feasibility study for a connection between the Spokane Street viaduct and the E-3 busway. Proposed resolutions 98-22 and 98-23 are a result of that analysis.

RELEVANT BOARD POLICIES AND PREVIOUS ACTIONS TAKEN:

- Resolutions 73 and 75 adopting *Sound Move – The Ten-Year Regional Transit Plan* and its Appendices and the request for voter approval.

- Major Decisions: System plan amendments shall require a favorable vote of two-thirds of the entire membership of the Board.
- Subarea Benefits: Sound Transit is committed to investing revenues to benefit the areas where they are raised.
- System Expansion: Any second phase capital program, which continues local taxes for financing, will require voter approval within the Sound Transit District.

KEY FEATURES:

Identifies criteria in the following general categories to be used for the analysis of proposed revisions.

- A. Consistency with Sound Transit's enabling legislation.
- B. Consistency with Sound Transit's funding requirements and priorities.
- C. Consistency with the proposition approved by voters in the November 1996 election.
- D. Consistency with and support of the transportation goals, commitments, projects, and corridors served in *Sound Move*.
- E. Adequacy of environmental review completed under SEPA and/or NEPA, either as part of the 1993 System Plan EIS or otherwise.
- F. The extent to which the proposed revision has been reviewed and is supported by the subarea(s), local jurisdiction, and community.

ALTERNATIVES:

- Do not approve the Resolution and adopt criteria as guidelines for staff to use when evaluating and preparing proposals for the Board to review.
- Do not establish criteria and treat each proposal on an individual basis.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has completed a test of these criteria and has recommended a change to the *Sound Move* plan in Lynnwood. We recommend that the criteria as described be adopted in order to evaluate future plan revision requests until early 1999.

SOUND TRANSIT

RESOLUTION NO. R98-22

A RESOLUTION of the Board of the Regional Transit Authority adopting criteria to guide evaluation of proposals to amend *Sound Move – The Ten-Year Regional Transit Plan*.

WHEREAS, the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority ("Sound Transit") is a governmental entity vested with all powers necessary to implement a high capacity transportation system as provided in Chapters 81.104 and 81.112 RCW; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution No. 73, adopted May 31, 1996, the Board *adopted Sound Move, the Ten-Year Regional Transit Plan*, and by Resolution No. 75, adopted August 23, 1996, the Board called an election to approve local taxes to implement *Sound Move*; and

WHEREAS, on November 5, 1996, Central Puget Sound area voters approved local funding for *Sound Move*, the ten-year plan for regional high capacity transit in the Central Puget Sound region; and

WHEREAS, in order to cost-effectively maximize the public transportation benefits to the Central Puget Sound Region, the Sound Transit Board may wish to consider amendments to *Sound Move* to respond to the region's transportation needs; and

WHEREAS, it is in the public interest to ensure that any plan amendment is consistent with the transportation goals, commitments, projects, and corridors served in *Sound Move*, and with the policies adopted to implement *Sound Move*; and

WHEREAS, a set of criteria to guide evaluation of proposed changes to *Sound Move* would aid the Board's consideration of proposed plan amendments;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of the Regional Transit Authority as follows:

1. The Board hereby adopts the "Criteria to Guide Evaluation of Proposals to Amend *Sound Move – The Ten-Year Regional Transit Plan*" (attached hereto as Exhibit A).

2. Appropriate Board committees may undertake preliminary review of proposals to amend *Sound Move* and make such findings and recommendations pursuant to the criteria adopted herein as may be appropriate under the circumstances.
3. The Board intends to review the criteria in early 1999. Accordingly, the Board directs staff to report to them on the effectiveness of the criteria and to propose any changes that may be necessary or appropriate in early 1999.

ADOPTED by the Board of the Central Puget Sound Regional Transit Authority at a regular meeting thereof held on the 23rd day of July 1998.



Bob Drewel
Board Chair

ATTEST:



Marcia Walker
Board Administrator

Exhibit A

Criteria to Guide Evaluation of Proposals to Amend *Sound Move – The Ten-Year Regional Transit Plan*

- A. Consistency with Sound Transit's enabling legislation.
- B. Consistency with Sound Transit's funding requirements and priorities. As appropriate, factors that the Board may consider include, but are not limited to:
 - Identification of a reliable funding source to pay for the proposed plan amendment (*e.g.*; surplus local tax revenues; commitment of local, state, federal, or private funds not otherwise available to Sound Transit; cost savings from completed projects in the same subarea).
 - Consistency with Sound Transit's financial policies, including limits on indebtedness if the proposed change to the plan would involve increased borrowing.
 - Ensuring there are adequate funding and reserves for projects and services already identified in *Sound Move*.
 - Ensuring subarea equity.
- C. Consistency with the proposition approved by voters in the November 1996 election. As appropriate, factors that the Board may consider include, but are not limited to:
 - Extent to which the proposed change would cause the high capacity transportation project as a whole to deviate from that considered by the voters.
 - Whether the proposed revision involves a decision not to develop or provide a project, facility, or service specifically identified in *Sound Move*.
 - Cost of the proposed revision relative to the cost of the plan approved by the voters.
 - Whether a "reasonable voter" would consider the proposed change to be a minor change that falls within the range of expectations or a change in the essential features of the plan that is beyond voter expectations.
- D. Consistency with and support of the transportation goals, commitments, projects, and corridors served in *Sound Move*. As appropriate, factors that the Board may consider include, but are not limited to:
 - Impact of the proposed revision on the ten-year timeframe and prospects for delay of completion of any element of *Sound Move*.
 - Extent to which the proposed revision achieves the facility or service goals in *Sound Move*, but at less cost or with greater public benefits.
 - Specificity of *Sound Move* as to location, alignment, or other characteristic of a replaced or amended project, facility, or service.
- E. Adequacy of environmental review completed under SEPA and/or NEPA, either as part of the 1993 System Plan EIS or otherwise.
- F. The extent to which the proposed revision has been reviewed and is supported by the subarea(s), local jurisdiction, and community.