

Regional Transportation System Initiative Technical Committee Meeting #2 Summary

April 7, 2017, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Puget Sound Regional Council Office – 1011 Western Ave, Suite 500, Seattle, 98104

Welcome and Introductions

Bob Wheeler (facilitator – Triangle Associates) called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. and Regional Transportation System Initiative (RTSI) meeting participants did a round of introductions. Participants then accepted the RTSI Operating Protocols and March 3 meeting summary.

Overview of the RTSI Process

Brian Parry (Sound Cities Association - SCA), Ben Bakkenta (Puget Sound Regional Council - PSRC), and Jay Osborne (King County Road Services Division – KC RSD) gave an overview of the RTSI process.

- Brian Parry (SCA) noted that the RTSI is an opportunity to bring multiple jurisdictions together to address the needs of the regional transportation network. He looks forward to the RTSI Technical Committee exploring options to improve mobility and find equitable funding options.
- Ben Bakkenta (PSRC) noted that questions have come up about how the RTSI compares to PSRC's Transportation 2040. Ben noted that the RTSI is complementary to Transportation 2040, however the RTSI will help fill in gaps in PSRC's understanding about the network. The RTSI will also help identify existing and potential future transportation revenue sources for local jurisdictions. Ben additionally noted that it may be useful to reach out to neighboring counties as part of this effort.
- Jay Osborne (KC RSD) has heard that the state legislature is concerned there is no regional plan for funding the regional roads network. He noted the RTSI effort will include meetings with elected officials to start crafting a state legislative strategy for the regional roads network, and the RTSI is an opportunity for technical representatives from cities to provide guidance to elected officials as they craft a legislative strategy. He also noted that Mayor Butler from Issaquah and others have discussed a possible op-ed which will address regional transportation needs in King County. Jay mentioned the Northeast RTSI sub-area already met on April 4 to make some suggested revisions to the regional roads network that will be presented to the Technical Committee.

The facilitator then reviewed the likely RTSI process through 2017 – including RTSI Technical Committee meetings and elected official meetings. He noted that the RTSI Technical committee will meet the first Friday of every month in 2017, except for July, August, and September. The Technical Committee will meet on Friday July 14 instead of July 7, on Friday September 8 instead of September 1, and it will not meet in August. Triangle Associates (Triangle) will add future RTSI meeting dates to participants' calendars.

Initial Questions and Comments from Participants:

Participants asked a few initial questions – both related to what they heard at the first RTSI meeting as well as opening remarks. Many of the initial comments were discussed or answered later in the meeting, though the list of questions below also includes, where applicable, responses that were offered during this section of the meeting.

- How do local roads factor into what is being called a “regional network”?
 - There are many local roads on the regional network map that was presented at the first RTSI meeting, including roads that are lifelines and critical safety connections.
- Is the RTSI being asked to refine criteria for what roads are considered part of the regional transportation network?

- The initial plan for the RTSI is to present the big picture of the regional transportation network and get direction from elected officials in June as to whether they are satisfied with the identified regional transportation network and to identify additional information they need.
 - Definitions of different road classifications, used for determining what is in the already-proposed regional transportation network, have been shared with the RTSI Technical Committee and will be presented again at this meeting.
- It is unclear what the RTSI is being asked to accomplish.
 - What is the role of transit and other transportation modes in the RTSI's discussions?
 - What is the story we are trying to tell to the state legislature through the RTSI?
 - What is the difference between the PSRC's Transportation 2040 and RTSI? Cities have already contributed information to identify the network for Transportation 2040.
 - The RTSI Technical Committee should avoid coming up with too daunting of a list of projects and needs. This concern was expressed for both the local elected officials and the State Legislature.
 - The RTSI should get strong recommendations to elected officials to jointly plan around issues that cross regional boundaries.
 - There may be some roads on the presented regional network that should not be part of the regional roads network.
 - The RTSI should also address bridges and trails.
 - Many on the RTSI Technical Committee are worried that this overall effort is too big and the potential list of needs will be too big. It may be useful to do early screening of what should or should not be considered part of the regional roads network.
 - June may be too early for holding a first elected officials meeting. Elected officials will not be able to quickly agree on issues around the regional roads network. The RTSI should first focus on prioritizing what should or should not be included in the network before going to elected officials.

Regional Transportation Network Presentation

Craig Helmann (PSRC) gave a presentation showing how the regional transportation network was developed, changes made to the network based on information provided by participants at the first RTSI Technical Committee meeting, and how the network compares to PSRC's Regional network. He first presented definitions for different roads included on the regional transportation network map including principal arterials roads and state routes, major and minor arterial roads, lifeline and connecting roads, and transit corridors. He then shared maps showing components of the regional transportation network – with colors representing different road types and additions to the regional transportation network from the first RTSI meeting. The regional transportation network presented by PSRC includes 1,160 miles of roadway, 191 locally-owned bridges, and 148 state-owned bridges. Craig also compared the regional transportation network map being developed by the RTSI to PSRC's Regional Arterial Network – the latter of which is more focused on principal arterials and state highways.

Participants requested the following additional information based on PSRC's presentation:

- The percentage of roads on the regional transportation network map that are in incorporated versus unincorporated King County
- Different funding sources for the regional transportation network

Participants then discussed PSRC's presentation and ways to define the regional transportation network. Through this discussion, the RTSI Technical Committee decided it was not ready to accept the regional transportation network as it was presented, but rather must first agree on the criteria that will be used to define that network. The group additionally requested a color-coded map that would show the roads based on the criteria that are ultimately determined. However, the base map of the regional transportation network can be a starting place for further discussion as long as it is marked "draft."

General Questions and Comments about the Regional Transportation Network:

- Does the Principal Arterials map shared by PSRC only include King County principal arterials?
 - No, local principal arterials were also included in the regional transportation network map.
- Does the regional transportation network map presented by PSRC include any new roads planned or in construction?
 - No, the presented map only includes existing roads.
- Not all of the roads on the presented regional network map are equal and they should not be weighted the same way on a map.
- A key first step for the RTSI Technical Committee would be defining the criteria for what should or should not be included as part of the regional transportation network. This will provide more justification for the map when it's shown to elected officials.
- Transit should not be a factor to consider for the regional transportation network. For example, in southeast King County, buses are often stuck in the same traffic as cars. Also, buses have an impact on pavement.
- PSRC already presented several criteria, on a "definitions" slide in the presentation, for what was included in the regional transportation network. Perhaps we can have definition-based criteria.
- The regional transportation network map should clearly identify different categories of roads, preferably by the criterion that road exemplifies.

Criteria for Further Defining the Regional Transportation Network

The RTSI Technical Committee discussed several ideas for determining criteria that should or should not be considered when defining the regional transportation network. Participants drew a distinction between criteria for defining what roads should be in the network versus criteria for identifying and prioritizing projects that are needed on the network. Based on their discussion, participants agreed to meet at least once prior to the May 5 meeting as sub-areas (one meet per sub-area) to further identify criteria used to define the regional transportation network along with what roads in their sub-area meet those criteria.

Jay Osborne (KC RSD) explained that the legislative package that will come out of this RTSI process will ideally include a regional message about more tools that are needed for local governments to fund the regional transportation network and give cities more flexibility to address their funding needs. These funding tools may be long-term solutions for cities. Jay noted he recognizes there are different transportation needs and issues in different parts of the region, but our common story is that we have a congestion problem, not enough infrastructure, too many people moving around, and lack the funding tools to address these problems. Jay additionally explained that the ability to build additional roads is becoming more and more limited and it is harder to add capacity.

Questions and Comments about Criteria for the Regional Transportation Network (and other comments made stemming from this topic):

- There should be criteria that define a "critical connection."
- Consider performance-based criteria.
- Discussions about criteria for prioritizing projects should be done in RTSI sub-area meetings since cities know best what the priorities are for their area.
- For determining criteria for what should or should not be in the network, the RTSI should start with federal roadway classifications and then any additions or subtractions to roads from the federal classifications could be worked out within sub-areas.
- If elected officials are being asked to fund the regional transportation network, goals and objectives for the network must first be defined in order to get constituent support.

- Black Diamond is developing 6000 homes within a few years, and many of those new residents will commute on roads identified as the regional transportation network – such as the Issaquah-Hobart Road. These types of developments are not planned with a consideration of the impacts of such a development on the regional roads. Cities need more funding mechanisms for addressing the impacts of growth on the regional transportation network.
- The RTSI should recognize that there are constrained and unconstrained projects and different issues for incorporated versus unincorporated areas.
- Growth on the regional transportation network is a challenge, and cities cannot fix roads past their boundaries. We need to look at other options like a regional Transportation Benefit District.
- The RTSI could talk extensively about criteria and priorities for the network, but those discussions should happen within sub-areas.
- The RTSI should use some known local criteria as filters for prioritizing projects and then develop a projects list to define the need. We could develop a strong, regional story to bring to elected officials about the needs for the regional network.
- It does not sound like we are too far away from having a usable regional transportation network map as long as, for now, it is clearly marked “draft” and “in-progress.”
- It feels like the RTSI is not ready to convene an elected officials meeting in June.
- Some aspects of regional transportation get lost when arbitrary lines are drawn – such as the county border.

Next Steps

- 1) Based on feedback from RTSI participants, at least one meeting of each RTSI sub-area will be convened before the May 5 RTSI meeting. Sub-areas will work from the map presented at the April 7 meeting but this map will be clearly labeled “draft” and “in-progress.” Prior to these sub-area meetings, participants will be sent clarifications on the definitions PSRC used to develop the regional transportation network, and sub-areas will discuss revisions to these definitions and criteria that should be used to further refine the regional transportation network.
- 2) Triangle will confirm lead conveners for each sub-area and work with these lead conveners to identify dates, times, and locations of sub-area meetings prior to the May 5 RTSI meeting. Triangle will notify the RTSI Technical Committee about the details for each RTSI sub-area meeting, and participants are welcome to participate in any sub-area meeting they would like, especially sub-area meetings in which their jurisdiction has an interest (several jurisdictions are part of more than one sub-area).
- 3) Sub-areas will forward results from their meetings to Evan Lewis (elewis@triangleassociates.com) by May 2 as well as report back on outcomes at the May 5 RTSI meeting.

Attachment 1: April 7, 2017 RTSI Technical Committee Meeting Participants

Technical Committee Members

| Name | Position | Affiliation |
|------------------------|---|---|
| Genesee Adkins | Chief of Staff | City of Seattle , Dept. of Transportation |
| Will Appleton | Public Works Director | City of SeaTac |
| Boyd Benson | City Engineer/Public Works Director | City of Duvall |
| Kathy Brown (phone) | Public Works Director | City of Kirkland |
| Donald Cairns | Transportation Planning and Engineering Manager | City of Redmond |
| Rob Crittenden | Traffic Operations Manager | City of Redmond |
| Linda DeBoldt | Public Works Director | City of Redmond |
| Bob Giberson | Public Works Director | City of Tukwila |
| John Greenwood (phone) | Assistant City Administrator | City of Clyde Hill |
| Bob Harrison | City Administrator | City of Issaquah |
| Scott Hanis | Capital Project Manager | City of Black Diamond |
| Mark Hoppen (phone) | City Manager | City of Normandy Park |
| Robert Lindskov | City Engineer | City of Covington |
| Scott MacColl | Intergovernmental Relations Manager | City of Shoreline |
| Dan Marcinko | Parks and Public Works Director | City of Snoqualmie |
| Andrew Merges | Transportation and Engineering Services Manager | City of Des Moines |
| Jeff Lincoln | Public Works Director | City of Enumclaw |
| Eddie Low | Deputy Public Works Director | City of Bothell |
| Jim Morgan | Public Works Manager | City of Pacific |
| Heather Munden | Council Member | City of Snoqualmie |
| Cheryl Paston | Deputy Public Works Director | City of Sammamish |
| Rick Perez | City Traffic Engineer | City of Federal Way |
| Laura Philpot | City Manager | City of Maple Valley |
| Brian Roberts | Assistant Public Works Director | City of Burien |
| Kurt Seeman | Transportation Manager | City of Issaquah |
| Jim Seitz | Transportation Director | City of Renton |
| Azim Sheikh-Taheri | NWRO Program | Washington State Dept. of Transportation |
| Kevin Snyder | Community Development and Public Works Director | City of Auburn |
| Nytasha Sowers | Transportation Services Manager | City of Shoreline |

| Name | Position | Affiliation |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Paula Stevens (phone) | Assistant Director | Transportation Department, City of Bellevue |
| Mike Swires | Traffic Engineer | Washington State Dept. of Transportation |
| Scott Tkach | Public Works Director | City of Maple Valley |
| Kent Vaughan | Senior Civil Engineer | City of Kenmore |
| James Webb | Acting Transportation Manager | City of Auburn |
| Jude Willcher | Capital Programming | City of Seattle, Dept. of Transportation |
| Lacy Jane Wolfe | Senior Transportation Planner | City of Kent |

Meeting Staff

| Name | Position | Affiliation |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Ben Bakkenta | Program Manager | Puget Sound Regional Council |
| Craig Helmann | Program Manager – Data | Puget Sound Regional Council |
| Evan Lewis | Associate | Triangle Associates |
| Jay Osborne | Assistant Division Director | King County Road Services Division |
| Brian Parry | Senior Policy Analyst | Sound Cities Association |
| Susan West | Strategic Communications Specialist | King County Road Services Division |
| Bob Wheeler | Senior Facilitator | Triangle Associates |

Other Meeting Attendees

| Name | Position | Affiliation |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Chris Arkills | Government Relations Officer | King County Executive Office |
| Rick Brater | County Road Engineer | King County Road Services Division |
| Paul Carlson | Transportation Analyst | King County Council |
| Ed Conyers | Engineering Services Section Manager | King County Road Services Division |
| Alena Marshak | Policy Analyst | Sound Cities Association |
| Graydon Newman (phone) | Transportation Planner | King County Department of Transportation |
| Brandy Rettig | Customer Service Administrator | King County Road Services Division |
| Rey Sugui | Project Manager | King County Road Services Division |