

Summary Notes

Pierce County
Transportation Advisory Commission (TAC)
Thursday, February 27, 2020
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Location: Tacoma Mall Plaza Building
2702 S. 42nd Street
2nd Floor Conference Room
Tacoma, WA 98409

Call to Order: 9:09 a.m.

Roll Call: 9:10 a.m.

Voting Members Present: Brian Devereux, Deryl McCarty, Jane Moore, Katie Wilcox, Duane Wakan for Lindsey Sehmel (Transit), Paul Lubbesmeyer, Scott Jones, Steve Gordon. There was a quorum.

Absent: Jeremiah LaFranca, Tom Pierson

Non-Voting Members Present: Dennis Hanberg, Hugh Taylor, Toby Rickman

Pierce County Staff: Brian Stacy, Jesse Hamashima, Gary Hendricks, Neil Quisenberry, Shawn Phelps, Jie Chen, Clint Ritter, Letticia Neal.

Introductions: Jesse Hamashima, Letticia Neal, Clint Ritter, Duane Wakan, Brian Stacy, Brianne Blackburn, Rick Jones (SR-162 Community Group), Maxine Herbert-Hill (SR-162 Community Group), Eldon LaRue (SR-162 Community Group), Scott Jones, Steve Gordon, Paul Lubbesmeyer, Diane Evans, Amy Cruver, Shelly Schlumpf, Brian Devereux, Jane Moore, Libbi Lovshin, Deryl McCarty, Dennis Hanberg, Katie Wilcox, Jinelle Casten, Hugh Taylor, Judy Hurley, Dave Morell, Gary Hendricks, Jie Chen, Neil Quisenberry, Shawn Phelps

Approval of Agenda:

Opening Remarks – Councilmember David Morell: The TAC group was extended because of the good work that was done in the first phase of developing the Traffic Impact Fee. Phase 2 will consist of how to make that into a concurrent connected transportation system throughout Pierce County. As the Council moves forward, with options that hopefully the TAC will develop, to solve some of those problems. Councilmembers Marty Campbell have teamed up with councilmember Dave Morell to provide direction to the TAC; not to reinvent everything within Pierce County, but to look at the options within transportation. Each member brings their expertise and perspective to the process. Will attempt to keep the communication open and work together collaboratively. Mentioned that there is a bit of “tax fatigue” right now which will factor into the conversation when looking into financial options. The TAC will be reporting back to the Council in a pretty short timeline. Encouraged the TAC not to get into the weeds. Aware that economic development is affected due to the traffic congestion in the area. Asking that the TAC buckle down and do the best job possible for all of Pierce County, understanding that all of us have to come together to work this problem out. Thanked staff for their guidance to the TAC and looking forward to keeping an eye out on this.

Guidance from Chair – Project Expectations: Reiterated the deadline that we have until July for the Resolution directive. Maybe will want to meet at other times or dates with option of phone in. The Ordinance states that there is a need to look at funding mechanisms for roadways, remembering that the roadways are measured by state law, by capacity. First objective will need to look at reduction of congestion. There are safety aspects to go with that and trails when they cross a road, need to do something about that, plus ADA compliance in future. How to pay for capacity and if there is a mismatch, do we need to remove the project from the list. Funding from State and Federal sources are not created equal. Need to be aware of funding resources and the TAC is to be the advisory source to Council.

Transportation Project and Finance Proposal Opportunities – Clint Ritter, P.E. and Leticia Neal, P.E.

- Road Fund System Needs – Refresher from January

Operating under a 2-year budget 2020-2021; **County Road System Needs:** Part of the 24% administration costs fall under the maintenance and operations piece – direct labor costs. **Breaking Down MOPIA:** Road Fund – Property tax revenue – is this really enough?

Resolution R2019-133 Project Types Emphasized: Roadway Capacity, Economic Development, Active Transportation, Safety, and Preservation. Found in the Transportation Plan, implemented through the T.I.P; some of them are included in the Traffic Impact Fee Program. There is a lot of crossover between project types.

- Project Priority Groups

Concurrency/Capacity – adding lanes an example 122nd Ave E corridor; New Alignment/Corridor – network connections such as 94th Ave E corridor extension; Non-Motorized (Active Transportation) – provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities – C St S (in front of PLU) is an example; Preservation – preserve existing infrastructure/least lifecycle costs the Asphalt overlay program; Safety/Operations – improve safety/reduce crashes/reduce delay – Pt. Fosdick DR NW/Stone DR NW/34 Ave NW Roundabout; Economic Development – improve freight connections, reduce travel times, spur development, job creation – example Canyon Road Regional Connection

- Funding Need

20 Year Program Needs: Taken from the December 2019 TAC meeting and County Road Presentation on June 6, 2018 to the TBD Board of Governors. TIF – Intersections; Corridors and Connectors, and Capacity were grouped as capacity projects; Economic Development, Preservation, Fox Island Bridge, Safety, Environment, Active Transportation. **Active Transportation Essentials:** ADA Transition Plan, Sidewalk Construction, Bicycle Facility Construction for a total of \$80M. **Specific to Resolution:** Combines TIF projects into Capacity project type; Removes Fox Island Bridge; Economic Development is Canyon Road Regional Connection Project; Removes Environment Project Type (Fish Passage); 5% inflation from 2018 to 2020 dollars. Rhodes Lake Road – not included in the funding need. **Funding Gap Analysis:** Net Yearly Gap = \$21.9M (Expenditure: \$52.9 – Revenue: \$31M = \$21.9M); Revenues are approximate average yearly estimates.

- Financial Options

Characterized in a very general nature: Levy Lid-Lift; REET2 (New bond issuance/Sunset) paid in 2029 borrow in year 2030; License Tabs (I-976 Impacts); Internal Transfer/Diversion Restorations (Law Enforcement); Other – Local Gas Tax, Sales Tax, Red Light Cameras (License Tabs/TBD Options Dependent on State Legislation.

- Revenue & Project Alignment

Projects drive revenue. Need to look at the overall picture and ask how are we to meet specific financial needs? Would be helpful to show both sides – Expenditures and Revenues – what is the return on investment? If needed, can discuss in another side meeting Maintenance & Operations, Preservation shortfalls. There is a lot of overlap on the project types. Everything is up for committee consideration. A

case in King County has set a precedent in being allowed to charge utilities in the right-of-way. May be something of consideration in the future. The big question is, what funding goes to what?

- **Workplan & Next Steps**

See page 22 of the February 27th presentation.

Discussion: Key Issues Needing Input to Advance: Consensus on Funding Need, Funding Options to Rule Out, Funding Options of Interest, Program Size, Program Duration, Construction Completed with Program Duration, Priority Group Focus.

Is There a Need for Additional Transportation Funding? Yes, there is a gap that needs to be addressed.

Administrative Issues

- a. Election of Officers: Agreed that Deryl McCarty will continue as Chair and Scott Jones will continue as Vice Chair
- b. Setting Meeting Dates/Time/Location: Agreed that 4th Thursday of each month from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. would suffice and all members encouraged to attend. Possible call in or video would be available on those dates if member cannot attend due to illness or on vacation and alternate unavailable.

Public Comment: Maxine Herbert-Hill (SR-162): Always a privilege to be allowed to speak in the meeting. Rick Jones (SR-162): Asking that there be found a way to coordinate the State and County efforts to open Military Road and 162. Duane Wakan (Pierce Transit): Please take some BRT flyers and distribute. Shawn Phelps (Pierce County Staff) Found a notebook left from the last meeting, please see him if it belongs to you.

Adjourn : 11:27 a.m.; Steve Gordon; 2nd by Scott Jones & Katie Wilcox