

Summary Notes

Pierce County
Transportation Advisory Commission (TAC)
Thursday, September 24, 2020
9:00AM to 10:21AM

Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting

Call to Order: 9:00AM

Roll Call: 9:05AM

Voting Members: Deryl McCarty, Shelly Schlumpf, Scott Jones, Jane Moore, Lindsey Sehmel, Brian Devereux, Steve Gordon. There is a quorum.

Absent: Paul Lubbesmeyer, Jeremiah LaFranca, Tom Pierson, Katie Wilcox.

Non-Voting Members: Dennis Hanberg, Hugh Taylor, Diane Evans.

Pierce County PPW Staff: Brian Stacy, Rory Grindley, Jesse Hamashima, Neil Quisenberry, Letticia Neal.

Pierce County Non PPW Staff: Councilmember Dave Morell, Deputy Executive/Chief Operating Officer Dan Grimm, Amy Cruver (County Council Office), Mark Williams (County Council Office), Brianne Blackburn (Parks & Recreation).

Other: Maxine Herbert-Hill (SR-162 Community Group), Larry Laveen.

Approval of Agenda:

Councilmember Guidance: Councilmember Morrell wants to ensure the success of the TAC. He noted that it is more apparent that there is a funding gap in the six-year transportation plan.

He would like the TAC to work at a program/funding package and prioritization of projects. He wants the TAC to assist in moving the County forward with transportation projects. He would like Hugh to go over key points in the Resolution, so the TAC knows what to expect.

Transportation Financing Proposal Mid Project Check In Presentation: Presented by Hugh Taylor.

Reviewed the three main tasks of Resolution R2019-133 for the Transportation Advisory Commission.

- 1) Review of the County's 6-year and 20-year transportation improvement programs and plans and associated funding needs;
- 2) Identify transportation funding options; and
- 3) Recommend a transportation system prioritization and funding proposal to address the identified needs.

The primary focus should be roadway capacity, safety, preservation, active transportation, and economic development projects and needs.

Funding proposal should include recommendations regarding project priorities, funding priorities, funding levels, funding timelines, and funding mechanisms.

Proposal may also include recommendation regarding policies and practices associated with MOPIA where appropriate.

Reviewed summaries and discussions of each meetings to date. In July, the TAC reviewed, revised and endorsed a letter to the Council with TAC's findings on transportation needs and revenues. The TAC chair presented this letter to the Economic Infrastructure Development Committee in August.

Thus far, the Commission has completed review of the County's 6- and 20-year transportation improvement programs and plans and associated funding needs. The Commission has also completed identifying transportation funding options. Now the Commission needs to recommend a transportation system prioritization and funding proposal to address the identified needs.

Presented on possible next steps/discussion Topics. What prioritization elements does the TAC wish to discuss? What information does the TAC need related to funding and project prioritization? What do TAC members envision the final recommendation to look like?

There is a need for specific recommendations from TAC.

Discussion of Next Steps: Clarified that the \$22M funding gap per year was for a 20-year period ending around 2040. Vision 2050 has not been adopted. The comprehension plan is based on 2040.

Board members would like guidance from Pierce County staff on prioritization. Staff noted that there are six priority groups for the 6-year plan. There are nine different criteria for each priority group.

Would like to know how County compares projects in a high-level capacity. Members would like staff to present on how they prioritize their six-year projects. Here is what we look at. What kinds of things on safety do you look at?

It was noted that projects can have overlapping priority groups. It was discussed that prioritization is a generic term. Look at updating concepts. What might have worked before, might not work today. Need to justify why money is being put towards certain corridors.

Do we take an approach on primarily focusing on what needs to be completed, or do we look at how we fund the gap? If we fund the gap, what projects get priority for that funding?

It was recommended that County staff present on How the County arrives at comparisons between projects for the October meeting and start looking at all projects that are out there for the November meeting. It was also recommended that the TAC focus on projects.

Would like a discussion on traffic model. We should look at costs versus benefit ratio for projects.

There was a previous meeting that staff presented on traffic model. It is hard to speculate post COVID traffic volumes. What new projects we put on list might want to be TAC's focus. Bigger intersections have more bang for the buck.

Reminded members and staff that some members were not present from TAC's beginnings and feels redoing some presentations might be beneficial.

List of project and project types don't need to be prioritized by numbers (1, 2, 3, etc.). Rating projects as high, medium, and low priority would work.

It was confirmed that no financial package has been chosen. We should have a financial package along with prioritizing projects.

Would like to have post COVID data on traffic trend projections. It was noted that it will be awhile before that data would be available.

Funding is a more pertinent issue than prioritization.

TAC needs to understand that transportation in ten years will be different than it is this year.

Action Items: Would like a layout of different projects and in what stage each project is in.

Focus on project prioritization, biggest bang for the buck (cost versus benefit), and financing.

Jesse to present on project comparison and project types. What factors looking at projects, traffic modeling data, and boundaries on matrix.

Summary Notes Approval: July's summary notes were approved as written. 1st Scott Jones. 2nd Lindsey Sehmel. No oppositions for approval of summary notes.

Next Meeting: October 22, 2020.

Public Comment: None.

Move to Adjourn: 10:55AM; 1st Scott Jones; 2nd Brian Devereux. No opposition for adjourning.