

AGENDA

Transportation Policy Board

Wednesday, June 8, 2016 7:00 a.m. – 8:30 a.m.

Thurston Regional Planning Council

Conference Room A, 1st Floor

2424 Heritage Court SW, Suite A

Olympia, WA 98502-6031

- | | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Introductions/Announcements | Graeme Sackrison,
Vice Chair |
| 2. | Approval of Agenda | ACTION
Graeme Sackrison,
Vice Chair |
| 3. | Approval of Meeting Notes from May 11, 2016 (Attachment) | ACTION
Graeme Sackrison,
Vice Chair |
| 4. | Public Comment Period | |
| 5. | 7:15 – 7:45 Federal Transportation Funding (Attachment)
<i>Provide background information on the Regional Surface Transportation Program and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality federal funding processes and discuss a possible framework for a Fall 2016 Call for Projects.</i> | DISCUSSION
Paul Brewster,
Senior Planner |
| 6. | 7:45 – 7:55 Regional Transportation Plan: Status Update (Attachment)
<i>At its May meeting, the Policy Board recommended that the Regional Council adopt the "2040 What Moves You Regional Transportation Plan." Staff will provide an update on the June 3, 2016 Council meeting and next steps.</i> | UPDATE
Veena Tabbutt,
Research & Data Director |
| 7. | 7:55 – 8:15 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP): Planning for Transit... Planning for Rail...
<i>When considering the new RTP, policymakers asked for more discussion about how the Region is planning for rail and for transit. The Policy Board will hear about preliminary conversations, potential partners, and goals.</i> | DISCUSSION
Karen M. Parkhurst,
Programs & Policy Director
Graeme Sackrison,
Vice Chair |
| 8. | 8:15 – 8:25 Federal Funding Opportunity: Leveraging Travel Demand Model Greenhouse Gas Data Outputs to Support Data-Driven Local Land Use and Transportation Decision-making
<i>Staff will provide an overview of this grant application.</i> | INFORMATION
Veena Tabbutt,
Research & Data Director |
| 9. | Outside Committee Reports
<i>At the discretion of the Chair, this may be covered in the after meeting summary.</i> | BRIEFING
Doug DeForest |

Additional Attachment:

- RTIP Amendment 16-02

Next TPB Meeting
July 13, 2016

REMINDER: No August 2016 meeting!

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 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
May 11, 2016
Thurston Regional Planning Council
Conference Room A, 1st 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)
Debbie Sullivan, Intercity Transit
Andy Ryder, City of Lacey (Chair)
Clark Gilman, City of Olympia
EJ Zita, Port of Olympia
John O'Callahan, City of Tenino
Pete Kmet, City of Tumwater
Kevin Dayton, WSDOT, Olympic Region
Tracey Wood, City of Yelm
Doug DeForest, Business Representative
George Carter III, State Government Representative
(Alternate)
John Suessman, North Thurston Public Schools
Jonathan Stephenson, City of Rainier

TPB Members Absent:

Martha Hankins, Citizen Representative
Heidi Thomas, Nisqually Indian Tribe
Jesse Gleason, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
Reservation
Ramsey Zimmerman, Economic Development Council

Staff:

Lon Wyrick, Karen Parkhurst, Paul Brewster, Veena
Tabbutt, and Tom Gow

Others:

Martin Hoppe, City of Lacey
Joel Carlson, Citizen
Dennis Bloom, Intercity Transit
Tom Hanson, WSDOT
JoAnn Schueler, WSDOT
Scott Davis, Thurston County
Randy Wesselman, City of Olympia
Russ Hendrickson, City of Yelm

Introductions/Announcements

Members, staff, and guests provided self introduction.

Approval of Agenda

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

Approval of Minutes from April 13, 2016

Boardmember DeForest moved, seconded by Boardmember O’Callahan, to approve the April 13, 2016 minutes as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Public Comment Period

There were no public comments.

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

Programs and Policy Director Karen Parkhurst briefed the Board on comments received to date on the draft RTP and several recommendations. The Board will be asked to forward a recommendation to the Regional Council to adopt the RTP with changes set forth by the Board.

Director Parkhurst reviewed TRPC’s public comment process during the three-year update process. Members of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), jurisdictional staff, TPB members, Regional Council, and others have provided feedback on the plan. Staff presented the plan to local councils, boards, and civic organizations and received and incorporated all input into the plan. Many member jurisdictions also submitted written comments. The public comment period began on April 6 and closed on May 9. All public comments during the public comment period were submitted online, via email, or in writing.

Director Parkhurst provided members with a 43-page summary of all the comments. Throughout the process, staff reviewed and acknowledged the comments and prepared draft responses. With assistance by the TAC, staff crafted answers and reviewed ways to incorporate suggestions within the plan while ensuring the effectiveness of the plan for the region.

Director Parkhurst reminded members that the RTP is a long-range regional plan with a forecast horizon to 2040. Each year, the Board and Regional Council have the opportunity to amend the plan. Early next year, the Board will consider whether changes should be recommended to the plan. Every four years, the region undertakes a major review of the plan.

Boardmembers Wolfe and Wood arrived.

Research and Data Director Veena Tabbutt referred members to the 43 pages of comments and staff responses, and a series of one-page topic areas on Changing Population, High Capacity Transportation, Moving the Needle, and Technology. She reviewed several major themes generated by the comments:

- Observations of a disconnect in the plan
- Need for performance measures
- Recommendations for changes to Chapter 2.
- Revisions to Chapter 3 – Goals and Policies
- Housekeeping recommendations from staff

Observations of a Disconnect in the Plan

Several public comments pointed to a disconnect, specifically between the Sustainable Thurston Plan and the RTP. Director Tabbutt explained how the two plans are connected and where there might be some confusion. The comments were generated both during the public comment period and through verbal feedback when the plan was released for public review.

Boardmember Sullivan arrived.

Within the goals and policies of the plan, staff believes there is consistency between the RTP and the Sustainable Thurston Plan. Staff audited the goals and policies of both plans, as well as the Countywide Planning Policies to ensure consistency between all plans. Any recommended changes were presented to the Board during one of the Board’s earlier reviews of the plan.

Recommendations to Chapter 2

The TPRC Work Program includes most of the action items from the Sustainable Thurston Action Plan. The actions implement Sustainable Thurston moving forward. Other actions in Sustainable Thurston were designated for implementation by local jurisdictions, Intercity Transit, or other entities. The actions pertinent to TRPC were incorporated within the region's work program.

Revisions to Chapter 3 – Goals and Policies

The Land Use Chapter and Future Conditions Chapter generated some confusion. In Chapter 4, Future Conditions, the transportation model 2040 forecast considers adopted land uses because the Growth Management Act requires consistency between the RTP and local comprehensive plans and adopted zoning. The Sustainable Thurston land use vision includes many action steps for achieving sustainability in the region. As steps are implemented, change in trends will likely occur leading to changes in the forecast. Most local jurisdictions are updating comprehensive plans. Changes will be reflected within the next forecast as zoning is updated and as trends evolve to more compact development and less rural development. The process is a gradual shift to support the Sustainable Thurston vision. It's also possible to incorporate the Sustainable Thurston land use vision model into the regional model to identify future outcomes. Staff proposes to include that modeling as one of the work program items for pursuing an alternative review of how much land use might change.

Boardmember Kmet recommended more discussion on the issue because of its importance. The RTP is not reflective of any substantial curve in trends. The region continues to expend a tremendous amount of money on capacity and road-widening projects essentially reflecting little change in trends.

Performance Measures

Many comments were submitted surrounding performance measures. Beginning last year, the Board discussed future federal performance measures as required in the new transportation legislation. Currently, the federal performance measures are in still in the rulemaking stage, with Safety recently released and the state updating its target for safety. Therefore, the RTP does not contain performance measures other than a target for vehicle miles traveled, which was amended to the current RTP as part of the Sustainable Thurston Plan.

Additionally, several comments questioned the lack of inclusion of any Sustainable Thurston targets and goals, such as the target to achieve 95% of new growth in the urban areas and no more than 5% in the rural areas. Staff recommends measuring those goals through the Sustainable Thurston Report Card (Benchmarks Program) because the goals are pertinent to land use.

Director Tabbutt reviewed the "Planning for..." documents. "Planning for Changing Population" was prepared because of feedback pointing out how the RTP lacked information on changing demographics while the summary mentioned the importance of changing demographics. An informational sheet on trends link future changes in population age groups with future travel trends. For example, the transportation model forecasts less shared rides in the future than today, which at first glance might reflect an increase in vehicle miles. However, demographics reflect fewer families and fewer children reducing the need for shared rides. Demographics reflect more people living longer, living by themselves, and driving by themselves. Shared rides tend to occur most within families. The informational sheet provides information on trends during the last 15 years, the next 25 years, and steps on how to plan for changing demographics. Staff proposes to include these in Chapter 2.

Boardmember DeForest spoke in support of including the information but questioned the purpose of the message in terms of whether it reflects an adequate plan to serve growth in the future or whether major changes would be required.

Director Parkhurst introduced the informational sheet on "Planning for High Capacity Transportation." Many questions were received about rail. For many people, high capacity transportation often equates to rail. Staff recommends including the proposed information within the plan regarding Sound Transit's plans. Although Pierce County residents currently pay taxes to support Sound Transit, service plans for Tacoma reflect no expanded service until 2041-2047. Sound Transit's revenue package also does not include plans to extend service to Thurston County.

Boardmember DeForest noted that service to the City of DuPont is not included in Sound Transit's revenue plan. Sound Transit plans to extend service to Tacoma by 2041 with the next service extension to Tacoma Community College in 2047.

Boardmember Zita arrived.

Boardmember Kmet said Sound Transit's forecast is somewhat confusing, as he believes commuter rail is currently provided to Lakewood. He asked whether the service is operated by Sound Transit. Director Parkhurst reported the service is a downtown connection. The plan speaks to Link and Sounder Service. Sound Transit's plan addresses rail initiated in Seattle and doesn't include any forecast for extending service to Thurston County.

Boardmember Kmet pointed out how terminology surrounding commuter rail and light rail are frequently interchanged creating confusion. He recommended more specificity by including "light rail" within the first bullet.

Boardmember DeForest shared that during the presentation of Sound Transit's plan at the last Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Transportation Policy Board (TPB) meeting, Sound Transit officials indicated the plan covers light rail, commuter rail, and enhanced bus service.

Boardmember Kmet questioned the operator of commuter rail to the Tacoma Dome from downtown Seattle to Tacoma and to Lakewood. Director Parkhurst advised that Sound Transit is the service provider. Boardmember Kmet said the information that speaks to Sound Transit not providing service to Pierce County is inaccurate. Director Parkhurst affirmed the language could be revised and definitions included for different types of rail service. Boardmember Kmet said it appears Lakewood commuter rail would not be extended to the City of DuPont during his lifetime. Director Parkhurst acknowledged the request to clarify the language.

Director Parkhurst said the information also speaks to density that is typically necessary to support rail. Currently, Intercity Transit's revenues do not support expanding commuter express service. Trade-offs might be necessary to continue the service and increasing service within Thurston County. Intercity Transit also has inadequate funding to increase connections to the Centennial Train Station. The information also addresses the Passenger Rail Group and the suggestion to complete a high capacity transportation study. That study would be expensive but necessary before the region could qualify for funds for high capacity transportation.

Other information speaks to the plan in 20 years and how the region continues to explore rail options, strives to develop communities in dense and compact development, continues to increase commute trip reduction, explores ways to expand different transportation options, and continues to work with Sound Transit officials and others to ensure the region is considered moving forward. Rail continues to be important as more than a third of survey respondents want to expend funds on rail creating a vision-reality disconnect between when rail might be extended and what it could entail for the region. Staff will make the changes to clarify the first two bullets and include different rail service definitions.

Boardmember Kmet asked whether the RTP speaks to the region seeking legislation or other sources of funding to extend rail to Thurston County. Director Parkhurst replied that the plan's summary speaks to the need to seek new funding sources. She also believes information is included in the rail section within goals and policies for seeking additional funding sources. Additional information could be included to the policies or as a Supportive Measures. Boardmember Kmet remarked that any extension of rail to the region would require another source of revenue. The plan should acknowledge or speak to that issue.

Boardmember Sullivan commented that the Intercity Transit Authority recently discussed commuter rail. Taxpayers in Everett agreed to pay taxes before receiving any rail service to Everett, which is much more densely populated than Thurston County. Everett taxpayers are upset at the prospect of paying taxes during their lifetime and never receiving service. It would be difficult to gauge when density in Thurston County would be sufficient to extend commuter rail. She recommended exploring other options, such as express bus service, which is currently provided to Pierce County as an interim step until the region is able to extend rail.

Chair Ryder agreed and added that it's also important to consider the plan's audience. Preliminary project cost estimates in the plan can be daunting and it might be useful to include similar information for rail to help establish the reality of the funding situation because many in the community will continue to ask for rail each year. It's important to refer citizens to the RTP and the amount of funds necessary to extend rail to Thurston County.

Director Parkhurst acknowledged the request and recommended adding the cost of extending the link from Seattle to Everett as an example.

Boardmember Sackrison commented on the changes occurring over the last decade and his preference to avoid solving all problems within the context of the long-term plan. He suggested the Board could engage in future discussions about how to address several subjects often addressed by the public surrounding transit and rail rather than trying to resolve those issues during the update process.

Boardmember Kmet pointed out that the issues raised in some of the comments pointed to the lack of any acknowledgement within the plan that the region lacks sufficient funding for transit. Boardmember Sackrison said his recommendation is not to acknowledge those comments; however, there is much random information that's not cohesive about the status of transit and rail.

Director Parkhurst added that the public comments would be posted on the website, as well as additional in-depth information linked to data from the earlier Rail Study and Sound Transit plans for those who want more information on high capacity transportation. It's also important to remember that should the region request funding from the federal government for completion of an alternatives analysis, rail cannot be pre-identified as the answer. More frequent express bus service by Intercity Transit might be the starting place or even bus rapid transit. Pre-determination of an outcome is not permitted.

Boardmember DeForest shared that during the PSRC TPB meeting discussion, a Bellevue City Councilmember shared that the average 2-car family in Bellevue would pay \$1,000 a year for many years to extend rail. Rail entails a long lead time and an enormous amount of money upfront.

Director Parkhurst said the conversation reflects the Board's interest in continuing the rail discussion. She asked for agreement that the rail issue would not be resolved within the plan other than some changes to the plan as requested by the Board.

Joel Carlson commented that not all of Thurston County would need to be included in Sound Transit's taxing boundary.

Director Tabbutt reviewed the information on "Planning for Moving the Needle on Mode Split." The region received many comments on the Future Conditions Chapter and the forecast of a 1% increase in walking trips, which was very disappointing to many. The information reflects the difficulty in changing different transportation modes and some steps to effect change. Since the completion of the Household Travel Survey 15 years ago, the region has experienced little change in the drive alone rate and a 1% increase in walking and biking. The results are directly related to demographics in the county with other factors influencing mode split, such as gas prices, etc. The figures represent a period when the Growth Management Act was implemented promoting compact urban development versus rural sprawling through zoning, investments, and policies. However, transit funding has suffered in the last 15 years when some citizen initiatives passed.

Results from the modeling also indicate change would be limited as well. Information is included on ways to move the needle through changes in zoning, promoting telework, and improving the safety and convenience of walking and biking.

Boardmember Kmet said that although he likes the informational sheets, the language tends to encourage while the plan requires most major road projects in the region to include bike lanes and pedestrian improvements. Although the plan doesn't control infill and redevelopment, it does provide infrastructure to support those efforts. The tone of the bullets could be changed to reflect what the plan is executing rather than encouraging. The region has implemented a number of policies to move the needle. Additionally, it's frustrating that over the next 10 to 20 years, it's more of the same as the region hasn't done anything significantly different to try and change the pattern. Small steps might eventually

result in positive outcomes. Some measures may also have helped to prevent conditions from worsening. Many projects in Tumwater for example, are required to address hazardous issues. The same situation likely applies to other jurisdictions. However, the plan includes a substantial amount of funds for road building, which he finds frustrating, as it doesn't appear to move the needle.

Chair Ryder remarked that each jurisdiction is responsible for following through on the vision for moving the needle forward. The RTP is a blueprint for the region. The Regional Council has no authority to move the needle. Each jurisdiction's comprehensive plan should have the ability to move the needle. He doesn't believe it's TRPC's charge to move the needle because it's up to the cities of Tumwater, Olympia, and Lacey and the other jurisdictions to move the needle within individual comprehensive plans.

Boardmember Kmet replied that the Board has essentially taken major road projects forecasted by each jurisdiction and included them within the plan without question or ascertaining whether another action should be considered. He acknowledged that many of the projects are driven by land use and the mode of transportation selected by citizens today; however, the plan spans the next 25-30 years and the question is whether the project list defines how the region wants to invest limited resources.

Boardmember Sackrison said the discussion raises a good point; however, if the needle is to move, why is Tumwater seeking road widening and capacity building projects instead of other projects, which is true of all jurisdictions. Each jurisdiction makes practical decisions that might extend the status quo to some extent, but it's within the authority of each jurisdiction to move in another direction.

Boardmember Kmet replied that Tumwater's largest capacity projects include Old Highway 99 and the Brewery bypass corridor, both of which are driven by traffic not originating in Tumwater. In order to improve the Brewery District, the City must ensure traffic is routed away from the area to implement other pedestrian and land use improvements.

Chair Ryder advised that the issue is large and the plan may not necessarily solve those problems. Those issues could be addressed through the Urban Corridors Task Force work and other good work completed by the Board. He advocated for taking the next steps in those efforts completed to date. The RTP is a broad forecast updated each year and it shouldn't be revised at the last moment in an attempt to try and move the needle.

Boardmember Kmet replied that it wasn't his intent other than acknowledging there are no easy answers. The changes proposed by staff are realistic. Alternatively, Boardmembers need to understand and convey to their respective jurisdictions that the plan establishes a blueprint for a place that all jurisdictions are attempting to avoid.

Executive Director Wyrick said the Board discussed how the plan is a regional plan and vision; however, there is some direction in the plan to all jurisdictions for consistency between comprehensive plans and transportation plans with the RTP. Actions by jurisdictions falling outside that direction or vision, could likely result in the Council's review of the jurisdiction's certification of consistency. It's also important not to establish a vision no comprehensive plan can address or achieve. It's important each jurisdiction's long range plan establishes a realistic direction in support of the RTP.

Boardmember Kmet said the reality is against radically changing land use because people invested in properties for specific purposes. It's possible to implement some adjustments; however, any dramatic changes in land use would turn the community upside down in a number of ways. Similar to the RTP, individual comprehensive plans are not going to include substantial changes.

Boardmember DeForest agreed that the plan creates a direction recognizing that the reality continues down the same path because the will or way for altering the course isn't possible.

Director Parkhurst asked members for input on whether the summary in the RTP should clearly articulate how the region's policymakers are not happy when contemplating the future and would like to spend time determining ways to promote more livable communities, such as referring to the work program and several examples of actions elected officials will be working on over the next several years. Several members supported revising the summary to reflect that intent.

Chair Ryder spoke to the functional use of the plan. The plan is primarily used by jurisdictions to seek grants. Any additional information that deflates that goal would be negative in his opinion. He cautioned against producing a plan that indicates the region is “screwed.”

Boardmember Kmet said the reality is that the direction of the region is governed by many small decisions, such as approving upzones, allowing a street connection, or investing money in a trail versus a road. Each incremental decision by jurisdictions as public bodies steer development incrementally one way or the other. It’s a continuing education of newly elected officials about the importance of those small incremental decisions and ultimately moving the region in a direction that collectively, all jurisdictions know the community wants to achieve. Often those are very difficult decisions to render.

Chair Ryder agreed that the political will to follow through with a jurisdiction’s plan is sometimes very difficult as incremental changes often receive resistance by loud minority voices.

Boardmember DeForest agreed change occurs from incremental decisions, as well as to some degree the impression of the development community on how receptive a jurisdiction may be to work with. If the development community perceives a jurisdiction as difficult to work with, they don’t develop in those jurisdictions.

Director Parkhurst reviewed the final piece on “Planning for Technology.” The information affirms the region’s ongoing monitoring of technology, employing technology, and continued research on technology.

Director Tabbutt reported staff is recommending some changes to Chapter 2. Chapter 2 includes the region’s work program and the regional project list. Additional information is recommended on activities by local jurisdictions and Intercity Transit to balance the region’s work program and reflect the entire region. In terms of the project list, staff recommends adding a page on local projects to reflect other investments in the region to include the amount of funding for maintenance to balance the list of regional projects. An additional recommendation is changing “capacity projects” to reflect “mobility improvements” acknowledging that projects in urban areas feature pedestrian and bike facilities and in rural areas include expanded shoulders for bike mobility.

Boardmember Kmet said the renaming suggestion appears to be doubletalk because the projects are capacity projects. Director Tabbutt said the recommendation is an acknowledgment that some projects are not for vehicle capacity and add bike lanes and roundabouts to increase efficiencies. Not all projects are widening projects. Boardmember Kmet agreed the descriptions could be revised to reflect the inclusion of bike lanes and pedestrian improvements when the project includes those improvements. In most cases, the reason for the project is not just to add bike lanes and pedestrian facilities; it’s to increase capacity for vehicles. The recommended change is misleading.

Boardmember Gilman remarked that if a complete streets project is a funding requirement or an adjunct to increasing vehicle capacity, then the project is a capacity project acknowledging that bike and pedestrian facilities are contributing to complete street infrastructure rather than as part of building a network for those modes of transportation.

Executive Director Wyrick pointed out the importance of not trivializing mobility improvements, especially when considering how small incremental changes assist in moving the needle forward. He supported the suggestion to recognize those elements within the project description.

Boardmember Kmet suggested the language could be revised to reflect “capacity and mobility improvements...”

Boardmember Sackrison commented that the use of “mobility” is often interpreted as ADA improvements. Mobility is not a common term to describe different modes of transportation. He offered substitution language of “capacity/mode improvements” and agreed the recommended change by staff of “mobility improvements” doesn’t accurately describe the projects.

Director Tabbutt affirmed the Board’s direction to retain “capacity” and adding another description for other mode improvements. Staff plans to review the suggestion with the TAC to develop alternative language.

Martin Hoppe, City of Lacey TAC member, remarked that most of the projects on the list are non-capacity projects. For example, Capitol Boulevard and Hokum Bay include turn lanes. Very few of the projects are true capacity projects because the project doesn't include the addition of a general purpose lane.

Boardmember Kmet pointed out how the projects add miles of additional capacity.

Mr. Hoppe stated that the projects as efficiency and safety rather than capacity because most of the projects on the list do not add capacity.

Director Tabbutt advised that staff would retain "capacity" and substitute other terminology to broaden the description of those projects.

Chair Ryder spoke to Mr. Hoppe's clarification that the projects are not capacity projects.

Boardmember Kmet contended that if a project adds a lane, characterizing the project as another type is inaccurate because it increases capacity of the road. Turn lanes move more traffic through the intersection. Even the Capitol Boulevard project, which doesn't add any lanes, would increase capacity because of the addition of roundabouts. Those projects are driven in part by capacity.

Director Parkhurst suggested an alternative of "multimodal capacity." It's also important to remember that if the plan was for a different part of the country, bike lanes or sidewalks likely wouldn't be included, which speaks to differences within the country, which is important to acknowledge within the project title. Members supported revising "capacity projects" to reflect "multimodal and capacity."

Director Tabbutt reported another recommendation is to move the detailed list of projects into an appendix to improve readability of the plan. Members agreed with the suggestion.

Housekeeping Recommendations from Staff

Planner Tabbutt reviewed several recommended housekeeping changes. The RTP is based on modeling completed in January 2016. The model was adjusted to reflect speeds on Interstate and to incorporate transit within the urban corridors. New modeling figures are proposed for inclusion but do not affect the direction of the plan.

The chapter on Compliance requires an update to meet new federal rules on the FAST Act.

The chapter on Public Involvement was drafted prior to the last phase of public involvement and requires some changes to acknowledge new public comments.

Other changes include minor edits and formatting throughout the plan.

Members concurred with the proposed changes.

Directors Parkhurst and Tabbutt reviewed the 24 proposed policy changes generated from comments:

#	Comment	Staff/TAC Recommendation	Board Discussion/Action
1	<i>There was no mention in the plan of Target Zero/Vision Zero efforts despite a growing momentum internationally, nationally, and within Washington State.</i>	Add supportive measure to Goal 4 System Safety and Security stating, "Examine the state's Target Zero plan and adopt safety targets consistent with the federal performance measure requirements."	The Board concurred with the recommendation.
28	<i>While linking parks and paths is important, for transportation purposes, a stronger emphasis should be placed on making it easier for people to bike and walk for transportation.</i>	Suggested revised language, "Coordinate with local agencies and other stakeholders to update the countywide Thurston Regional Trails Plan to evaluate the progression of trail system development, identify new opportunities for improving connectivity and access to existing trails, open spaces, and major community destinations."	The Board concurred with the recommendation.

Transportation Policy Board
 Minutes of Meeting
 May 11, 2016 Page 9 of 16

#	Comment	Staff/TAC Recommendation	Board Discussion/Action
47	(Under Goals and Policies) 1. Transportation and Land Use Consistency – Ensure the design and function of the transportation facilities are consistent with and support sustainable, healthy urban, suburban, and rural communities. <i>This and the other 19 Goals encompass the totality of what the regional transportation plan is intended to do. But there are major trade-offs among goals that are not addressed. The list reads a bit like an attempt to please every interest in the region with little acknowledgement of limits and contradictions.</i>	Suggest adding some language regarding trade-offs to goals and policy section.	The Board concurred with the recommendation.
65	<i>As I look at the transportation projects you have on the books, I see quite a few road addition and road widening projects. I realize with our current way of thinking/traveling, this is required. In my dreams Thurston County will become Copenhagen's twin and not require many/any road widening projects in the future. I know this type of change takes time. At this point, I'm not requesting that these projects are taken off the books. I do request that you make sure that there are bike lanes on these roads (unless the road happens to parallel a nearby bike trail or another road with a very good/safe bike lanes). When designing these bike lanes, I hope you will consider raising them a few inches above the level of the road. Adding safe, ideally raised, bike lanes to all new roads at least helps us head in the direction of becoming Copenhagen's twin City.</i>	Additional language is recommended to "Capacity Projects" description emphasizing that multimodal facilities are planned alongside lane additions.	The Board concurred with the recommendation.
83	Priorities: "Research and develop strategies to increase access to goods and services in existing and planned neighborhood centers throughout the region. Identify strategies to achieve the Sustainable Thurston Plans' preferred land use vision." <i>This should be moved to High Priority.</i>	Staff recommends increasing the priority of work program.	The Board concurred with the recommendation.
86	<i>The plan states as included supportive measures for a multi modal system:</i> Continue to serve new development with interconnected public streets (with multi modal access). <i>This is business as usual and will get us where we are going, not somewhere new. How about incorporating the more current concept of "complete the streets" where every project includes all necessary modal components?</i> Implement a street design that encourages safe, multimodal user behavior. <i>How does this address retrofit? The plan also talks about looking for opportunities. How about, "Make the public infrastructure walking and bicycling friendly." Prioritize projects by category and allocate resources to do this. Create project plans that identify specific priorities, timeframes, funding, and responsibility to do so. The current design standards should be followed, of course. And changing behavior also must include effective education and support/encouragement. In our RTP let's delve into these important components much deeper.</i> Promote multimodal trip-making by locating appropriately sized park-and-ride facilities. <i>A great example, but it is important to convey that a detailed implementation strategy is needed to identify many needed engineering and, with collaboration with other sectors like education, other measures.</i>	Add supportive measures.	The Board concurred with the recommendation.
	One way of managing congestion is to build communities that offer safe and convenient travel options. <i>Another option is to use one of the most basic motivators of human behavior – the pocket book. But, besides that, is a real long-term and indispensable factor: changing land use and development patterns, including different uses for where development already exists. I feel it is essential to weave zoning effectively into the RTP.</i>	Remove barriers to infill and redevelopment in urban centers and along transit corridors, where a wider choice in travel options currently exist.	Chair Ryder recommended adding supportive measures defining how jurisdictions can remove barriers. Director Tabbutt recommended adding language similar to, "Such as those identified by the Urban Corridors Task Force." The Board concurred with the recommendation.

#	Comment	Staff/TAC Recommendation	Board Discussion/Action
101	<p>Page 37 – C-Capacity Projects <i>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 project. 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 are many components to these projects.</i></p>	<p>Recommend modifying the categories as noted: C. Capacity-Projects <u>Mobility Improvements</u></p> <p><u>Change language describing Capacity Projects to:</u></p> <p>The Mobility Improvement projects fulfill a variety of needs and support a variety of modes. They improve system mobility and circulation by adding vehicle capacity to existing streets, roads, and bridges that are part of the regional transportation system. The Mobility Improvement projects add sufficient road capacity to meet the needs of the region, as evaluated in the regional transportation model. These projects also include general purpose travel lanes, continuous two-way left turn lane along a corridor, corridor access management (such as a system of medians and roundabouts), and freeway interchange reconstruction. In urban areas, they upgrade streets and roads to communities' design standards and usually include sidewalks, bicycle lanes, landscaping, and lighting. Rural projects in this category typically widen shoulders, serving people who walk and bike. Both urban and rural projects upgrade stormwater infrastructure.</p> <p>Highway and freeway projects sponsored by local agencies, but not yet part of a state facilities plan, are included in the Mobility Improvement project category, and are financially constrained in this RTP.</p> <p>Although not described in the plan, every construction project must meet a variety of requirements before building begins – complying with local, state, and federal requirements for design, environmental review, and right-of-way acquisition.</p> <p>The list does not include local projects such as adding a signal or a single roundabout to an intersection, adding sidewalks or bicycle lanes, or re-paving streets or roads. While such projects are essential to the safe and efficient operation of the transportation system, the RTP accounts for them in the overall Goals and Policies, and in the local construction, preservation, maintenance, and operation expenditures in the financial forecast.</p> <p>See Map 2-1 for a comprehensive look at Mobility Improvement Projects, or use the online interactive map.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>
102	<p>Page 140 – Goals and Policies <i>The Regional Goals and Policies have been written in the last couple plans to be a blue print 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.</i></p>	<p>Recommend modifying the policies as noted: 1.j North County – Urban Corridors & Centers: Create vibrant city centers and activity modes 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 & Resource Lands: Protect the region's farms, forests, prairies, and open spaces while providing appropriate transportation services for those choosing a rural lifestyle.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation</p>
137	<p><i>Intercity Transit recommended the RTP state more prominently:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Doing what we are doing now, we are not going to meet our goals.</i> • <i>And we cannot afford to build our way out of congestion</i> 	<p>Suggest adding language to this effect in the summary.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation</p>
140	<p><i>Under the plan, many of Intercity Transit's projects are predicated on voter approval for additional sales tax. The plan should recognize that the remaining 1/10th of 1 percent available under state law might not be adequate to serve the need and expectation for public transportation in the region.</i></p>	<p>Staff recommends adding the following language: <i>The Financial Forecast in the RTP for Intercity Transit reflects collecting 9/10th of 1 percent of sales tax, the amount allowed under state law. Currently, voters have authorized 8/10th of 1 percent in taxing authority. With the downturn of the economy and changes in federal funding, Intercity Transit's long range financial forecast does not indicate that transit funding is adequate to cover current transit costs let alone expanded service. Many of the transit projects in the RTP are predicated on voter approval for additional sales tax. The RTP recognizes that the remaining 1/10th of 1 percent available under state law might not be adequate to serve the need and expectations for public transportation in our region.</i></p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation</p>
143	<p>Page 11 – Goals and Policies 10. Public Transportation</p> <p><i>Provide a <u>robust</u> an appropriate level of reliable, effective and convenient public transportation options commensurate with the region's evolving needs to increase the share of all trips made by public transportation.</i></p>	<p>Staff suggested rewrite: Provide a <u>robust</u> an appropriate level of reliable, effective and convenient public transportation options commensurate with the region's evolving needs to increase the share of all trips made by <u>public transportation.</u></p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>

#	Comment	Staff/TAC Recommendation	Board Discussion/Action
145	<p>Page 29 The Challenge</p> <p><i>This section describes a list of challenges in the form of questions and then summarizes with the following paragraph:</i></p> <p>The challenge is in the balance, individual versus community needs. Short-and-long term strategies. Costs weighed against benefits. Urban versus rural. Investing now and sustaining the future. All hard choices, with no simple solutions. Balance</p> <p><i>These are indeed challenges, but they will not simply be resolved in the form of trade-offs. The listed items (investing now and sustaining the future) should not be viewed as "versus" each other. These challenges will require learning together as a region and resolving to make plans, invest in and create a future that will be sustainable. As we learned during the Sustainable Thurston discussions, these will not be easy conversations, but they are necessary and we should begin as soon as possible.</i></p>	<p>Suggested rewrite:</p> <p>The challenge is in the balance. Balancing individual and community needs. Short-and-long term strategies. Costs weighed against benefits. Urban and rural considerations. Investing now and sustaining the future. All hard choices, with no simple solutions. Balance.</p> <p>These challenges will require learning together as a region and resolving to make plans, invest in and create a future that will be sustainable. As we learned during the Sustainable Thurston discussions, these will not be easy conversations, but they are necessary and we should begin as soon as possible.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation</p>
148	<p>Chapter 3 Goals and Policies Goal 1. Transportation and Land Use Consistency</p> <p>Page 137 2. Multimodal Transportation System</p> <p><i>Work toward an integrated, multimodal transportation system that supports the adopted land use plans, reduces overall need to <u>drive or</u> drive alone, and provides alternative travel choices.</i></p>	<p>Suggested language: Work toward an integrated, multimodal transportation system that supports the adopted land use plans, reduces overall need to <u>drive alone</u>, and provides alternative travel choices.</p>	<p>See the Board's discussion below.</p>
<p>Boardmember O'Callahan said he's uncomfortable with the suggestion as the Board's purview is transportation. Telling people that they cannot drive defeats the purpose of the Board.</p> <p>Several members pointed out the language doesn't prevent people from driving. Boardmember Gilman added that from a policy perspective, policy measures such as encouraging opportunities to shop close to home or encouraging the development of housing density would help reduce driving.</p> <p>Boardmember O'Callahan remarked that over the last 20 years, jurisdictions are pushing to reduce driving alone. New technology will help reduce drive alone rates as well as reducing pollution. The statement that "it's not possible to build our way out of congestion" while the region considers spending billions of dollars to extend rail could have been expended to reduce congestion.</p> <p>Executive Director Wyrick advised that it's not the purview of the Board to market transportation, rather the Board provides guidance to increase transportation efficiencies.</p> <p>Director Parkhurst offered some alternative language stating that the region is providing a system that gives people a choice not to drive.</p> <p>Boardmember O'Callahan said he prefers avoiding the use of "not driving." He cited freedom and mobility vehicles provide to people.</p> <p>Director Tabbutt reviewed the proposed substitute language.</p> <p>Boardmember DeForest said he prefers retaining "and/or drive alone" as the goal is to reduce both driving and driving alone.</p> <p>Boardmember Wood acknowledged the goal to create and encourage people to use other options; however, as an elected official he recognizes that his position is to represent his constituents and it's important to consider that aspect rather than including language that speaks to controlling rather than sustaining or assisting citizens.</p> <p>Members agreed to defer additional discussion on the proposal following the review of remaining comments.</p>			
149	<p>Page 138 6. Transportation Demand Management</p> <p><i>Increase overall operating efficiency of the transportation system through the effective use of measures that reduce the need to <u>drive or</u> drive alone.</i></p>	<p>Suggested language: Increase overall operating efficiency of the transportation system through the effective use of measures that reduce the need to drive alone.</p>	<p>The Board deferred discussion to later in the meeting.</p>
151	<p>Page 141 Examples of Supportive Measures</p> <p><i>Promote telework in South County towns and cities to keep workers and their dollars local and reduce vehicle miles traveled.</i></p>	<p>Suggested language: Promote telework in South County towns and cities to keep workers and their dollars local and reduce vehicle miles traveled.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation</p>
152	<p>Page 142 Example Supportive Measure</p> <p><i>Locate public office buildings and facilities near major transit corridors to <u>provide options for</u> encourage all facility users and employees to use alternatives.</i></p>	<p>Suggested language: Locate public office buildings and facilities near major transit corridors to <u>provide options for</u> encourage all facility users and employees to use alternatives.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>

#	Comment	Staff/TAC Recommendation	Board Discussion/Action
154	<p>Page 144 Goal 2: Multimodal Transportation System</p> <p><i>Work toward an integrated, multimodal transportation system that supports adopted land use plans, reduces overall need to <u>drive or drive alone</u> and provides <u>alternative and encourages transit, walking and cycling as choices</u>.</i></p>	<p>Suggested language: Work toward an integrated, multimodal transportation system that supports adopted land use plans, reduces overall need to drive alone and provides <u>alternative and encourages transit, walking and cycling as</u> choices.</p>	<p>The Board deferred discussion to later in the meeting.</p>
155	<p>Page 147 Examples of Supportive Measures</p> <p><i>Find sustainable financial support for <u>urban and rural</u> public transportation programs</i></p>	<p>Suggested language: Find sustainable financial support for <u>urban and rural</u> public transportation programs.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>
158	<p>Polices 6.a</p> <p><i>Promote transportation-efficient development and redevelopment, and site public-services and facilities where transit, walking, and bicycling are now or will be viable alternatives to driving or driving alone.</i></p>	<p>Suggested language: Promote transportation-efficient development and redevelopment, and site public-services and facilities where transit, walking, and bicycling are now or will be viable alternative to driving alone.</p>	<p>The Board deferred discussion to later in the meeting.</p>
159	<p>Page 158, Policies 9g: <i>Ensure that street, road, and bridge projects are integrated with pedestrian, <u>cycling and transit amenities</u> in districts and neighborhoods, and adding lasting value to the community.</i></p>	<p>Suggested language: Ensure that street, road, and bridge projects are integrated with pedestrian amenities in districts and neighborhoods, and adding <u>lasting</u> value to the community.</p>	<p>See the Board's Discussion below.</p>
<p>Boardmember Zita mentioned that many people are interested in cycling amenities. She questioned the lack of including cycling amenities. Director Tabbutt advised that this particular policy focuses on pedestrian amenities because they are different than cycling amenities. Martin Hoppe added that cycling and transit amenities were removed because it pertained to neighborhoods where bike lanes are rarely located.</p> <p>Director Parkhurst reported the current policy is within the Streets, Roads and Bridges policy and speaks to neighborhoods. TAC members agreed that bike lanes are typically not included in all neighborhoods.</p> <p>Boardmember Kmet asked whether another goal speaks to bicycle improvements. Director Parkhurst affirmed there is a separate goal in the same section.</p> <p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>			
161	<p>Policy 10.i <i>Plan for the long-term countywide funding needs of the region's public transit-transportation systems.</i></p> <p>Page 161 Examples of Supportive Measures <i>Place a high priority on the availability of public transportation services, <u>as well as pedestrian and cycling and access, when locating evaluating alternative locations for public, medical, educational, service, residential, and business facilities.</u></i></p> <p><i>Please consider adding Supportive Measures:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support HOV Lanes • Convene regional conversations to discuss the value of and funding mechanisms for both urban and rural public transportation. • Support additional local sales tax options for Intercity Transit in the state legislature. 	<p>Suggested language Policy 10.1 Plan for the long-term countywide funding needs of the region's public transit-transportation systems.</p> <p>Place a high priority on the availability of public transportation services, <u>as well as pedestrian and cycling and access</u>, when locating public facilities.</p> <p>Additional Supportive Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support HOV Lanes • Convene regional conversations to discuss the value of and funding mechanisms for both urban and rural public transportation. • Support additional local sales tax options for Intercity Transit in the state legislature. 	<p>See the Board's discussion below.</p>
<p>Boardmember Kmet asked whether public transit funding is a policy statement in a section specifically focused on public transit. Director Parkhurst acknowledged that it pertains to Goal 10, which is public transportation. Intercity Transit is requesting an addition to Supportive Measures of supporting local funding options for transit.</p> <p>Additionally, changing "public transit" to "public transportation" reflects the title of the Goal (Public Transportation).</p> <p>Director Tabbutt added that the agency also believed that changing the title would encompass other options, such as vanpools.</p> <p>The Board concurred with the recommendation</p>			
162	<p>Page 176 Goal 18 – Environmental and Human Health</p> <p>Add to Policy list: <i>Use modeling and other tools to analyze transportation projects, programs, actions needed to achieve Sustainable Thurston goals.</i></p> <p><i>Support Thurston Thrives health planning activities related to land use and transportation.</i></p>	<p>Add to supportive measures: Use modeling and other tools to analyze transportation projects, programs and actions needed to achieve Sustainable Thurston goals. (suggest adding to goal 2 see below)</p> <p>Support Thurston Thrives health planning activities related to land use and transportation.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>

#	Comment	Staff/TAC Recommendation	Board Discussion/Action
163	<p>Chapter 4 – Future Conditions Page 191</p> <p><i>In the Transportation Demand Management Discussion on this page there is a shaded box indicating that TRPC, in a future work program, will investigate what effects enhancing TDM strategies will have on factors such as vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and also will investigate actions and investments needed to reach our VMT and greenhouse gas emissions goals.</i></p> <p><i>This Work Plan intent should be elevated to a policy level under Goal 18 as described above and include a range of actions, projects and programs in the analysis.</i></p>	<p>Suggest moving VMT targets and supporting graph from 18 – Environment and Human Health to 2 – Multimodal Transportation System and add supportive language that includes a range of actions, projects and programs that may be needed to meet VMT goals.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>
167	<p>Comments on http://www.trpc.org/153/Regional-Transportation-Plan 2025 From Port of Olympia Commissioners – forwarded by E.J. Zita, 9 May 2016 Commissioner Bill McGregor: Comments on Chapter 3 Draft of March 21, 2016</p> <p>- Section 1 Page 140. I think there needs to be some mention/language on Freight Transportation to reflect that it is a component of the Transportation and Land Use Consistency</p> <p>Page 142 – Move the third from bottom bullet to the previous page – this may take care of my concern on the above comment. Being towards the end seems to reduce its importance. (“Consider appropriate freight access and infrastructure in land use and transportation decisions and projects.”)</p>	<p>Move supportive measure: “Consider appropriate freight access and infrastructure in land use and transportation decisions and projects.” to page 141 (higher in the list).</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>
169	<p>- Section 13, Page 166-167, The last sentence begins “Without a sufficiently... These difficult assemble corridors could be lost to future transportation uses.” I think this refers to keeping them in public ownership (Rails to Trails?) but it locks out the need to provide freight rail service if in the future there becomes a need in those areas that are not being used today. It could also impact the future need to provide passenger rail service (like Portland’s or Tacoma’s rails that move people inter-City as a transit service) – if they are turned into walking trails?</p>	<p>Language could be modified to be more clear – intent seems to be to discuss challenge in preserving corridors if rail lines are abandoned – whether for trails or future rail use.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>
171	<p>Section 15, page 171, first bullet “Identify...Marine terminal...Olympia” this same language should be inserted in the Aviation section as well – changing the names to Aviation and Tumwater.</p>	<p>Add the following supportive measure to page 169 (Aviation goal):</p> <p>Identify any areas of conflict between future plans for the aviation terminal and adjacent land use plans in Tumwater, and develop a coordinated strategy with all affected interests for addressing those issues to ensure that all user needs are met.</p>	<p>The Board concurred with the recommendation.</p>
175	<p>Chapter 3-15, paragraph 1, under “Importance and Challenges”: Change the last sentence starting with Marine Terminals, to: “Marine terminals, while situated at a sensitive environmental location on the water’s edge, serve a vital national purpose in facilitating marine transportation of cargo and people.”</p> <p>Zita proposes slightly different language here: “Marine terminals, on environmentally sensitive locations on the water’s edge, can also facilitate marine transportation of people and cargo.”</p>	<p>Two alternatives proposed by Port:</p> <p>“Marine terminals, while situated at a sensitive environmental location on the water’s edge, serve a vital national purpose in facilitating marine transportation of cargo and people.” or “Marine terminals, on environmentally sensitive locations on the water’s edge, can also facilitate marine transportation of people and cargo.”</p>	<p>See Board’s discussion below.</p>

#	Comment	Staff/TAC Recommendation	Board Discussion/Action
	Boardmember Zita spoke to the two Port proposals. Her version (2nd option) softens the patriotic language to some degree by indicating that marine terminals facilitate marine transportation of people and cargo to recognize the role of marine terminals.		
	Chair Ryder commented that it's difficult to consider that the Port is not vital for national purposes in facilitating transportation, because it is. The Port is one of only two ports that Joint Base Lewis McChord (JBLM) can use in times of national security issues. Not mentioning that fact is a disservice to the Port.		
	Boardmember Dayton questioned whether the same language is included within sections pertaining to Interstate 5 and the Burlington Northern rail line. Staff indicated the language isn't included for those two areas. Boardmember Dayton suggested for consistency the plan should include similar language for Interstate 5 and Burlington Northern Railroad.		
	Chair Ryder said he prefers the first option.		
	Boardmember Zita remarked that whether the Port of Olympia continues to serve in that capacity in the face of sea level rise remains to be seen.		
	Chair Ryder said the Port currently serves in that capacity.		
	Boardmember Zita countered that it is not the Port's primary capacity and the Port of Olympia is not the primary port serving JBLM.		
	Chair Ryder replied that the Port is one of two ports serving JBLM.		
	Boardmember Zita said the first option overstates the Port's mission.		
	Boardmember Kmet agreed as the first option is somewhat of an overstatement while the second option is not adequate as well.		
	Director Parkhurst recommended substituting "can serve." Chair Ryder supported the suggestion while Boardmember Zita agreed the Port can serve a national purpose but she would prefer not including a vital national purpose as another port serves JBLM more often.		
	Executive Director Wyrick pointed out that "vital" refers to JBLM rather than the Port, as JBLM is a vital national purpose.		
	Boardmember Kmet said the language doesn't speak to JBLM but rather to the Port, which is the underlying reason for the language.		
	Several members disagreed with the removal of "vital."		
	A majority of the Board supported the following revised proposal: "Marine terminals, while situated at a sensitive environmental location on the water's edge, <u>can</u> serve a vital national purpose in facilitating marine transportation of people and cargo."		
	The Board continued its discussion on comment 148.		
	Boardmember Wolfe remarked that she has several grandchildren who are of driving age. Approximately half of her grandchildren live in the north county area and the other half live in the South Hill area of Puyallup. The grandchildren living in the north county have a choice of either driving, using transit, walking, or bicycling. Her grandchildren in the Puyallup area have no choice but to drive as there are no sidewalks or transit service. The point of the RTP is to provide choices for people.		
	Boardmember Sackrison said that although he understands the prior comments around driving and driving alone, he believes the point has been missed. Increasing bus service to Tenino and affording people with the option of public transportation would reduce the need to drive. The language doesn't remotely convey that people can't drive because the language is clear that the goal is to reduce the need to drive, which is different from dissuading people from driving. He supports the existing language because it encourages options for Boardmember Wolfe's grandchildren, who currently have to drive, and it provides more options for the south county area.		
	Boardmember Kmet asked whether the purpose is to provide alternatives to reduce the need to drive or to drive alone. Boardmember Sackrison said the language encourages public transportation and options. Boardmember Kmet noted that some of the goals speak to carpooling and other modes. Boardmember Sackrison agreed those modes reduce driving and lessens the need to drive.		
	Chair Ryder acknowledged the previous stated concerns but believes the language is appropriate.		
	Boardmember O'Callahan conceded he is only representative of one vote; however, he believes that over the years, the Board mainly focused on transportation issues progressing to transportation and land use issues, and more recently information was received that the Federal Department of Transportation is expanding the definition of transportation with accompanying funds to pay for improvements. The Board is transitioning to policies that force people to use other forms of transportation. He stressed the importance of clear policy language to be ensure it's understood in 20 years.		
	Director Parkhurst recommended focusing on adding choices, such as "work toward an integrated multimodal transportation system that supports the adopted land use and provides alternative travel choices" and delete "reduces the overall need to drive or drive alone."		

Boardmember DeForest moved, seconded by Boardmember Suessman, to recommend the Thurston Regional Planning Council approve the Regional Transportation Plan with the modifications as approved by the Board (to include Director Parkhurst's recommended language change for comment #148 (as well as for Comments 149, 154 & 158)).

Boardmember Kmet said the existing language is important as the goal is to encourage people to not drive alone. Providing alternatives is not reflected in the policies. Twenty years ago, the Board considered the scenario of continuing rural sprawl and building roads to accommodate sprawl by expanding Capitol Boulevard in Tumwater to a seven-lane street and converting county roads to five lane roads. The Board agreed that course would cost billions of dollars and destroy communities. The Board agreed to change direction for the future by limiting growth areas and developing policies to steer growth to those areas, as well as implementing improvements to create a multimodal system. Those policies provided alternatives while also attempting to change the direction of the community toward less car dependency.

Boardmember Sackrison agreed and doesn't prefer the proposed compromise. Existing language prohibited no one from driving and did not suggest people shouldn't drive, but simply conveyed "reduce the need to drive." Removal of the language is a mistake as it runs counter to policies and has no effect on people who live in rural areas.

Boardmember Kmet moved, seconded by Boardmember DeForest, to amend the motion and approve the following language pertinent to comment #148 stating, "Work towards an integrated multimodal transportation system that supports the adopted land use plans, reduces overall need to drive alone, and provides alternative travel choices."

Boardmember Wood pointed out that similar language is also included in comment #149 (staff recommendation), which states, "Increase overall operating efficiency of the transportation system through the effective use of measures that reduce the need to drive." The proposed motion strikes him as a way to discourage him from driving.

Boardmember Zita pointed out that reducing the need to drive does not prohibit driving.

Boardmember Wood acknowledged the intent of the language, however, the message conveys the opposite.

Motion failed 4/10.

Boardmember Zita moved, seconded by Boardmember Dayton, to amend the motion and approve the language as originally recommended by staff for comment #148 stating, "Work toward an integrated multimodal transportation system that supports the adopted land use plans, reduces overall need to drive, and provides alternative travel choices."

Motion carried 10/4

Motion carried unanimously on the main amended motion.

Executive Director Wyrick encouraged members to share their thoughts regarding the Board's discussion with their respective Regional Council representative.

Director Parkhurst advised that the RTP will be forwarded to the Regional Council in June for a first reading with adoption scheduled at its July meeting. The work plan as described within the plan will move forward.

Outside Committee Reports

Boardmember DeForest reported that at the last PSRC Transportation Policy Board meeting, discussion focused on highways of national significance. Sound Transit light rail previously carried 36,000 per day on average. Since the opening of the University and Capitol Hill Stations, the number of passengers increased to 50,000 during the week and to 80,000 during the weekend.

Other Business

Executive Director Wyrick reported on his recent submittal of a letter announcing his retirement at the end of July.

Chair Ryder thanked Executive Director Wyrick for his service.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Ryder adjourned the meeting at 8:46 a.m.

Andy Ryder, Chair

Prepared by Puget Sound Meeting Services, psmsoly@earthlink.net



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: Paul Brewster, Senior Planner
DATE: June 2, 2016
SUBJECT: Federal Funding Processes

PURPOSE

Provide background information on the Regional Surface Transportation Program (STP, "TAP") and Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) federal funding processes and discuss a possible framework for a Fall 2016 Call for Projects.

Summary:

- As a Metropolitan Planning Organization, TRPC periodically programs federal funds to priority regional projects.
- The amount and type of funding available is set forth in federal transportation legislation.
- From 1991 to 2015, TRPC programmed over \$72 million into projects valued at more than \$165 million.
- TRPC has some discretion in how the region manages this funding. TRPC historically:
 1. Focuses funding on safety, efficiency, preservation, and maintenance.
 2. Uses a policy-based rather than a point-based project selection process.
 3. For certain funding, provides each traditional partner with a likely funding limit based on the share of regional trips they serve.
 4. Historically allocates a portion (5 percent) of certain funding categories for non-traditional partner projects.
 5. Limits applications to three per entity, with the entity indicating the priority order for multiple applications.

REQUESTED ACTION

Discussion. Provide staff direction on the discretionary elements of the funding process.



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

BACKGROUND

As a federally designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, TRPC periodically allocates federal funds to priority regional projects.

From 1991 to 2015, TRPC programmed over \$72 million into projects valued at more than \$165 million. Local agencies frequently use these awards to leverage other state or federal grants, bringing more transportation revenues into the region. Projects ranged from major road reconstruction to high school bicycle lockers.

In 2013, the state implemented changes that bind TRPC and local agencies to federal fiscal year constraints – referred to as the “use it or lose it” policy. Under this new policy, jurisdictions must adhere to the project schedules they commit to or risk losing funding. The “lose it” could mean that the project is defunded, but also that the state would allocate the funding to another region. This led to the need for more frequent calls for projects and for TRPC to fund projects in phases.

Types of Funding

The federal revenue sources include:

- **Surface Transportation Program (STP)**
Covers a wide variety of transportation needs. Since 1998, TRPC has focused this funding on priority multimodal projects that improve the safety, efficiency, and/or preservation and maintenance of the existing transportation system.
- **Surface Transportation Program Block Grants** (previously known as the Transportation Alternatives Program or TAP)
This funding intends to strengthen cultural, aesthetic, and environmental aspects of the intermodal transportation system. Eligible projects include Safe Routes to School, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs, landscaping, environmental mitigation, historic preservation, scenic highway programs, and control and removal of outdoor advertising. Historically, TRPC has funded bicycle and pedestrian projects, including those that support schools.
- **Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ)**
The Thurston Region receives CMAQ funding because of the urbanized area’s classification as a limited maintenance area for PM10 (particulate matter 10 microns or less in diameter). TRPC must direct these funds toward cost-effective emission reduction and congestion mitigation activities that provide air quality benefits. The Smart Corridors project that improved system operations (for jurisdictions and transit) on specified corridors received this type of funding.



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: Veena Tabbutt, Research & Data Director

DATE: June 2, 2016

SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Status Update

PURPOSE

Update Policy Board on status of RTP post Regional Council discussion on June 3, 2016.

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. The laws and regulations also describe the update process and timing.
- TRPC kicked off the RTP update in 2012. Since then, TRPC and jurisdictional staff, the community, stakeholders, Technical Advisory Committee, Transportation Policy Board, Regional Council, and others have been working on the Plan.
- In April 2016, the Regional Council, upon recommendation from the Policy Board, released the draft plan for a 30-day public review period, which closed on May 9 at 5:00 p.m.
- In the May 11, 2016 regular meeting, the Policy Board reviewed public comments and proposed responses as well as other changes. The TPB took action to recommend that the Regional Council adopt the *What Moves You 2040 Regional Transportation Plan*, with those modifications.
- TRPC staff notified the Council of the Policy Board's recommendation and provided a link to the comments and an overview of the changes.
- At their June 3, 2016 meeting, the Regional Council will review the final draft and direct staff to make any changes. The Council is scheduled to adopt the plan at their July 8, 2016 meeting.
- Staff will provide an overview of the Council's discussion.

REQUESTED ACTION

Update and discussion.



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



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

DATE: June 2, 2016

SUBJECT: Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) Modification (16-02)

PURPOSE

Update Policy Board on RTIP Modification for WSDOT Project 300502C I-5/SR 510 Interchange – Add ROW phase with obligation year 2016.

Summary:

- The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) is a four-year programming document derived from each local agency’s comprehensive six-year Transportation Improvement Programs (TIPs). The RTIP identifies projects programmed for implementation within the next four years which secure federal funding, are WSDOT projects, or are regionally significant, regardless of funding source. It identifies proposed transportation projects planned for the next four years which have been adopted in local TIPs but have not secured funding. The RTIP also demonstrates that projects programmed for the next four years will not cause, aggravate, or contribute to any new or existing air quality violation of the federal PM10 standard.
- TRPC has a two-tiered approach to dealing with changes to the RTIP. An amendment requires public notification and Council adoption. A modification requires only notification to the Policy Board and Council.
- WSDOT has requested a change to their 300502C I-5/SR 510 Interchange – Reconstruct Interchange project – to obligate a right-of-way phase in 2016. Because this is simply changing the date of a phase for a project already in the STIP, this is considered a modification.

REQUESTED ACTION

Notification Only.



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