# Regional Transportation Plan Financial Strategy. Transit Operators Committee October 22, 2025 Puget Sound Regional Council



We are leaders in the region to realize equity for all. Diversity, racial equity and inclusion are integrated into how we carry out all our work.

## RTP Financial Strategy Requirements

The plan must identify reasonably available sources and revenues to fund <u>all</u> investments in the plan – capital, operations and maintenance – for a financially constrained plan

- The financial strategy is not an adopted budget it is a general plan with reasonable assumptions
- Assumptions of new or increased revenues must include strategies for ensuring availability
  - This can include necessary local or state legislative actions



## RTP Proposed Investments vs. Available Revenues

There are stark differences in the revenue gap across sponsor categories

Sponsor Category	Percentage Gap
Counties	12%
Cities	45%
Local Transit	29%
Regional Transit	0%
Washington State Ferries	8%
Washington State DOT	7%



## Preliminary Approach for Potential New Revenue Sources

- From prior discussions, focus on those sources that can be implemented consistently across the region and that are more likely to generate greater potential revenue
- Five sources identified:
  - Road usage charge
  - Increased vehicle fees
  - Increased sales tax rates for local transit
  - Increased county road levy
  - Retail delivery fee



# Additional Background

New Revenue Source	Default Distribution Method / Current Rates	Eligible Recipient
Road Usage Charge	Gas tax distribution = State 80%, Counties/Cities 20%	State, Counties, Cities
Vehicle Fees	Vehicle Fee distribution = State 68%, Counties/Cities 28%, Local Transit 4%	State, Counties, Cities, Transit
Transit Sales Tax	Sound Transit - 1.4%  Local transit capped at 1.2% with  legislative approval  King County Metro - 0.9%  Community Transit - 1.2%  Kitsap Transit - 1.1%  Pierce Transit - 0.6%  Everett Transit - 0.6%	Local and Regional Transit
County Road Levy	Capped at 1% annual growth	Counties
Retail Delivery Fees	n/a	Counties, Cities



# Local Transit Gap by Operator: Scenario 2b

#### Scenario 2b (millions of \$2026 dollars)

		NEEDS				REVENUES		
		System Improvements						
	Maintenance,	Regional						
	Preservation	Capacity	Other	New Transit				% of Local
	and Operations	Projects	Improvements	Service		Current		Transit Revenue
Operator	(Optimal State)	(before 2040)	(70% of need)	(2% per yr)	Total	Law	Revenue Gap	Gap
Community Transit	\$7,090	\$350	\$80	\$1,480	\$9,000	\$8,400	-\$600	3%
Everett Transit	\$1,050	\$0	\$230	\$160	\$1,440	\$1,000	-\$440	2%
King County Metro	\$35,510	\$1,210	\$5,560	\$5,930	\$48,210	\$35,200	-\$13,010	71%
Kitsap Transit	\$4,760	\$190	\$30	\$770	\$5,750	\$3,400	-\$2,350	13%
Pierce Transit	\$5,000	\$50	\$310	\$1,020	\$6,380	\$4,400	-\$1,980	11%
Local Transit	\$53,400	\$1,800	\$6,200	\$9,400	\$70,800	\$52,400	-\$18	8,400



## Current Law Revenue Distribution by Operator

2/3 of current transit revenue is from Sales and Use Taxes.

	Share of Current Law Revenue						
Operator	Sale & Use Tax	Fares	State Grants	State Multi- Modal Fund	Federal Grants		
Community Transit	71%	13%	5%	1%	11%		
Everett Transit	61%	13%	6%	1%	18%		
King County Metro	65%	23%	4%	1%	8%		
Kitsap Transit	67%	13%	9%	2%	9%		
Pierce Transit	74%	11%	6%	1%	7%		
Local Transit	66%	20%	4%	1%	8%		



## **Discussion Topics**

- What sources be included in the RTP financial strategy for local transit?
- What levels or rates should be assumed?
- What additional policy issues need to be flagged for implementation? E.g.,
  - Equity and fairness considerations
  - Meeting the gaps by agency
  - Changes to current distribution methods
- Future PSRC action / work program?



### Local Transit Revenue Scenario

#### Should a Scenario:

- Increase sales & use taxes at different levels for some or all agencies?
- Include vehicle fees?
- Other sources to consider?



