

Regional Transportation System Initiative Technical Committee Meeting #3 Summary

May 5, 2017, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Bellevue City Hall – 450 110th Ave NE, Bellevue, WA 98004 Room 1E-108

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 April 7 meeting summary.

Report Outs from Sub-Area Meetings

Participants from each RTSI sub-area reported on the outcomes of meetings held in late April and early May, 2017 to refine criteria and to provide any road segment additions to the map for defining the regional road network.

Southeast Sub-Area Report Out

The Southeast Sub-Area convened on May 1, 2017. Attendees included: Laura Philpot - Sub-Area group lead (Maple Valley); Mayor Carol Benson (Black Diamond); Ingrid Gaub (Auburn) Jeff Wilson (Enumclaw), Bob Lindskov (Covington), and Kurt Seeman (Issaquah). On the Phone: Lacey Jane Wolf (Kent); Susan West (King County); WSDOT.

The Southeast sub-area discussed the viability of the RTSI legislative approach, the sub-area's attempts at forming a local Transportation Benefit District (TBD) and the sub-area's focus on increasing capacity of State Routes 410, 169 and 516. Sub-area participants agreed that federal classifications were a good starting point for defining the regional road network. It also discussed possibly removing lifeline and connector routes from the regional road network map in order to narrow the RTSI's focus. The sub-area did not feel there was a clear definition on how some of the criteria for the regional road network were determined. The sub-area also noted that Kurt Seeman (Issaquah) and Bob Lindskov (Covington) should be added to the sub-area meeting summary.

Southwest Sub-Area Report Out

The Southwest Sub-Area convened on April 25, 2017. Attendees included: Kevin Snyder (Auburn); Brian Roberts (Burien); Andrew Merges (Des Moines); Rick Perez (Federal Way); Lacey Jane Wolfe (Kent); Mark Hoppen (Normandy Park); Jim Seitz – Sub-Area group lead (Renton); Tracy Krawczyk (Seattle); Jude Willcher (Seattle); Susan Oxholm (King County); Susan West (King County).

Two jurisdictions in the sub-area expressed the ultimate need for projects to be prioritized, and the discussion evolved into suggestions on how to develop messages for and the feasibility of a legislative package. There was much discussion on the legislature authorizing funding tools versus a funding allocation for projects. Ultimately, the sub-area agreed on four additional screens to apply to the regional network to ensure that important routes were included. The sub-area also discussed having the public health community define lifeline criteria and considering equity issues for such criteria, and looking at first and last mile routes.

The sub-area agreed that a good starting point for the regional road network is federally classified major or minor arterials. There was uncertainty and a difference of opinion about what connection routes are, though participants could see logic in some of the connections. The sub-area also was not sure whether prioritization should be a focus and there was a broad array of opinion on this. Participants noted surprise

that the June elected officials meeting was set since there was feedback at the April 7 RTSI Technical Committee meeting to not set it as early as June.

Northwest Sub-Area Report Out

The Northwest Sub-Area convened on April 27, 2017. Attendees included: Jude Willcher – Sub-Area group lead (Seattle); Tracy Krawczyk (Seattle); Kris Overleese (Kenmore); Scott MacColl (Shoreline); Susan Oxholm (King County); Susan West (King County).

The sub-area requested clarification on the intent of the RTSI and had a discussion about the need to prioritize projects. Sub-area participants felt there was not consensus on what they were being asked to solve. Participants were concerned that some jurisdictions did not have the same transportation funding tools as others (such as issuing bonds, establishing a Transportation Benefit District or imposing development impact mitigation fees) and raised questions about an equitable allocation of potential revenues from the RTSI if not all jurisdictions have equal taxing authority. It posed the idea that addressing maintenance and preservation needs and funding could be a way to ensure equitable RTSI outcomes. It also raised concern about having an elected officials meeting in June.

Northeast Sub-Area Report Out

The Northeast Sub-Area convened on April 26, 2017. Attendees included: Autumn Monahan – Sub-Area group lead (Issaquah); Joel Pfundt (Kirkland); Laura Thomas; Bob Crittenden (Redmond); Boyd Benson (Duvall); John Greenwood (Clyde Hill); Susan Oxholm (King County); Susan West (King County).

The sub-area’s conversation centered on finalizing the regional road network and criteria. The group was comfortable using federal classifications for major and minor arterials but thought lifeline and connecting roads should only be included in the regional road network in certain circumstances – such as to schools and hospitals. There was some confusion expressed about transit corridors and whether they should be included on the map. It also questioned where the line should be drawn on the kinds of transit routes to include on the map and whether to consider multi-modal or freight overlays.

PSRC Presentation and Consensus on Regional Road Network Map and Criteria

PSRC presented its additions to the regional road network map based on the outcomes of sub-area meetings. Craig Helmann (PSRC) explained that the inclusion of minor arterials addressed 80 percent of comments on the map from sub-areas. Craig walked participants through each component of the map including federally designated principal and minor arterials, connection routes, T1 and T2 freight routes, National Highway System (NHS) roads (minimal as most of these roads were previously identified as principal or minor arterials), and transit network routes. All of these road categories yielded a 1450 mile road network presented to the RTSI Technical Committee.

Questions and Comments

- How have sub-areas tried to define lifeline routes?
 - The City of Seattle wanted to define lifeline routes and engage the public health community.
 - The City of Covington noted that state routes are its lifeline routes.
- What is the RTSI goal and how big is the need we’re trying to show?
 - Roads on our regional network are damaged and not right for the kind of development we have and expect. We have an illogically designed system, and residents do not care who owns the roads they are driving on.
 - RTSI is an opportunity to get all 40 jurisdictions to speak with one voice in defining the funding problem and to get the funding tools to address this problem.

- Regarding lifelines, how do local needs line up with T2040? What are the gaps? What sources are available to assist with closing the gaps and how do we make progress in the short term?
- Are we talking about T2040 transit routes?
 - The map presented by PSRC included both current and planned Metro Connects transit routes.
- What is the basis for the Technical Committee drawing lines on the regional road network map?
 - The goal is to come up with a map illustrative of a regional transportation system. King County has a Growth Management Act overlay and a federal overlay on the presented map. For instance, on Vashon Island, there is one highway classified as principle arterial under the federal classification, and another under the County classification. Other lifeline routes can be pulled off if desired.
 - Technical Committee members are trained to think carefully when weighing in on funding decisions. However, by the time new state funding and funding tools are available, how that funding is distributed will change and vary. It is too early for conversations about funding distribution.
 - The sub-area meetings and mapping effort was an attempt to see how to fill in understanding of the network with information that was missing.
- It would be beneficial to discuss issues critical to the region as a whole.
- What is the RTSI being asked to focus on? Are we addressing regional or local issues, and have we determined what is regional and what is local?
 - The City of Seattle is struggling with the scale of RTSI and what we are trying to do. There is already a regionally defined PSRC network.
- Is the RTSI intended to identify specific roads for future funding by the fall of 2017?
 - No, it is going to develop a report and presentation of rolled up costs for the regional road network. The RTSI should not focus on priorities at this stage.
 - Southeast King County cities have been working together for a long time, and as a sub-region the Southeast and other sub-area cities are far beyond where the RTSI is at or even will be by fall 2017. The Southeast group suggested questions to consider around the lifeline routes. It wants objective criteria and it is not clear how criteria are determined for the RTSI regional road network. Perhaps the public health community can identify lifeline and connecting routes. The Southeast sub-area also looked at first and last mile routes from the state freight plan.

Acceptance of Regional Road Network

The RTSI Technical Committee had a detailed discussion about what roads and road classifications should be considered part of the regional road network. Through this discussion, King County further reiterated that the RTSI Technical Committee is being asked by elected officials to address regional congestion and mobility. The first step is to get elected officials to accept the regional road network and its needs, and then later identify what parts of the network have funding, what new tools are available for funding, and which parts of the network go unfunded. It is expected that the elected official's committee will meet three times between June and November 2017.

Questions and Comments

- While there has been a lot of progress made in recent years on large regional transit and interstate projects, PSRC sees the biggest gap being in long-range funding for local and county roads and local transit projects. 2040 is too far away and investments need to be made sooner. PSRC believes what is on or off the map is not overly significant. The King County area has the momentum right now for how to address these issues through the RTSI.
- The City of Bellevue did not put transit routes on the map and would like to see narratives for why certain transit routes and other certain lines were added to the map.

- King County has significant maintenance responsibilities and it does not function well under the GMA. It is unfair to put the burden for maintaining the regional network just on unincorporated King County residents. As is clear from the 2015-16 King County Bridges and Roads Task Force and the Sound Cities Board, there are multi-jurisdictional road problems that need to be solved, and the recommendations from both groups were to address these problems on a regional level.
- The second step for the RTSI should be on priorities and distribution formulas, and there may be a second recommendation that comes out of this Technical Committee.
- The City of Issaquah would like to see the elected official's committee meet in June.
- So as not to overwhelm elected officials, they may need to work with just three criteria for defining the regional road network and not look at local roads.
- We have to have a unified voice and look at the regional perspective – not the local perspective.
- The elected official's committee may have similar debates to what the Technical Committee had.
- Whether it is 1300 or 1400 miles, there are a lot of roads not getting proper attention. We have a huge arterial network with needs, and we are not here to prioritize those needs. If there are 1400 miles of roads, and 700 have not been addressed, at \$20 million per mile, that's \$14 billion of need. Showing these big numbers to the legislature will be very effective.

Through this discussion, the RTSI Technical Committee removed several criteria related to local connectors and then accepted the following motion:

The RTSI Technical Committee accepts the regional road network map presented by PSRC, with the following components:

- Federally-designated principal and minor arterials;*
- King County-designated principal and minor arterials;*
- T1 and T2 routes;*
- National Highway System (NHS) routes; and*
- Frequent transit network routes – regardless of the operator.*

PSRC Transportation 2040 Presentation

Ben Bakkenta (PSRC) presented on the Transportation 2040 (T2040) update and ways in which the T2040 update supports the RTSI process. The T2040 update will showcase investments, address near-term gaps in performance and funding deficiencies, get ahead on key issues, address ways to meet certain requirements, and address certain administrative tasks. The T2040 update financial strategy will look at new revenue sources, current law revenue, system expansion costs, maintenance, preservation and operation needs. The T2040 Finance Working Group will provide recommendations to the Transportation Policy Board in June 2017, draft the T2040 financial strategy, and the T2040 plan will be released in early 2018.

The RTSI complements the T2040 update because it is focused on King County, initiated by King County elected officials, supports the State legislature's request for a unified voice, addresses King County's unique congestion issues, addresses the largest unmet need in T2040 (local jurisdictions and local transit) and identifies action steps for King County and the region.

Questions and Comments

- Who are the elected officials being asked to meet about RTSI?
 - They are elected officials from cities. The RTSI started from a conversation between the King County Executive and City elected officials.
- It needs to be clear what elected officials are being asked to do, how we distinguish King County from other counties, and how we message to elected officials. Messaging and the timing of messaging are critical.

- It seems like now is the time to start a conversation around affordability and not becoming another version of the Bay area.
- June seems to be a good time to get elected officials grounded. The invitation to elected officials will go out soon and the Technical Committee will be copied on the invitation.
- One representative commented that there was a lack of desire to hold the elected official's meeting June 13 and requested a straw poll of those present to see where the participants stood on moving forward with the meeting. The straw poll showed a divide among the group with a slightly larger number indicating a desire to move forward with the June elected officials meeting. The following comments were added to the discussion:
 - SCA is getting pressure to have the June 13 elected official's meeting.
 - The City of Issaquah would like to hear from elected officials about what the work plan looks like for the legislative package. There are several questions that require direction.
- It would help to have some pointed questions for the elected officials.
- Materials for the elected official's meeting should be sent well in advance to the RTSI Technical Committee members
- Materials for the elected officials should be sent out at least a week before the June 13 meeting.

Next Steps

- 1) PSRC will update the network map based on the Technical Committee's accepted motion, and Triangle will send the map to the Technical Committee by Friday 5/12.
- 2) Technical Committee members will send Evan Lewis (elewis@triangleassociates.com) questions they would like elected officials to consider.
- 3) The RTSI Project Coordination Team will aim to send materials out a week before the elected officials meetings.
- 4) The June 13 elected officials meeting will move forward.

Attachment 1: May 5, 2017 RTSI Technical Committee Meeting Participants

Name	Position	Affiliation
Jeff Brauns	Public Works Director	City of Newcastle
Shawn Buck	Construction Inspector	City of Covington
Donald Cairns	Transportation Planning and Engineering Manager	City of Redmond
Ingrid Gaub	Director of Engineering/City Engineer	City of Auburn
Richard Gould	City Administrator	City of Pacific
John Greenwood	Assistant City Administrator	City of Clyde Hill
Bob Harrison	City Administrator	City of Issaquah
Steve Leniszewski	Public Works Director	City of Sammamish
Robert Lindskov	City Engineer	City of Covington
Jeff Lincoln	Public Works Director	City of Enumclaw
Eddie Low	Deputy Public Works Director	City of Bothell
Scott MacColl	Intergovernmental Relations Manager	City of Shoreline
Kate March	Assistant to Assistant Director	Transportation Department, City of Bellevue
Andrew Merges	Transportation and Engineering Services Manager	City of Des Moines
Autumn Monahan	Assistant to City Administrator	City of Issaquah
Heather Munden	Council Member	City of Snoqualmie
Rick Perez	City Traffic Engineer	City of Federal Way
Joel Pfundt	Transportation Engineering Manager	City of Kirkland
Laura Philpot	City Manager	City of Maple Valley
Brian Roberts	Assistant Public Works Director	City of Burien
Paula Stevens	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
Jude Willcher	Capital Programming	City of Seattle, Dept. of Transportation
Desiree Winkler	Deputy Public Works Director	City of Federal Way
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
Shay Huff	Project Associate	Triangle Associates
Susan Oxholm		King County Road Services Division

Other Meeting Attendees

Name		Affiliation
Chris Arkills	Government Relations Officer	King County Executive Office
Rick Brater	County Road Engineer	King County Road Services Division
Ed Conyers	Engineering Services Section Manager	King County Road Services Division
Jennifer Knauer	Planning Manager	King County Roads Services Division
Lise Kaye	Analyst	King County Council
Alena Marshak	Policy Analyst	Sound Cities Association
Graydon Newman	Transportation Planner	King County Department of Transportation