

## AGENDA

Transportation Policy Board

**Wednesday, May 11, 2016 7:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.**

Thurston Regional Planning Council

Conference Room A, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor

2424 Heritage Court SW, Suite A

Olympia, WA 98502-6031

- |    |  |  |
|----|--|--|
| 1. | <b>Introductions/Announcements</b>   | Andy Ryder, Chair                                    |
| 2. | <b>Approval of Agenda</b>  | <b>ACTION</b><br>Andy Ryder, Chair                   |
| 3. | <b>Approval of Meeting Notes from April 13, 2016 (Attachment)</b>  | <b>ACTION</b><br>Andy Ryder, Chair                   |
| 4. | <b>Public Comment Period</b>   |  |
| 5. | <b>7:15 – 8:20 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (Attachment)</b><br><i>The RTP Public Comment period closes on May 9 at 5:00 p.m. Staff will provide an overview of comments and proposed changes and corrections for the Board's discussion.</i><br><i>The Policy Board will be asked to take action to recommend that the Regional Council adopt the What Moves You 2040 Regional Transportation Plan.</i> | <b>ACTION</b><br>Karen M. Parkhurst<br>Veena Tabbutt |
| 6. | <b>8:20 – 8:30 Outside Committee Reports</b><br><i>At the discretion of the Chair, this may be covered in the after meeting summary.</i>   | <b>BRIEFING</b><br>Doug DeForest                     |

### Next TPB Meeting

June 8, 2016

TRPC ensures full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by prohibiting discrimination against any person based on race, color, national origin, or sex in the provision of benefits and services resulting from its federally assisted programs and activities. For questions regarding TRPC's Title VI Program, you may contact the Department's Title VI Coordinator at 360.956.7575.

If you need special accommodations to participate in this meeting, please call us at 360.956.7575 by 10:00 a.m. three days prior to the meeting. Ask for the ADA Coordinator.

For TDD users, please use the state's toll-free relay service, 711 or (800) 833.6388, and ask the operator to dial 360.956.7575.

[ThurstonHeretoThere.org](http://ThurstonHeretoThere.org) is an easy-to-navigate website which includes information on carpooling, vanpooling, rail, air, bus, bike, walking, health, telework and flexible schedules, recreation, and school transportation. Please consider using an alternate mode to attend this meeting: bike, walk, bus, carpool, or vanpool. This facility is served by Intercity Transit Routes 43 and 44.

## MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Transportation Policy Board  
April 13, 2016  
Thurston Regional Planning Council  
Conference Room A, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
2424 Heritage Court SW  
Olympia, WA 98502-6031

### Call to Order

Chair Andy Ryder called the meeting to order at 7:00 a.m.

### Attendance

#### TPB Members Present:

Cathy Wolfe, Thurston County  
Graeme Sackrison, Citizen Representative (Vice Chair)  
Martha Hankins, Citizen Representative  
Don Melnick, Intercity Transit (Alternate)  
Heidi Thomas, Nisqually Indian Tribe  
Clark Gilman, City of Olympia  
EJ Zita, Port of Olympia  
John O'Callahan, City of Tenino  
Pete Kmet, City of Tumwater  
JoAnn Schueler, WSDOT, Olympic Region (Alternate)  
Doug DeForest, Business Representative  
George Carter III, State Government Representative (Alternate)  
John Suessman, North Thurston Public Schools  
Randy Schleis, City of Rainier  
Jesse Gleason, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation

#### TPB Members Absent:

Tracey Wood, City of Yelm  
Ramsey Zimmerman, Business Representative

#### Staff:

Karen Parkhurst, Jaily Brown, Paul Brewster, Veena Tabbutt, and Tom Gow

#### Others:

Martin Hoppe, City of Lacey  
Joel Carlson, Citizen  
Dennis Bloom, Intercity Transit  
Jonathan Stephenson, City of Rainier

### Introductions/Announcements

Members, staff, and guests provided self introduction.

### Approval of Agenda

Boardmember O'Callahan moved, seconded by Boardmember DeForest, to approve the agenda as published. Motion carried unanimously.

**Approval of Minutes from March 9, 2016**

**Boardmember DeForest moved, seconded by Boardmember O'Callahan, to approve the March 9, 2016 minutes as presented.**

Chair Ryder thanked Vice Chair Sackrison for chairing the last meeting during his absence while he attended the National League of Cities Conference in Washington, D.C. Chair Ryder noted that the specific efforts of Senator Maria Cantwell resulted in federal funding for freight corridors. I-5 is classified as a freight corridor and therefore eligible for funding.

*Boardmembers Kmet and Zita arrived*

**Motion carried unanimously.**

**Public Comment Period**

There were no public comments.

**Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)**

Senior Planner Jailyn Brown briefed the Board on the status of public outreach for the Draft RTP. Initially, major efforts were through emails to include the Board. The intent of the outreach is to drive visitors to TRPC's website to solicit comments on the plan. Additional outreach includes a legal notice published in *The Olympian* newspaper, the region's paper of record. The plan and flyers about the plan are available at branches of the Timberland Regional Library. Local media received a news release. Intercity Transit and Thurston Climate Action Team (TCAC) are cross promoting the plan. Information will also be featured during the upcoming Department of Enterprise Services Sustainability Fair. Senior Planner Paul Brewster recently provided information at the Bicycle Expo at Office Building 2 on Capitol Campus. Staff is also scheduling presentations to boards, commissions, city councils, and civic organizations. A presentation is also scheduled at the Thurston Chamber Business and Economic Development Committee on Friday, April 15.

Staff have updated the RTP website to focus on feedback and comments on the draft plan. Three ways to provide comment include online, email, and regular mail. TRPC has received comments since the release of the plan. One of the emails suggested that the plan include Target Zero, the state's transportation safety plan. Other emails pertained to air quality and planning for technology. One comment requested multiple bridge crossings over I-5 in Tumwater for pedestrians and bicyclists. TRPC will forward comments to specific jurisdictions if appropriate.

TRPC also developed some tools on the website at [www.trpc.org/drafrtp](http://www.trpc.org/drafrtp). Planner Brown demonstrated one of the new tools for providing online comments. The tool, developed in California, allows the visitor to comment directly on a PDF, as well as respond to other comments creating opportunities for two-way discussions. The page includes the plan with introductory material, Executive Summary, Guiding Principles, Chapters 1-6, and the Appendices. To comment on the plan, visitors must register and log in. Logging in is not necessary to view comments by others.

Boardmember DeForest asked whether commenters are identified. Planner Brown said it depends on how the commenter registers. All commenters have an associated email and many create handles.

Boardmember Hankins asked whether the tool allows for easy export of the data to a spreadsheet. Planner Brown affirmed there are several ways to export data. Staff is combining all comments into a sortable spreadsheet.

While there is a cost for this tool, the results should be extremely valuable to planners. Planner Brown shared that she is scheduled to meet with other TIP managers across the state to share information about the tool. She was asked whether it's possible for a visitor to comment on posted comments. Users logged in are automatically at the comment level and can comment within the string, on another comment, or leave a separate comment at the same place.

TRPC has also developed an interactive map of all the projects (Chapter 2). Because the plan includes seven categories of projects, the map includes all projects with identifying information on each project in separate project pages. Information within the project pages will be reviewed by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) each year for updating. As jurisdictions begin executing projects, the project pages would be updated to reflect current status.

Survey results are included on the website, as well as the survey video and the investment calculator enabling survey participants to prioritize transportation investments. Because the calculator set a specific amount of funding, many respondents noted changing their priorities to fit with the limited funding.

Joel Carlson noted the webpage lacks information on rail. He asked about the ability to include rail as more information becomes available. Planner Brown advised that rail planning is identified in the Work Program and isn't included on the site. The work program element articulates exploring high capacity transit, which includes bus rapid transit or increased express service, as well as rail.

Chair Ryder encouraged members to share information about the website with their respective colleagues to help increase traffic to the site. Planner Brewster added that throughout the comment period, TRPC is adding Facebook posts. He encouraged member agencies to cross promote and repost the information.

### ***Journeys* Regional Transportation Annual Report**

Planner Brown provided an overview of the 12<sup>th</sup> edition of *Journeys*, the region's annual transportation report summarizing transportation accomplishments and activities of the previous year.

Front and last page sidebar columns highlight 2015 notable projects in the Thurston region. Two lead articles include information on the regional grants awarded in 2015 and the update and release of the 2015 Thurston County Bike Map. The bike map is TRPC's most requested item, and is also distributed through local bike shops and at CTR-affected worksites. The map and an app for smartphones or tablets is also available online. Olympia Safe Streets received funding from TRPC's call for projects to help fund map development and printing.

The second page features Executive Director Wyrick's article on the recent passage of the federal six-year transportation bill. The second article summarizes information about five key legislative priorities for the region in 2015.

The third page features information about the Board's retreat helping to shape the Board's future work program. Information is also included on the Board's new practice of including short updates on each meeting agenda, as well as information on membership changes on the Board.

An insert features information about TRPC from a transportation perspective and includes a listing of TRPC staff and their contact information.

The fourth page recognizes the work accomplished by the TAC. Last year, the TAC spent considerable time developing the region's new transportation model and on the draft of the RTP. During the annual call for projects, the TAC reviews project proposals to determine eligibility for funding. Additionally, work completed in 2015 supported member agencies. Joint Base Lewis McChord (JBLM) has used the region's new dynamic transportation model. JBLM users provided TAC with feedback on the model.

Page 5 of the report features more information on the new transportation model, including new analysis capabilities. Another article acknowledges the recent departure of Senior Planner Thera Black after accepting a local private sector position.

Pages 6 & 7 feature current TRPC activities and initiatives:

- North Lewis County Industrial Access Study
- WSDOT's Corridor Sketch Initiative
- Thurston Thrives – Improving the Health of All Residents
- Port of Olympia Planning in Tumwater
- Main Street 507
- Earn-a-Bike Program initiated as part of the Walk N Roll Program in partnership with Intercity Transit. Sixty students earned refurbished donated bikes and learned how to ride safely and maintain their bike. The program is supported entirely by volunteers. The City of Olympia's former City Attorney initiated the program. In 2015, 481 volunteer hours were logged. It takes approximately 6 to 8 hours to refurbish a bike.

The last page features a continuation of the projects completed as well as a listing of important presentations during the year.

Planner Brown noted that the draft RTP released for public review includes changes as requested by the Board.

### **RTP Work Program Priority Actions – State of the System Report**

Programs and Policy Director Karen Parkhurst reported that the Regional Council identified a State of the Transportation Infrastructure Report as a Council priority, and asked that the Policy Board create the report. Today's discussion will explore a number of factors about the report:

- What should the report look like?
- What is the purpose of the report? For the Board? For others?
- Who is the report's audience?
- Frequency of report?
- What's included in the report – local, regional, state projects, accident reports, and/or the status of Washington Target Zero?
- Should the report center on benchmarks and performance measures?
- Should the report focus on infrastructure, operations, or both?

Director Parkhurst commented on the importance of honesty and transparency while cautioning against publishing a report that might alarm the community. She encouraged the Board to share ideas on the format and content of the report.

Research and Data Director Veena Tabbutt noted that the project is one of many on the Work Program items set forth in the RTP. The budget is minimal and the intent is working on developing the format and content with ongoing work over the next several years.

The region could use this task to report on performance. The new federal transportation legislation requires performance monitoring, however, the form of that reporting is making its way through the rule-making process. The first measure likely will center on the state's Target Zero Plan to achieve zero traffic-related fatalities or serious injuries by 2030. The state collects data on serious injuries and fatalities for vehicle, pedestrian, and bicyclist accidents. That data is available at the regional level. The Board could establish a local performance measure and link it to the state's goal.

Another less regulatory option could include benchmarks that are important locally, but do not necessarily tie to state or federal requirements. For example, Intercity Transit could provide data on transit boardings and the region could establish a benchmark and goal to increase boardings over time.

Director Tabbutt reviewed generally available data and data that would require additional collection processes. Readily available data includes pavement maintenance collected by local jurisdictions, bridge conditions, culvert status (fish passage blocking), and regional trail data from Thurston Thrives. Additional data collection could entail the region's bicycle network and stormwater retrofits for roads. Focusing on the operational aspect, data are available on safety (state) and school bus ridership. Additional data would be required for Centennial Station boardings, operational efficiency on street networks through intersection analysis, and bike and pedestrian counts on the regional network.

Director Parkhurst explained that based on the Board's discussion today, staff would scope the process for the first report and bring that to the Council in May and bring Council feedback and direction back to the Board. The Chair might be asked to attend the Council meeting and describe the Board's discussion.

Boardmember DeForest suggested the report should convey information to the public about what they are receiving for their transportation dollars. He acknowledged the importance of demonstrating progress, but it should be clearly identified in terms of how specific funding actions create results.

Boardmember Gillman stressed the importance of the report to convey to the public what they are receiving for their investment, as well as synchronizing data in the form of a dashboard on the state of the system.

Boardmember Sackrison referred to the many conversations about the amount of infrastructure and the difficulties in maintaining infrastructure. One of the questions from the public would likely be whether the region is making any progress on maintenance. One of the values of an annual report is the ability to provide a status report on progress compared against the prior year's system goals. He is also hopeful that any charts included within the report with a vertical axis are displayed appropriately to avoid conveying extreme fluctuations in data.

Chair Ryder recommended including pavement condition index (PCI) throughout the region.

Director Parkhurst asked for feedback on the audience for the report.

Boardmember Hankins said that the report could be an accurate reflection of where emphasis and energy should be focused in the short-term using data to bolster and reflect the reality the region is facing.

Director Parkhurst queried members as to whether all data should be included, such as transit, tribal, and regional transportation, or whether to focus on one specific topic each year.

Boardmember Zita commented that in addition to the public, the report would be valuable for planners in public and private agencies.

Chair Ryder referred to the "Bridging the Gap" project and the recognition regionally about the key link the project represented for the entire system. The report could focus on multimodal "gaps" within the system similar to how the region recognized the importance of "Bridging the Gap" as a key link. One of the comments on the RTP recommended connecting a link that would benefit many bicyclists.

Director Parkhurst asked members if they foresee the report as a series of charts and graphs similar to the *Profile*, or the narrative format of *Journeys*. She also noted that any report would be available online and in paper format.

Chair Ryder remarked that *Journeys* is a good publication because not only does it include all the projects completed in the region, it speaks to “why” those projects were completed in the region. That may be the next step to feature in the report, as all the projects were completed for a purpose. The “why” of what has been accomplished is important to the public.

Boardmember O’Callahan suggested posting information on Facebook and other social media as it affords better participation from the public. Other annual publications featuring graphs are beneficial; however, Facebook audiences are extensive. Sharing initial information on how money is spent in the region and adding periodic updates would eventually provide the information to complete a year in review report.

Boardmember Melnick (Alternate) commented about learning of the need for public transit in his role as a Lacey Planning Commissioner and serving on the Intercity Transit Authority. It’s important to identify the public transit gap within the region, as well as how much transit service is required to ensure growth occurs in appropriate areas. That information would be helpful for both the public and for planning agencies.

Chair Ryder said many times the region sets unrealistic goals. For example, in 2010, the commute trip reduction goal was 35% reduction by 2016. Although goals are important, setting unrealistic or unachievable goals creates difficulty in reporting on progress. Director Parkhurst said the state’s Target Zero goal of zero fatalities was an interesting conversation because establishing a specific level of fatalities wasn’t realistic. Rather, Target Zero is an aspirational goal because it makes sense to strive for zero fatalities. Part of the CTR story points to the responsibility of the public to help reduce vehicle miles. Chair Ryder said most people don’t equate vehicles with degrading roads, which costs taxpayer money, as well as providing more context to the story as most people don’t understand the “why.” It’s important to help connect the dots by telling the story.

Boardmember Sackrison said it might also entail the inability to accurately describe projects. Collectively, the region has not been effective in communicating that message. A higher summary report that speaks to achievements against aspirational or realistic goals could be the focus of the report addressing different elements of the transportation system. The report might entail two different products.

Director Parkhurst asked for input on whether land use should be part of the message in terms of the goal to expand transit acknowledging that land density is not sufficient to support transit. Those types of messages could be woven into the story especially with messages about bike and pedestrian facilities. The public is also interested in rail.

Mr. Carlson offered information on the tax increase required to extend Sound Transit service to Olympia. He questioned whether the taxing district would include all or a part of Thurston County.

Boardmember Sackrison shared that he offered a suggestion to Executive Director Wyrick to schedule a rail update and workshop to discuss facts regarding the extension of commuter rail. It’s important to publicize the facts, as there is much speculation about the issue.

Chair Ryder commented that the topic of rail has been discussed numerous times over the last decade. Rail hasn’t been extended because of the huge cost.

Boardmember Kmet suggested the report has two audiences – planners and elected officials and messaging to the public. The report needs to satisfy both audiences. If the Board could determine how to tell a story about a personal impact of a particular project, that would be recognizable to the public. It’s important to consider ways to create storytelling – the approach most people understand. A dashboard concept for comparing PCI, for example, would be difficult for most people to grasp while acknowledging that it’s important for the region to collect PCI data. TRPC currently has much of the data. He agreed

land use would be important to include. A useful graphic could be on where recent development is occurring. He recommended focusing on storytelling as an effective way of messaging to the public.

*Boardmember Hankins left the meeting.*

Director Tabbutt added that staff is also updating regional benchmarks, which is featured as an online dashboard. Other data collection is underway on other topics.

Director Parkhurst pointed out that the region does not celebrate the maintenance accomplishments with fanfare or ribbon cuttings. The report could serve as a way to celebrate some of the maintenance projects in a storytelling format.

Boardmember Sackrison cited the analogy of scale, which often frames a person's understanding of any type of system. The report could provide a sense of scale in terms of progress occurring on the entire system.

Director Parkhurst said the American with Disabilities Act (ADA) improvements also provide another story because many projects are required to include ADA upgrades as part of the cost of the project. She asked members to also provide feedback on potential stories to avoid.

Boardmember DeForest pointed to a recent report presented during the Puget Sound Regional Council (PRSC) Transportation Policy Board meeting. Regarding bridges, the report noted that some projects are so large and expensive; there is no strategy for repairing them.

Director Parkhurst said that staff would report back on the Council's discussion of this issue.

### **2016 Legislative Session**

Director Parkhurst provided an update on the outcome of the legislative session. Over 2,000 bills were introduced during the session with 156 House bills passing the Senate and 134 Senate bills passing the House totaling 292 adopted bills. During the special session, supplemental operating and capital budgets were adopted. Staff continues to review budgets to identify cuts. Some additional funding was provided to schools and for wild fires. The Public Works Trust Fund was cut. Some funds were allocated for housing and homelessness. Legislation was adopted on student homelessness. Planning funds for stormwater and comprehensive plan updates were cut and less funds for the Model Toxic Account programs. Staff continues to monitor issues surrounding mental health, mental health facilities, and public safety. Legislators paid attention to messages about suicide prevention, mental health, and veteran issues. At the end of the regular session, the Governor vetoed 27 bills in an effort to encourage the Legislature to complete its work and adopt a budget. Legislators met in special session and overrode all vetoes. A number of bills of interest to the region included industrial hemp, invasive species control, adjustments to existing marijuana legislation, and cultural foods.

Director Parkhurst reviewed several key regional priorities to include the I-5 fix promoted regionally. This year, it's important for the region to pursue a funding request for I-5, as well as discuss other important transportation funding requests. She encouraged the Board to begin strategically considering the region's priorities to assist in moving priorities forward.

### **Outside Committee Reports**

Boardmember DeForest reported that at the last PSRC Transportation Policy Board meeting, the main discussion centered on bridges. The region has 773 bridges of which 68 are structurally deficit and 289 are functionally obsolete. The next meeting agenda includes a discussion on the status of the Viaduct project and Sound Transit's STP3 program. The program is expected to cost \$50 billion over a 30 year period.

**Other Business**

Boardmember Sackrison announced a meeting sponsored by Thurston Climate Action Team (TCAC) on Thursday, April 14 at Traditions Café at 7 p.m. in anticipation of the Bicycle Commuter Contest. Individuals representing local bike shops will be speaking on commuter bicycling and City of Olympia personnel will share information on City bike routes. In May, TCAC is scheduled to receive tribal responses to climate change from the Nisqually, Chehalis, and Squaxin Island Tribes. On June 9, TCAC is sponsoring a “get to know your elected representatives” event on how to form friendly relationships with elected officials.

Boardmember Kmet announced a ribbon cutting for the Tumwater Historical Park trail on Saturday, April 23 at noon. The trail was funded by the Board and the Regional Council. At 10 a.m., an Earth Day project is planned at the same location with local high school students. Everyone is invited to attend.

Boardmember Gillman reported on a presentation of an economic impact study on transit recently provided to the Intercity Transit Authority. Dennis Bloom said the information was from a recent onboard customer satisfaction survey, a vanpool survey, and a rider and non-rider survey. Boardmembers expressed interest in receiving the presentation. Director Parkhurst confirmed that she would schedule the presentation with Intercity Transit.

**Adjournment**

With there being no further business, Chair Ryder adjourned the meeting at 8:25 a.m.

---

Graeme Sackrison, Vice Chair



**MEMBERS:**

- City of Lacey
- City of Olympia
- City of Rainier
- City of Tenino
- City of Tumwater
- City of Yelm
- Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis Reservation
- Nisqually Indian Tribe
- Town of Bucoda
- Thurston County
- North Thurston Public Schools
- Olympia School District
- Intercity Transit
- LOTT Clean Water Alliance
- Port of Olympia
- PUD No. 1 of Thurston County

**ASSOCIATE MEMBERS:**

- Lacey Fire District #3
- Puget Sound Regional Council
- The Evergreen State College
- Thurston Economic Development Council
- Timberland Regional Library

**MEMORANDUM**

**TO:** Transportation Policy Board

**FROM:** Karen M. Parkhurst, Programs & Policy Director  
Veena Tabbutt, Research & Data Director

**DATE:** May 4, 2016

**SUBJECT:** Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update.

**PURPOSE**

To recommend that the Regional Council adopt the *What Moves You 2040 Regional Transportation Plan*.

**Summary:**

- Under state and federal law, the Regional Planning Council must adopt a Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) that looks a minimum of 20 years into the future.
- For the past several years, the community, stakeholders, Technical Advisory Committee, Policy Board, Regional Council, and others have been working on the update of the RTP).
- In April, the Regional Council, upon recommendation from the Policy Board, released the draft plan for a 30-day public review period. That review will close on May 9 at 5:00 p.m.
- The Policy Board will hear an overview of the comments and proposed responses, as well as any other substantive changes to the draft plan.
- After discussion, the Policy Board will be asked to recommend that the Regional Council adopt the plan.

**REQUESTED ACTION**

Recommend that the Regional Council adopt the *What Moves You 2040 Regional Transportation Plan*.

Attachment



Lon D. Wyrick  
Executive Director

2424 Heritage Court SW  
Suite A  
Olympia, WA 98502-6031  
360-956-7575  
360-956-7815 Fax  
www.trpc.org



ID	Comment	Plan Area
<b>General Comments</b>		
1	<p>There was no mention in the plan of Target Zero/Vision Zero efforts (to eliminate traffic death and serious injury by 2030), despite a growing momentum internationally, nationally and even within Washington State. Target Zero/Vision Zero helps focus programmatic and facility resources via a data driven approach. A policy for the plan could be “12.g As a region, adopt a Target/Vision Zero policy and encourage and support all incorporated cities and the County to do so as well.”</p> <p>For more information, see: <a href="http://www.seattle.gov/visionzero">http://www.seattle.gov/visionzero</a></p>	3 Goals
2	<p>We need more pedestrian bridges over freeways! More pedbridges are needed, especially where office buildings are across freeways from shopping centers! Also, it'd promote weight loss &amp; cardio health! Vehicles have massive freeways, can't pedestrians have more pedbridges?</p>	
3	<p>Unfortunately, I think the current draft is deeply flawed, in several ways. 1. Aside, from a few pages here and there, it doesn't come to terms with what seems to me to be a fundamental fact about our transportation needs over the next 25 years. We need to make an 80% reduction from 1990 levels of CO2 in order to have a reasonable chance of avoiding dangerous human interference with the climate - and maybe deeper reductions than that, and conceivably catastrophic interference with the climate if we're unlucky... We need a plan that thinks seriously and profoundly about how we might possibly contribute to reductions like that, given that on-road transportation is something like 44% of our inventoried emissions (though less if you take the emissions generated outside the County to produce food and other goods and services that we're consuming into account.) But when I look at the project list, it's basically business as usual between here and 2040 - tons of money for road widening, a little money for transit, a little money for bikes and pedestrians. 2. There's no sense of the relative scale of the potential contributions to reductions (or increases) in emissions that various things included in the plan might produce. The consultants for the Governor's Climate Legislative Executive Workgroup concluded that all of the potential savings expected from the benefits of "smart growth" (more walking, biking, mass transit use, shorter trip distances, etc.) might produce about a quarter of the reductions expected from cleaner cars. I don't think the draft does anything to register the relative potential importance of these different possible ways to focus our efforts. (In fact, since the CLEW consultants' estimates for smart growth reductions are based on research and modeling for "metropolitan" areas, and it will be a long time before anything in Thurston County approaches those densities, they probably overestimate potential savings in our area. In addition, if you look at the actual research they cite, it turns out that they've consistently chosen to use the most generous estimates of the potential value of these savings.)</p>	2 Recommend.
4	<p>... 3. There's a section at the beginning about the very large potential changes in vehicle technology that many experts expect will arrive during the next twenty-five years - widespread electrification, autonomous vehicles, peer-to-peer car sharing... But there's no attempt whatsoever to think about what we might do about investments in projects to prepare for and support those potentially transformative changes, rather than widening more roads and encouraging more single occupancy driving.</p>	0 Summary

ID	Comment	Plan Area
5	<p>The Oly/Tumwater/Lacey area depends on reliable access to Tacoma, Seatac Airport, Seattle and to a lesser extent Vancouver and Portland. Reliance on I-5 as the only viable transportation corridor is obviously the biggest issue. Best solution would be to create an alternative - either rail, dedicated bus lane, or alternative road that takes LESS TIME than driving the current route and does so reliably. It is patently ridiculous that taking the train takes much longer, costs much more, and is not a city center to city center option. When my Asian or European friends ask me about it, they simply can't believe it. That is where 90% of resources should be focused. By comparison the local congestion and transit issues are easily fixed - the only congestion I encounter is because the super smart leadership in Federal, state and local government all seem to believe that we should all work or go to school at the same time(s) and all end at the same time(s).</p>	
6	<p>I have a couple comments about public transit. My views do not express the views or opinions of the Department of Ecology. I am responding to the Plan because we were sent a draft via our commute trip reduction program at the agency. I noticed there is a proposal to expand public transportation to create express routes to Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater city centers (T6). This is great news. My thoughts have always been that the bus stops with Intercity Transit are too close together. Often you can see the next stop from where you are standing (less than 2 blocks away). This makes for a longer commute and a lot of jolting as the bus stops too much. Often my bus commute is 45 minutes to go 6 miles to my workplace. It's frustrating that it takes so long. It is faster to ride my bike than to take the bus.</p>	
7	<p>I live in the NE Olympia neighborhood on the corner of Bethel and Miller. The 21 bus meanders through our neighborhood. My suggestions: · Add a second bus to the 21 route, going the opposite direction, to provide service on both sides of the street/route, so you don't have to ride the bus in a circle to get where you're going. · Start the 21 bus (and all other neighborhood buses) an hour earlier. This will provide better connections to the first busses leaving from downtown to Lacey and Tumwater. For example: The first bus I need to take to Lacey leaves at 6am from downtown Olympia. My first neighborhood bus doesn't reach my stop until 6:47. Therefore I have to ride my bike or walk to the Olympia Transit center to catch the bus I need to get to work. Because of this inconvenience I often only ride the bus in good weather and drive the rest of the time. Thank you for your planning efforts to improve our public transit.</p>	
8	<p>If there was a pedbridge on Linderson Way SW close to Costco/Fred Meyer, etc., then office workers in the 6300/6400/6500 state office complex would get more exercise during lunchtime! There's a pedbridge a city block south from 6300/6400/6500, but we need one that's closer to Costco/Fred Meyer, etc. – we could quickly go across the pedbridge &amp; get/grab lunch without using our cars &amp; contributing to traffic &amp; parking lot jams. Our office complex does not have a café. (The 6400 building is almost halfway thru construction, slated for completion 11/2016 . . . &amp; that will be a lot more traffic!)</p>	
9	<p>I would appreciate consideration be given to the safety in small towns of our rural area. We have asked numerous times to have the transportation plan include a safety component for our students who walk on the side streets throughout downtown Rochester to reach the boys &amp; girls club and Roof center after school. Three children being hit this morning up north could easily have taken place here in our area and making these areas safer should be of primary concern.</p>	

ID	Comment	Plan Area
10	<p>I think that most of the identified projects are much needed to improve traffic flow. Below are projects that I think should be priorities. ☐ Carpenter Road Widening from Martin Way to Britton Parkway. This would be an important project, but I am wondering why you have not considered adding on and off ramps to I-5 from Carpenter Road. It looks like there is plenty of room there and it would be fairly simple. This would provide a much needed alternate to the access ramps at Martin Way and Marvin Road. ☐ Brewery District Transportation Project. This area is currently a huge mess at rush hour so I think this project would be a big help. I can see one flaw that will keep traffic backed up on Custer for people going down Boston to get on I-5 or 101. Even with a roundabout at Boston and Custer, traffic will back up at the bottom of Boston where it intersects with Deschutes Parkway due to the three-way stop. My recommendation is to make Boston one-way up the hill to Custer and put a median down the middle of Custer at Boston to prevent people coming up the hill from turning left. This would force people wanting to get on I-5 or 101 to go down to E Street and come up Deschutes Parkway. With the one-way traffic on Boston only going up the hill (that road is too narrow for two-way traffic anyway), you could take out all three stop signs at the Deschutes Parkway and Boston intersection further improving traffic flow. E Street Extension. This project would help to reduce traffic through the Brewery District area. ☐ Martin Way/I-5 Interchange Project. I have wondered why clover leaf ramps have not been added to this intersection a long time ago. This would make a huge difference. ☐ Harrison Avenue Widening Phase 4 ☐ Hogum Bay Truck Route. A roundabout at Willamette would be a big help and also greatly improve safety. ☐ College Street Corridor Improvements ☐ US 101/West Olympia Access Project ☐ Insign Road Connection ☐ Desmond Drive Extension Study ☐ Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>	
11	<p>Provide bus routes NE Thurston County. Right now we have nothing AND the bike lane was taken away when median beautification project was installed about one and a half years ago (marvin rd near Jubilee). My only option is to drive even though I am 5 miles away from my job at Dept of Ecology.</p>	
12	<p>Your planning seems behind the times. in 10 years most of us will be riding segways, hoverboards, scooters, pc gps robot cars and only will need buried charger wires to recharge our lithium ion batteries as we move. I already drive a nissan leaf that gets me locally around for 3.5 cents per mile so I can go round lacey oly tumwater for 25-50cents per day. to work, shopping pleasure, errands, etc. I suggest we open our hi ways to bikes, scooters, hoverboards. Etc. make streets one way. let big pc control all cars, and lights [sic]</p>	

ID	Comment	Plan Area
13	<p>Thank you for your public service and commitment of time and energy to a brighter future for Thurston County. I write to share concerns about the draft Regional Transportation Plan. The next 20 years of growth in this plan appears to wholly ignore the community of Rochester, with the exception of a project on the Gate-Belmore Trail. While the Gate-Belmore Trail will be a wonderful recreational amenity, it is a project that does nothing little to improve the function and safety of the transportation system. There is a real need for two bicycle lanes between Grand Mound/Rochester and Littlerock, and from Littlerock to Tumwater. These lanes would enhance safety and recreation as well as promote commuter car trip reduction, and likely economic development as well in the communities of Littlerock, Grand Mound, and Rochester. Both Case Road, and Littlerock Road/Sargent Rd. provide fairly direct, efficient North/South bicycle access from South Thurston County to Tumwater. I think the Council and the public would see the most return on investment from enhancing these roads with safe bicycle lanes. Currently, there are very unsafe and irregular shoulders that cyclists brave because of the scenic rural nature of these roads. There are a good number of folks in the Rochester/Grand Mound community who would like a safe way to bike to work in Olympia or Tumwater. It is too far to the East, if you are in Rochester, to try and bike to the Chehalis Western Trail (CWT) to then proceed safely north to Olympia, and even if you do take the CWT, its route does not come close to Tumwater's major employers. By contrast, a bike route that went up Littlerock road, would easily connect at Trosper to Capitol Blvd and the state agency employers off Capitol or via Israel Rd. to Capitol Blvd. I am a homeowner in the Rochester area. My wife and I work for state government and commute to Olympia; we have a young child who attends daycare in Olympia and commutes with us. We shop in Tumwater off Trosper Road. Thus, we are most familiar with these county road alternatives to 1-5, and we see their potential for improving transportation safety, commuter car trip reduction, recreation, and economic opportunity. We are also concerned that one cannot bike safely from Sargent Rd. to the Community Center or Rochester schools because of lack of shoulder or bike lane on 133rd . This should be a priority, otherwise our community is compelled to be uni-modal, since we also do not have bus service in the area.</p>	
14	I really like "from the frisky to the frail". Please keep this tone.	0 Summary
15	<p>Personally, as a resident of ruralish (out Evergreen Parkway) Thurston County this is getting to be a bigger and bigger transportation challenge. I want my kids to have access to stuff and not have to drive. I don't expect TRPC to solve this. Where I live makes my choice for me, but it is an ongoing source of tension in my transportation life.</p>	0 Summary
16	Yes please! West Olympia and Lacey are challenging for walkers (though they are getting better, thank you for that).	0 Summary
17	This one makes me uncomfortable. [Refers to changing reliance on the gas tax]	0 Summary
18	Of course I missed the survey, but please help freeway congestion on the I-5/101 interchange and in north Thurston County.	0 Summary
19	Yes please. [Refers to making I-5 work reliably]	0 Summary
20	:) I could try reading the whole plan before commenting. [Refers to 6 new or realigned highway interchanges.]	0 Summary

ID	Comment	Plan Area
21	Thanks for this. I jumped from poverty to the middle class and I've got to say, the transportation world of Thurston County and the attendant options are worlds different.	0 Summary
22	Bend the trend? Frail to frisky? Whoever wrote this is awesome. Thanks.	0 Summary
23	I agree with both sentences. I don't get how they go together. The first one speaks to assumptions, and the second more or less defines "forecast". [Refers to text call out about the regional transportation forecast.]	0 Summary
24	It's "between", because your list here is distinct items. Sorry, that was bossy and know-it-all-ish. I should add that I'm pretty sure, but I was only reading that closely because I was enjoying the prose.	0 Principles
25	Please define "multimodal" this way somewhere in the "summary" document. I'm sure it's done in the more detailed sections, but the word comes up a lot in this document, and if I wasn't in an industry that used the term frequently, I'm not sure I would know what it means.	0 Principles
26	I'd like to see "multimodal" defined in this way earlier in the document. It comes up a lot, and if I didn't run across this term in educational institutions, I'm not sure I would know what it means. It might be defined earlier in the document, but this is really nice and clear.	0 Principles
27	Thank you for prioritizing multimodal transportation. I am a bicycle commuter, and one of the biggest challenges I face in riding between home and work is dealing with segments of the route that are very bicycle-unfriendly. As a bike rider, I don't mind getting into traffic a bit when necessary. However, on the route between my house in NE Olympia and my job in Tumwater, there is one choke point that puts my safety at risk. It's the intersection of Capitol Way NORTH and Custer, where the slope is uphill and in the evening rush hour, most car traffic is turning right. Adding a bike lane to that spot would improve safety and make that route a viable option for commuting. [Refers to TRPC Work Program item to enhance multimodal transportation.]	2 Recommend.
28	While linking parks and paths is important, for transportation purposes I believe a stronger emphasis should be placed on making it easier for people to use bicycles (and their feet!) for transportation. [Refers to TRPC Work Program item linking bike/ped pathways with parks & open spaces.]	2 Recommend.

ID	Comment	Plan Area
29	<p>My profile: - I live near Lacey (in the county) and work at the Old State Capitol Bldg. - I typically use Intercity Transit, route 62A &amp; B, and am familiar enough with the system that I know which routes to use to get to other locations. - I don't use transit in order to save the environment or combat 'climate change', I use it because it's less expensive than parking in downtown Olympia, and why expose my vehicle to downtown risks (such as vandalism by people protesting the latest cause). And in case of disaster, I could walk home if necessary. Riding transit, however, does increase my commute time, from about 20 minutes each way to 40 minutes. - My background is transportation engineering, so I'm familiar with what you are going through to get public input, assess whether the traffic model is providing meaningful output, and exploring solutions that people will accept. I understand and like roundabouts, my wife hates them. I know what a Diverging Diamond I/C is, and have seen one in use in Utah, my wife would probably hate it, too. - I'm in my 50's. If I survive to see what it's like in 25 years I honestly wonder if I'll still be able to drive. I'm an analog man in a digital world, and that world is changing fast. - - Comments (in no particular order) - Beware of thinking that you will provide the solutions or force society to commute a certain way. You're assessing what is likely to happen in the future, based on current trends and current technology, and on the input of people in their 50's who don't have a clue (except myself, of course). Provide options, and let people find what works best for them.</p>	
30	<p>...- As a Regional plan, you're right in considering the constraints such as the Nisqually area. I used to commute to Camp Murray. When there's an accident or other incident in the Nisqually area the only option is Mounts Road or to go through Yelm. WSDOT and FHWA will resolve that when the time comes, but Intercity Transit and Pierce Transit should be able to keep working together to maintain and expand vanpool and transit connections through that corridor.</p>	
31	<p>...The former rail corridor (now Woodland Trail) that connected downtown Olympia to Union Mills is disjointed and blocked in places, but I think part of the plan needs to preserve that as a grade-acceptable corridor for rail. That assumes a lot of that extra population wants to live near that corridor, whether in Olympia or Lacey. I know many people think of rail as old-fashioned, etc., but it's the only other transportation corridor and mode through Nisqually, and could connect to the improvements being made to rail through DuPont / Fort Lewis, etc. IF the above is viable, does the plan address a station – either Northeast of the existing transit center or underground between the Old State Capitol and the Greyhound Station? Something near Sleater-Kinney? Saint Martin's? Union Mills? - For that matter, a station near the former Brewery?</p>	
32	<p>...- Just looked at the Draft population and land-use trends. Wow. The dynamic of where and how many people will live, whether they'll have jobs close-by or have to commute (within county or to an adjacent county, etc.), and where all the children will go to school (and how). I can only imagine the information that will go into all of those EMME Traffic Analysis Zones. I hope that the local school districts are involved with this planning process beyond what they would typically do in what we call a Study &amp; Survey (a document that looks at educational goals and needs, especially school facilities). Is it possible for a school-bus to pick-up students at a 'rally-point', for lack of a better term, that is off of an arterial? IF (and that's a big IF) there will be a large influx of people living in downtown Olympia and/or Lacey / Tumwater, will the school districts build Elementary capacity that's within a walk of where those people will live? Is Intercity Transit prepared to accommodate middle and high school kids using their network even more than now?</p>	

ID	Comment	Plan Area
33	...- When someone reads about pedestrian-oriented design and bicycle facilities do they think you are saying it is 'transportation' or 'livable-space'? I would guess that at least some would see it as social-engineering to get people to walk and ride a bicycle as a commute (and people will resist it). How well could it be shown as intra-neighborhood transportation and a streetscape that creates livable-space? Which then encourages people to want to live in a higher-density neighborhood, which then can accommodate more transportation choices.	
34	...- Hawk's Prairie I/C: I personally think a Diverging Diamond I/C would work well there. Aren't there high volumes of turning movements, from either side of the freeway? If so, a Diverging Diamond reduces the number of conflicts, and I bet it would fit within the existing bridge.	
35	...- Regarding bicycles, is there a way to get more than two bicycles on a bus? Some people don't have a problem with hills, but I wonder if more would ride if they could by-pass the steeper grades.	
36	...- Regarding buses, is consideration being given to articulated buses? Can a 'normal' bus be exchanged for an articulated one in-between traffic peaks?	



**From:** [Martin Hoppe](#)  
**To:** [info@trpc.org](mailto:info@trpc.org); [Lon Wyrick](#); [Jailyn Brown](#); [Veena Tabbutt](#); [Karen Parkhurst](#)  
**Cc:** [Virgil Clarkson](#); [Ryder, Andy](#); [Egger, Scott](#); [Spence, Scott](#); [Schoessel, Roger](#); [Tyson Poeckh](#)  
**Subject:** 2040 Regional Transportation Plan - Lacey Comments  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 04, 2016 11:49:03 AM  
**Attachments:** [Scanned from a Xerox Multifunction Device.pdf](#)

---

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. Due to our involvement with the Plan throughout the process, Lacey only has a couple of comments. The Plan looks like it is nearly ready for adoption.

#### Page 37 - C-Capacity Projects

If you look at these projects, there is much more elements than a capacity component. There are also bike lanes, sidewalks, safety aspects to all of these projects. Using "M" for Multimodal or Multifaceted would appear to be a more appropriate description. Also, this page should be written to highlight the fact that there are many components to these projects.

#### Page 140 – Goals and Policies

The Regional Goals and Policies have been written in the last couple plans to be a blueprint for other jurisdictions to incorporate them into their Comprehensive plans. This way we would never be inconsistent, and everyone would have the same basic structure. Several of the policies that were added late in the process are area specific such as 1.j or 1.k for example, and could not be used by some jurisdictions. All policies should be rewritten to be to allow any jurisdiction to adopt the policy in their comprehensive plan or the policy should be moved into the supportive measures. Attached are recommended policy modifications for Goal #1.

Thanks,  
Martin Hoppe PE, PTOE  
Transportation Manager  
(360) 438-2681  
[mhoppe@ci.lacey.wa.us](mailto:mhoppe@ci.lacey.wa.us)

# 1. Transportation and Land Use Consistency



**Goal:** Ensure the design and function of transportation facilities are consistent with and support sustainable, healthy urban, suburban, and rural communities.

## Policies:

**1.a** Commit to the development and implementation of land use plans, development patterns, and design standards that encourage walking, bicycling, transit use, and other alternatives to driving alone.

**1.b** Provide transportation facilities that support the location of jobs, housing, industry, and other activities as called for in adopted land use plans.

**1.c** Meet mobility, access, and economic goals in designated Strategy Corridors with an appropriate combination of investments, policies, and land use measures.

**1.d** Design and invest in transportation projects that have a lasting positive impact, reflect the goals of the people who live and work in the area, and contribute to a sense of place and community.

**1.e** Support policies, programs, and procedures that promote urban infill, and make transportation investments that support increased urban densities.

**1.f** Provide transportation facilities and services which appropriately support urban development in cities and Urban Growth Areas, and help maintain rural character outside Urban Growth areas.

**1.g** Ensure adequate transportation capacity to address growth consistent with adopted comprehensive plans.

**1.h** Preserve and promote awareness of our historic, cultural, and natural heritage.

**1.i** Minimize high noise levels.

**1.j** ~~North County – Urban Corridors & Centers.~~ Create vibrant city centers and activity nodes along transit corridors that support active transportation and housing, jobs, and services.

**1.k** ~~South County – City/Town Centers.~~ Create safe and vibrant ~~South County~~ city and town centers that foster entrepreneurship, active transportation, civic pride, and a sense of place.

**1.l** ~~Neighborhoods.~~ Create safe and vibrant neighborhoods with places that build community and encourage active transportation.

**1.m** ~~Rural & Recreational Land.~~ Protect the region's farms, forests, prairies, and open spaces while providing appropriate transportation services ~~for those choosing a rural lifestyle.~~

**1.n** Site major public facilities that generate substantial traffic near major transportation corridors.