

MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

Transportation Policy Board
January 13, 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)
Martha Hankins, Citizen Representative
Ryan Warner, Intercity Transit
Andy Ryder, City of Lacey (Chair)
EJ Zita, Port of Olympia
John O'Callahan, City of Tenino
Nicole Hill, City of Tumwater (Alternate)
Ron Landon, WSDOT, Olympic Region (Alternate)

Doug DeForest, Business Representative
Bob Covington, State Government Representative

TPB Members Absent:

Heidi Thomas, Nisqually Indian Tribe
Cheryl Selby, City of Olympia
Dan Budsberg, Confederated Tribes of the Chehalis
Reservation
Tracey Wood, City of Yelm

Staff:

Lon Wyrick, Karen Parkhurst, Jaily Brown, Paul
Brewster, Veena Tabbutt, Aaron Grimes, and Tom Gow

Others:

Martin Hoppe, City of Lacey
Dennis Bloom, Intercity Transit
Ramiro Chavez, Thurston County
JoAnn Schueler, WSDOT
John Suessman, North Thurston Public Schools
Erik Martin, City of Tumwater
Joel Carlson, Citizen
John Dziedzic, Citizen

Introductions/Announcements

Members, staff, and guests provided self introductions.

Senior Planner Jaily Brown reported on several newspaper articles on rail published in December. The first was a legal announcement proposing the abandonment of service by Tacoma Rail on a section of the east Olympia line. The second announcement was about the recent purchase of the brewery properties in Tumwater.

Tacoma Rail is requesting the abandonment of service on a segment located near Kenneydell Park to the south and north of 66th Avenue to where the Gate to Belmore Trail right-of-way begins. Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railroad requested the abandonment of service by Tacoma Rail. Tacoma Rail is the short-line rail operator in the region under contract with BNSF. Tacoma Rail no longer wants to provide short-line services and subsequently BNSF is hiring a new short-line operator. No service is currently offered on that segment of rail track. When the new operator is contracted, a two-year period is required before any request for abandonment of that section of rail could occur. Should the abandonment of the segment occur, it is likely right-of-way would also be abandoned. Thurston County officials are currently in discussions with BNSF officials about the possibility of extending the Gate to Belmore Trail, which is part of the Regional Trails Plan. The request at this point is not abandonment of the rail line, but rather to discontinue providing service to a segment that doesn't currently use the service.

Tacoma Rail also serves other areas including the East Olympia line that connects to the Port of Olympia and serves Mottman Industrial Park crossing through Tumwater Valley. Tacoma Rail also serves the St. Clair line to the box plant area. Should the box plant discontinue rail service, which is under consideration, that piece is currently served by Tacoma Rail and many BNSF cars are stored on the line and unlikely to be abandoned anytime soon. However, the situation should be monitored, as the City of Lacey's plans include extending the Woodland Trail to that area.

The Tumwater Valley rail line is important as it connects through the brewery properties to the Port of Olympia. The rail line also serves the newer brewery and travels behind the old brewhouse connecting to downtown Olympia. The line has potential value for the developer because rail service would be possible to industrial or manufacturing uses in the Valley. It is also of interest for future passenger rail service to the area.

Boardmember DeForest added that the story indicated that Tacoma Rail was losing volume but still providing service of approximately 1,500 cars annually on the second line. Planner Brown replied that the service was profitable for Tacoma Rail but were required to stop switching requiring three crews to switch the lines. To maintain service, approximately 3,000 cars were required to break even. Another short line operator might be more profitable. The Port of Olympia is aware of the change.

Senior Planner Karen Parkhurst shared a draft of the Board's response to the Draft Statewide Public Transportation Plan presented last month by Boardmember Warner, with the Washington State Department of Transportation. The draft captures the Board's concerns about the definition of public versus private and the request to include rail information. Chair Ryder will submit the letter as the public comment period was extended to January 15 rather than January 5.

Approval of Agenda

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

Approval of Minutes from December 9, 2015

Boardmember DeForest moved, seconded by Boardmember Warner, to approve the December 9, 2015 minutes as presented. Motion carried.

Public Comment Period

John Dziejdz reported he is a Tumwater resident and previously served on the Intercity Transit Authority as a citizen representative in the 1980s. During his tenure, the Authority voted to extend service to Pierce County breaking the boundary of the Public Transportation Benefit Area (PTBA). Recently, a friend and colleague from the Attorney General's Office was appointed as a judge at the Court of Appeals in downtown Tacoma. Previously, she was able to use her free STAR pass issued by the Attorney

General's Office to use transit to attend meetings in Tacoma. Now that she is working in Tacoma, she is no longer able to use the STAR pass because of a previous policy decision limiting the usage of the STAR pass to those state employees who are working at a worksite in Thurston County. According to his research, the provision is not required by statute, not required by regulations, and is not required by any funding bill, but merely a discretionary choice by the Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) Board. He advised that he would be pursuing a change and wants to avoid any inconsistencies with the Board's position. The proposal is consistent with the state's plan to promote the CTR program.

Planner Parkhurst provided some information on the reason for the policy decision. The STAR Pass and the Emergency Drive Home Programs are both supportive of CTR and are funded through state employee parking fees collected in Thurston County on Capitol Campus. Any state employee working in Thurston County is able to use the STAR Pass. The decision was rendered by the CTR Board many years ago because the Board believed there should be a nexus between where the fees were collected and who could take advantage of the program. Essentially, fees collected from state employees in Thurston County are not used for services in Pierce County even though the person may be a state employee.

Updates

Planner Parkhurst distributed an *Update* on projects as part of the ongoing report to the Board on the status of projects within the region. This month's update includes:

- **Statewide CTR Worksite Results (2007-2014).** Members received a copy of the CTR Board Report to the Legislature, a requirement under the Commute Trip Reduction Program. CTR is a program implemented in 2000 as part of the Clean Air Act encouraging major worksites to encourage employees to use commute alternatives. Within the Thurston region, TRPC is the lead agency on behalf of the cities of Lacey, Olympia, and Tumwater and Thurston County for moving the program forward. The goal is reducing traffic congestion, maintaining a healthy economy, building healthy communities, and reducing greenhouse gases. During 2007 through 2014, the CTR program achieved the following results:
 - Drive alone rate down 3%
 - Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) rate down 3%
 - Annual Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction of 14,700 tons
 - Participants left about 14,500 cars home every day equivalent to a single lane of traffic 37 miles long.

Of important note, the drive alone rate is increasing especially with the recent decrease in the price of gas. The CTR program does not require employee participation but does require employers to provide options to employees on different ways to travel. . The CTR Board is scheduled to present the report to the House and Senate Transportation Committees in the next several weeks. The report recommends broadening the program beyond commute trips.

- **Rural & Tribal Transportation (RT) Makes a Difference!** Since 2000, RT has provided general purpose transportation service to residents in the rural communities of the Chehalis Reservation, Nisqually Indian Reservation, Bucoda, Tenino, Rainier, Yelm, and Rochester. Customers use the service to travel to jobs, services, recreation, education, and other destinations in Thurston County and Lewis County. In 2015, RT supplied 35,400 trips, traveled 185,634 miles, and provided over 7,613 service hours during weekdays. The service is federal and state grant-funded through the Washington State Department of Transportation Consolidated Grant Program. Local partners provide an 11% in kind match and the Nisqually Tribe provides cash match. Both tribes have provided funding in the past - the only communities who have put cash on the table.

Senior Planner Paul Brewster invited members to attend the "Bike Shop Open House" as part of the Earn Your Bike Program under the Walk N Roll Program. The program was funded by a Transportation Alternatives Program grant awarded by TRPC to Intercity Transit. Staff will be available to answer questions about the Earn the Bike Program. The event is scheduled later in evening from 4 to 7 p.m. and on Saturday, January 16 from 1 to 4 p.m.

2016 TPB Meeting Schedule

Planner Parkhurst referred members to information on the meeting schedule during 2016. The meeting date is the second Wednesday of each month at 7 a.m. Last year, the Board elected not to meet in August for a summer recess. Staff requests approval of the proposed meeting schedule to include no meeting in August.

Boardmember DeForest moved, seconded by Boardmember Sackrison, to approve the 2016 Transportation Policy Board meeting schedule as presented. Motion carried unanimously.

Administrative Issues

Business Representative Recruitment

Planner Parkhurst reported on recruitment efforts conducted last year for Business Representatives. The Board currently has two vacancies. Staff will re-initiate the recruitment process, including outreach to local business associations as chambers. She asked members to forward the information to any potential candidates. One applicant from last year is still interested in the position and would be included in the recruitment.

Election of Officers

Planner Parkhurst noted that because jurisdictional Board appointments generally occur in January, the Board elects officers at its February meeting. The Bylaws do not require written nominations. At the February meeting, nominations will be accepted for the two officer positions. Chair Ryder and Vice Chair Sackrison expressed interest in continuing to serve.

Thurston County Transportation Benefit District

Executive Director Wyrick reported that during the Council's last retreat, one item carried forward was reviewing Transportation Benefit Districts (TBD). Over the last several years, TRPC pursued some language changes to TBD legislation to enable more jurisdictions to participate or form a TBD. Currently, legislation requires a population formula. When the city of Olympia formed TBDs, the formula requirement restricted other jurisdictions within the county from forming a joint regional TBD. The briefing will cover some changes in the law and provide information on Thurston County's TBD and development of the project list and the funding option.

Ramiro Chavez, Director Public Works, Thurston County provided an overview of Thurston County's TBD.

The Thurston County Board of Commissioners approved the formation of the TBD on December 30, 2014 for the unincorporated areas of the county. A TBD is a quasi-municipality that can raise revenues to address transportation improvements only. The TBD has a Board of Directors. Thurston County's TBD governing Board is the Board of County Commissioners. Thurston County Commissioner Wolfe serves as the President.

Thurston County's transportation system encompasses an area of 740 square miles. In 2014, the population in Thurston County was 264,000 people projected to increase to 400,000 people in the next 25 years. The transportation system within the unincorporated area of the county includes over 1,000 miles of roadway. Approximately 80% of the roadway miles have good pavement condition. The system also includes 15 traffic signals, 120 miles of sidewalks, 900 street lights, 17,000 traffic signs, 127,000 linear

feet of guardrail, over 3,700 culverts less than 20 feet in length, and 109 bridges. Approximately 40% of the bridges are over 40 years old.

Users of the system include cars, trucks, schools, non-motorized, and emergency services. The transportation system is the backbone of a prosperous community. It's important for the county to be proactive in addressing the needs of the transportation system versus waiting until the transportation system fails.

Between 1990 and 2012, Thurston County experienced an increase of 38% in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), similar to other counties in the state. During the same period, the county only expanded the road network by 6%. While VMT has increased over the last decade, those miles increase pressure on the transportation system.

In the next 15 years, based on projections, the county will continue to experience an increase in VMT. From 2015 to 2030, VMT is projected to increase - but not at same level as the gas tax. This will create a funding gap for maintenance and improvements. If Congress approves a five cent increase in gas tax, the same funding gap will exist by 2026. The gas tax, which has been the traditional way to fund the transportation system, may not be sustainable over the long term.

The impact of efficient vehicles and electric vehicles has been good for the environment. However, those vehicles use the transportation system without contributing to the gas tax. The State of California predicts that by 2029, there could be a funding gap \$16.6 billion in VMT versus the ability to collect gas tax. The same trend is anticipated to occur in Washington State.

Over the last 10 years, Thurston County has experienced an increase of 80% in construction activity but only received a 16% increase in revenues. Revenues are not keeping pace with costs.

Thurston County created a TBD to establish a funding source to provide the level of service residents expect.

Last year, the Legislature passed a transportation funding package. The package didn't include much funding for local jurisdictions based in part on the ability for local jurisdictions to exercise local options, one of which is the TBD. A TBD is an effective method to raise local taxes to address local transportation system needs.

A TBD may choose from several funding options. The first is councilmanic action – authorizing the TBD Board to take action without the vote of the public. Another option is seeking voter approval for different levels of funding. Councilmanic action recently changed during the last legislative session affecting the management of the TBD and providing local jurisdictions with the option to operate within the jurisdictional structure or maintaining a separate board. In May 2015, the Thurston County TBD Board elected to remain as a separate Board. Other changes pertained to the funding rate for vehicle license fees. Prior to July 2015, the councilmanic option allowed up to a \$20 annual car tab fee. Any increase beyond \$20 and up to \$100 required voter approval. Recent legislation changes enable TBDs to assess a \$20 car tab fee followed by a two-year waiting period whereby the fee could be increased to \$40, followed by another two-year waiting period whereby the fee could be increased to \$50 without voter approval. The TBD has the option to increase the vehicle tab fee to \$100 with voter approval.

Another TBD councilmanic option is implementing a transportation impact fee on commercial and industrial buildings. For the Thurston County TBD, that option is not viable as those uses are limited in the unincorporated areas.

Voter approval options include a sales and use tax up to 0.2%, collection of a one-year excess levy or an excess levy for capital purposes in property taxes, or imposing vehicle tolls.

Boardmember Hill (Alternate) noted that Tumwater TBD's successful sales tax measure is limited to 10 years to afford the ability to complete and provide a report to citizens on the success of the program.

Boardmember DeForest asked whether Thurston County currently assesses transportation impact fees on residential structures as well. Mr. Chavez affirmed that new residential developments incur transportation impact fees. The TBD option would assess transportation impact fees on existing land uses.

Mr. Chavez reported that if the Thurston County TBD elects to implement a \$20 vehicle tab fee it would generate approximately \$1.8 million annually.

Statewide, TBDs can implement different methods of project delivery. One method is developing a project list of projects for delivery within a specific timeline. Thurston County's TBD is focusing on projects that preserve, enhance safety, and utilize technology.

The City of Lacey is currently considering the formation of a TBD and a funding strategy.

Preservation projects include pavement overlays to maintain the roadway system. The TBD plans to overlay 10 lane miles annually within the unincorporated area of the county, as well as upgrading ½ mile of guardrails. Technology upgrades include green light priority signaling for vehicles. Safety measures in addition to the guardrails include installation of rumble strips along the shoulder of roadways and adding safety edge overlays.

The last meeting of the Thurston County TBD Board was on December 2014. In 2015, Thurston County staff worked with the Board to develop a charter and bylaws and negotiated an interlocal agreement between the Thurston County Department of Public Works and the TBD. Ongoing work includes development of a work plan that identifies location and project specifics. In 2015, the TBD developed a comprehensive communications plan and a series of strategies to outreach to the public and other interested parties on the intent and purpose of the Thurston County TBD and potential funding options available to the Board. During 2016, staff will continue public outreach efforts to inform the public about the intent and purpose of the TBD and some potential options the Board will consider. By spring, the TBD Board is scheduled to receive a funding proposal for consideration.

Establishment of the TBD will not address bridge needs in Thurston County. A recent bridge collapse required closure of one lane of travel. Thurston County does not have the funds to replace a 24-inch culvert and would likely need to build a bridge, as a bridge is considered a fish passage facility. Replacing a 24" corrugated pipe would likely cost only \$60,000. However, the reality is likely replacing the culvert with a bridge costing close to \$1 million. Thurston County recently replaced the bridge on Littlerock Road. The county was able to locate funding and the project was extremely successful winning a state award for a county project for the short project delivery timeline. The bridge cost nearly \$1.6 million. Inflation and increasing costs will continue to widen the funding gap. In 10 years, 60% of the county's bridges will be over 50 years or older. The life expectancy of a typical bridge is 50 years.

Boardmember Hill inquired about the amount of the county's annual revenue for road tax. Mr. Chavez said the property tax levy for roads is limited to 1% equating to approximately \$8 million. The previous reference to increasing revenues of 16% includes the road levy property tax. Boardmember Hill said Tumwater's TBD sales tax increase is anticipated to generate approximately \$900,000 annually and would be used partially to leverage more grants to pay for construction projects.

Mr. Chavez said when the Board of County Commissioners contemplated the direction of either a programmatic program versus a specific project list, it was necessary to develop a financial plan, as the revenue generated by the TBD would not be sufficient to fund all the projects. Some assumptions include receipt of grants, which can be risky because should the financial plan not materialize, the TBD would be unable to deliver promised projects.

Chair Ryder noted that councilmanic action doesn't sunset in 10 years.

Mr. Chavez addressed questions about the ability to bond against TBD funds. It's likely the Thurston County TBD would not because it's not included in the original mission.

Boardmember Hill shared that the Tumwater TBD Board considered the option of bonding for some projects.

Boardmember DeForest asked whether the vehicle tab fee applies to residents living in the smaller incorporated cities and towns. Mr. Chavez said during early conversations for forming a TBD, the discussions centered on developing a regional TBD. However, the RCW governing TBDs requires that the interlocal agreement must be approved by Thurston County in 60% of the cities representing 75% of the population within the cities. At that time, the City of Olympia had formed its TBD representing 39% of the incorporated population with the City of Tumwater following representing 15% of the incorporated population. There were no other avenues available to Thurston County.

Executive Director Wyrick pointed out that TRPC worked unsuccessfully to change the legislation to allow the county to form a TBD with the smaller jurisdictions. Smaller jurisdictions are able to create their own TBDs; however, the amount of revenue those TBDs would generate would likely be insufficient to support a program.

Mr. Chavez said that should the Thurston County TBD Board approve the \$20 vehicle tab fee, a six month waiting period follows. Staff continues to develop the work plan and anticipates approval of the plan by the end of 2016 with revenues received in 2017.

Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) Update: Appendix 1 Modeling

Senior Planner Veena Tabbutt briefed the Board on the recent update of TRPC's transportation demand model. She asked members to review the chapter and provide feedback and comments to staff.

The transportation demand model is a set of mathematical equations and statistics representing travel behavior that describes choices travelers make. The model identifies the number of trips, destination, and the mode of travel. The travel demand model computes the cumulative effect of all the different traveler decisions and assigns those decisions to travel behaviors. The model is a tool to assist the region in predicting and forecasting as the region grows and how travel and types of travel mode might change.

The region's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is comprised of jurisdictional staff who has met biweekly to update the model. TRPC's transportation modeler is Aaron Grimes and the model's developer is Clyde Scott. Other TRPC staff has supported the update effort.

The updated model includes:

- An enhanced non-motorized network of regional trails and bicycle lanes.
- Models new or enhanced travel modes, such as carpool and vanpool and trips involving park and ride lots.
- Improves travel demand estimates at key border crossings by adding 177 transportation analysis zones (TAZs) in Pierce, Grays Harbor, Lewis, and Mason Counties.
- Models travel patterns in greater detail within Thurston County, expanding to 778 TAZs from 588 (in 1995).
- Is better coordinated with the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) travel demand model.
- Contains the ability to model household travel behavior based on income.
- Contains a truck module.

- Will allow modeling of more travel demand management factors, including parking prices, or anticipated effects of new policies on telework.

The modeling was expanded into Pierce, Grays Harbor, Lewis, and Mason Counties to identify the interaction of travelers as they travel into Thurston County, as well as assisting in other broader studies underway.

The four steps for travel forecasting include:

1. **Trip Generation** includes producing the trips and identifying the travel destination. Trips are defined as a beginning point and an ending point. Traveling to work and stopping to buy coffee is considered two trips.
2. **Trip Distribution** are trips distributed based on the purpose of the trip, destination, land use, and distance. Distance is related to the type of trip. For example, home-based shopping trips are closer to home than work-based trips.
3. **Mode Choice** is the way of traveling either by car, biking, walking, or public transportation, which is affected by household characteristics, income, number of vehicles, accessibility, and cost of travel between points.
4. **Traffic Assignment** is the route traveled with most motorists seeking the shortest route. In areas of congestion, most motorists will avoid the route and choose an alternate route even if longer.

Boardmember Hankins asked whether the model considers peak demand during different times of the year as trip choices vary over the year. Planner Tabbutt replied that the model considers only average conditions and doesn't consider seasonal changes.

Planner Tabbutt described how the modeling process is completed. The model uses TAZs, which are geographic areas ranging in size from a few blocks to several square miles. TAZs are the primary unit of measure in the travel demand model and are characterized by land use, including number of households, employment, environmental constraints, and parking costs. A TAZ Centroid is a node at the center of each TAZ and the start and end point of all trips to and from that zone. Centroid Connectors connect TAZs with the transportation network. Nodes are points where links meet. Network links are connected links representing the region's streets, transit lines, bike lanes, and multiuse trails. Each link contains data on length, travel speed, lanes, and allowable modes of transportation.

The accuracy of the model is verified by comparing data against survey data and traffic counts collected by local jurisdictions and passenger count data provided by Intercity Transit.

The model is used to:

- Forecast the number of trips on the region's roads, transit, and trail networks.
- Project long-range traffic growth patterns by area and roadway network.
- Highlight the traffic impacts of new land use developments.
- Estimate air quality based on VMT.
- Test policy implications of travel mode choice (Travel Demand Management)
- Assists local jurisdictions to find ways to mitigate current and future traffic capacity constraints.

Boardmember Covington asked whether the source of data includes any real-time data, such as GPS location data from cell phones. Planner Tabbutt replied that the regional model includes Household Survey data and some of the data were collected by cell phones and GPS. The model is intended to represent the entire regional network on the ground. A more detailed modeling exercise would likely be required to determine the impacts generated by a new development.

Boardmember DeForest said the 2% mode allocated for transit is troubling, as it appears that if that is the true estimate, the region is expending a great amount of money on a mode that few people never use. Another issue is how it's reflected in the mode select in terms of what constitutes a trip. He cited the

example of traveling to the meeting in his vehicle and because of the convenience would likely make several other stops. If he had used transit, he wouldn't be making any additional stops and likely would defer the extra stops until the weekend. Planner Tabbutt agreed that taking transit would likely reduce the number of trips. Trips could be considered by the distance traveled rather than number of trips to arrive at a better estimate of actual usage of network miles. In terms of 2% transit, transit only serves part of the county. Segregating transit trips in the urban core would increase the percentage of trips.

Chair Ryder questioned how the model is utilized in terms of assisting in facilitating policy decisions compared to assisting jurisdictions in applying for grants. Planner Tabbutt advised that the model is used for both purposes.

Boardmember Zita suggested that since the model supports both decision-making and submittals of grant applications, it might be beneficial to track transit use in the urban core by miles to reflect higher use.

Executive Director Wyrick pointed out that the model is only one of several tools used by the region. It's one of several inputs policymakers consider when making decisions.

Preparing for the 2016 Legislative Session

Planner Parkhurst reported the session opened on Monday, January 11 and is scheduled to end on March 11. At this time, the Legislature hasn't agreed on fully funding education with sanctions ongoing against the Legislature.

Each year, the Council establishes a list of legislative priorities. This year's focus begins with transportation and the message is a thank you for funding provided last session, as well as a reminder not to sweep existing funding sources. Transportation messages and asks this session include:

- Preserve and maintain the multi-modal system and complete current projects.
- Maintain and increase Regional and Rural Mobility funding.
- Maintain and grow public transportation services with increased local transit funding options and state funding for interregional services.
- Fix TBD legislation to allow for collaboration opportunities.
- Continue to fund fish passage culvert conversions and explore streamlining SEPA to support the process.

All bills in the second session of the biennium carry forward. Concerns have been vocalized about the I-405 tolling resulting in some bills introduced and likely acted on this session. Issues have been raised about the safety of airbags in terms of manufacturing and installation and electric vehicles, in terms of charging stations and use of lower speed vehicles. A bill was introduced on the collection of fuel charges on reservations.

Staff will prepare a list of bills to monitor and is scheduling meetings with legislators. Members are encouraged to participate in those visits.

Chair Ryder shared that he met with four legislators. The City of Lacey is thanking the Legislature for the transportation funding package acknowledging that most of the funding is not directed south of Mounts Road. Legislators have been asked to consider authorizing an initial phase of studying the I-5 corridor through Nisqually to 93rd Avenue and to include TRPC as part of that process. The City contacted WSDOT to obtain some initial cost estimates. The figure is approximately \$3 million. Several legislators recommended phasing the work.

Executive Director Wyrick added that the South Sound Military Communities Partnership continues to advocate for a long-range strategy for the I-5 corridor through Thurston County. The issue centers on the expensive and environmentally sensitive area of the Nisqually Delta and bridges.

Planner Parkhurst noted that in addition to the Council pursuing legislative issues, TRPC also supports many of the issues of the Association of Washington Business and Association of Washington Cities, as well as the local chamber partnership. All groups work jointly and support similar messages to legislators.

Outside Committee Report

Boardmember DeForest reported that at the last meeting of the PSRC TBD, members discussed the new HOV lanes in Bellevue and received a presentation by WSDOT on the toll lanes. TRPC Councilmember Alan Vanell accompanied him to the meeting affording the ability to use the HOV lanes.

Other Business

Chair Ryder encouraged members to attend the Thurston County Chamber of Commerce State of the City/County Forum scheduled at noon.

Adjournment

With there being no further business, Chair Ryder adjourned the meeting at 8:35 a.m.

Andy Ryder, Chair