

Regional Transportation System Initiative Technical Committee Meeting #5 Summary

July 14, 2017, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Puget Sound Regional Council – 1011 Western Ave #500, Seattle

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. Bob reviewed the meeting agenda, and then participants accepted the June 2 Technical Committee meeting summary.

Review Themes from the June 13 Elected Officials Committee Meeting

The facilitator reviewed themes from the June 13 RTSI Elected Officials Committee meeting. Primary themes included:

- Cut-through and pass-through traffic
- Consideration of transit and multi-modal transportation
- Consideration of state highways
- Prioritization
- Connections between the jobs-housing balance, and housing affordability, on regional transportation
- Finding a sustainable funding model for the regional road network

Additional topics mentioned included:

- Trails (pedestrian and bike)
- Cross-county border issues and impacts (with Pierce and Snohomish Counties)
- Freight mobility
- Balancing city and county road needs

The facilitator reminded participants that the RTSI charge going forward is to identify needs for the regional road network.

Approach to Estimating King County Regional Road Network Needs

Ben Bakkenta (PSRC) explained that the Technical Committee is being asked to provide input to PSRC on the methodology it will use for estimating maintenance and preservation costs for the RTSI regional transportation network (RTSI network). These costs are investments necessary to maintain existing infrastructure and services through 2040 for the RTSI network. He also reminded participants of the draft RTSI network map that was accepted at the June 13 RTSI elected officials meeting. That map was accepted with a few small caveats and issues to still clarify.

Ben explained that the PSRC Transportation 2040 Finance Working Group has identified \$107 billion in maintenance and preservation needs for King County through 2040. This is approximately half of the total 2040 financial need, with the other half comprised of regional capacity projects and local system improvements. It is normal for maintenance and preservation to account for around half of a region's transportation financial needs. The Working Group also identified a \$41.5 billion revenue gap through 2040 for addressing system expansion and maintenance and preservation needs. Cities, counties and local transit account for three-quarters of that gap. Ben then reviewed the work of the PSRC Maintenance and Preservation Working Group – an interagency team of planning and public works staff focused on

estimating costs, collecting and managing data, and documenting challenges related to maintenance and preservation.

Gary Simonson (PSRC) walked participants through cost estimation methodologies the Maintenance and Preservation Working Group has used for identifying needs, through 2040, of roadways, structures, ITS/traffic control, stormwater facilities and other transportation infrastructure.

Roadway Cost Estimation Methodology

PSRC presented the methodology it uses to estimate local roadway costs, through 2040, in King County. Roadway costs include data collected from a survey of local jurisdictions to strengthen ties between regional and local estimates. The estimates reflect costs to eliminate the maintenance and preservation backlog and maintain quality roadway conditions. There was a 30 percent response rate to the PSRC survey, with mostly larger cities in King County responding, however this reported data accounts for 95 percent of the total estimate for King County jurisdictions. Data was extrapolated for jurisdictions that did not respond. From this methodology, PSRC estimates \$10.5 billion in maintenance and preservation needs through 2040 for all roadways in King County.

PSRC then provided two options for estimating roadway maintenance and preservation costs of the RTSI network:

- Break down existing reported data from cities by facility type and match that data with the RTSI network as best as possible; or
- Apply a similar proportion of King County's share of PSRC cost estimates and use that to fill in the amount of need for the RTSI network.

Questions and Comments about Roadway Maintenance and Preservation Costs

- It would be helpful to see the roadway cost estimates broken down by facility types and regional versus non-regional roads.
- Roadway maintenance and preservation totals should address escalation costs when presented to elected officials.
- Do the PSRC roadway cost estimates include local numbers?
 - The presented data includes city and county roadways. The cost estimates from this data for the RTSI network would be somewhat smaller than the totals PSRC presented since some roads were not included in that network.
- Are Highways of Statewide Significance (HSS) included in the totals presented by PSRC?
 - Cost estimates for HSS routes are provided to PSRC from WSDOT and are incorporated into PSRC's financial strategy cost estimates. However, HSS routes are not part of the costs estimated for local jurisdictions in King County.
- It would be helpful to know if NE 145th Street is captured in the RTSI network map.

Decision: The Technical Committee determined PSRC should estimate roadway maintenance and preservation costs for the RTSI network by breaking down existing reported data from cities by facility type and matching that data with the RTSI network.

Structures Cost Estimation Methodology

PSRC uses a new method for approximating deterioration and rehabilitation costs for structures, such as bridges, which includes calculating bridge deterioration rates and assigning the most cost-efficient improvement for each bridge to ensure it is not structurally deficient. The method also estimates culvert replacement, local fish passage barrier, and other structure costs (such as for retaining walls). PSRC worked with the Fish Passage Barrier Removal Board to determine the costs of replacing culverts. It also worked

with a few specific jurisdictions to estimate seawall costs. Based on this method, PSRC estimates \$2.1 billion in costs for structure maintenance and preservation through 2040.

PSRC then provided two options for estimating structure maintenance and preservation costs of the RTSI network:

- Isolate bridges and other structures only on the RTSI network and apply those costs; or
- Make assumptions about culverts and the RTSI network and apportion those from the King County total.

Questions and Comments about Structure Maintenance and Preservation Costs

- Could PSRC send the structure cost estimate methodology to cities for validation, after structure costs are calculated for the RTSI network?
 - Yes, PSRC can send the structure cost calculations to cities for validation.

Decision: The Technical Committee determined PSRC should estimate structure maintenance and preservation costs for the RTSI network from the data and methodology PSRC already uses.

ITS/Traffic Control Cost Estimation Methodology

PSRC estimated ITS/traffic control costs with a survey of local jurisdictions. This survey had a 26 percent response rate, again comprised mostly of larger cities in King County. This accounted for 81 percent of the total need projection. The remaining data was filled in with reported averages and local lane mileage estimates. PSRC supplemented this data with state Budgeting, Accounting and Reporting System (BARS) data to include traffic control and the potential increase in ITS maintenance. Based on this method, PSRC estimates \$1.7 billion in costs for ITS/traffic control maintenance and preservation through 2040.

PSRC then provided two options for estimating ITS/traffic control maintenance and preservation costs of the RTSI network:

- Apply PSRC's existing ITS/traffic control cost estimate to the RTSI network; or
- Redistribute the ITS/traffic control survey to King County jurisdictions to obtain more comprehensive ITS and non-ITS traffic control data.

Questions and Comments about ITS/Traffic Control Maintenance and Preservation Costs

- Some of the smaller jurisdictions found it difficult to estimate ITS/traffic control costs on the survey PSRC sent to jurisdictions.
- Future ITS costs are uncertain and it is not clear if future ITS will involve new capital investments or a replacement of existing capital. As a region, we need to figure out how to capture the costs of new technologies.
- Is there a committee that identifies corridors for signal coordination?
 - Yes, PSRC convenes and facilitates the Regional Traffic Operations Committee (RTOC) which discusses collaborative and coordinated traffic operations, investments and practices in the Central Puget Sound region.
- Why does King County comprise half of ITS/traffic control costs among PSRC counties?
 - It is not clear why this is the case. We can revisit why this percentage breakdown exists.
- What would jurisdictions be asked to complete if a survey was redistributed?
 - GIS data would be shared and PSRC would push cities harder to provide non-ITS data.
- It does not seem like PSRC would get better ITS/traffic control data than it currently has by redistributing the survey.
- When the ITS/traffic control, and other cost estimates, are shared with elected officials in a final report all data limitations and unknowns should be identified.

- Distributing additional signalization money to particular jurisdictions will not address regional signalization needs.

Decision: The Technical Committee determined PSRC should estimate ITS/traffic control maintenance and preservation costs for the RTSI network from the data and methodology PSRC already uses. However, it will explain limitations of these cost estimates in the final RTSI report.

Storm Drainage Control Cost Estimation Methodology

To estimate storm drainage maintenance and preservation costs, PSRC primarily extrapolated out historic data. It also added historic stormwater costs not in state BARS data, addressed some of the miscoding of BARS data, incorporated the strengthening of permit requirements, and incorporated additional issues that will increase stormwater costs.

PSRC then provided two options for estimating storm drainage maintenance and preservation costs of the RTSI network:

- Apply the regional methodology to King County to obtain the full county number, then apply the estimated percentage aligned with the RTSI network.
- Distribute the survey to King County jurisdictions to obtain estimated stormwater maintenance costs associated with the RTSI network.

Questions and Comments about Storm Drainage Maintenance and Preservation Costs

- We need to address the fact that stormwater management is driving project costs higher for cities.
- Most cities rely on stormwater utilities that do the operation and maintenance of stormwater infrastructure.

Decision: The Technical Committee determined PSRC should estimate storm drainage maintenance and preservation costs for the RTSI network from the data and methodology PSRC already uses. However, it will explain limitations of these cost estimates in the final RTSI report.

Cost Estimation Methodology for Other Categories

Gary explained how PSRC estimated maintenance and preservation costs for street lighting, roadside development, sidewalks and paths, and other maintenance by extrapolating from state BARS data.

PSRC then provided two options for estimating other maintenance and preservation costs of the RTSI network:

- Use a similar data extrapolation method for King County to obtain a full county number, then apply the estimated percentage aligned with the RTSI network; or
- Distribute a survey to King County jurisdictions to obtain estimated maintenance and preservation costs for these “other” categories associated with the RTSI network.

Questions and Comments about Other Maintenance and Preservation Costs

- Bothell can provide PSRC with the extensive work it did to estimate sidewalk and path costs.
- If we have poor data from some areas across all maintenance and preservation cost categories, what are the implications later on? How will a lack of data affect prioritization?
 - It is unclear how incomplete data will affect prioritization later on. However, all data limitations can be explained in the final RTSI report.
 - In the final report, we can show a range of confidence in PSRC’s data for the different cost categories.

Decision: The Technical Committee determined that PSRC should estimate other maintenance and preservation costs for the RTSI network from the data and methodology PSRC already uses. However, it will explain limitations of these cost estimates in the final RTSI report.

Next Steps

- 1) PSRC will utilize its existing data methodologies to estimate maintenance and preservation costs for the RTSI network.
- 2) Now through November: The RTSI recommendations report will be drafted.
- 3) September 8 Technical Committee meeting: address capacity improvements cost estimation.
- 4) October 6 Technical Committee meeting: address potential revenue sources and congestion and mobility.
- 5) November 3 Technical Committee meeting: approve a final RTSI recommendations report.
- 6) Sometime in November or December: Hold a final RTSI Elected Officials Committee meeting.

Questions and Comments about Next Steps:

- How are we moving forward on developing recommendations when we have not completed the RTSI technical work?
 - The RTSI project coordination team is discussing these next steps. However, it has not had detailed conversations about the end product of the RTSI – particularly prioritization. Prioritization was not originally envisioned as happening as part of the RTSI. If prioritization is discussed then the RTSI will take more time.
 - Ben noted that PSRC is coming to the September transportation policy board meeting with information about new revenue sources to draw upon.
- What will the final recommendations package look like and what tools or new funding options are on the table to discuss?
- How are we defining “capacity”?
- It is possible that one more elected officials committee meeting will not be enough.
- Now is a difficult time to obtain new state funding, so perhaps step one should be to establish a local option gas tax for capacity improvements, and then develop a longer-term legislative approach.
- If the RTSI starts debating the value of projects then this process will go on for a long time. We should keep this effort broader and focus on new funding tools.
- It would help if the Technical Committee could see the range of recommendations on the table for consideration.
- Perhaps one of the future Technical Committee meetings could focus on how specific funding tools work and existing laws around some of the recommendations we are considering.
- It might help to involve intergovernmental affairs staff and lobbyists in the RTSI effort to better understand the politics involved in any recommendations that come out of the RTSI.

Attachment 1: July 14, 2017 RTSI Technical Committee Meeting Participants

Name	Position	Affiliation
Boyd Benson (phone)	City Engineer/Public Works Director	City of Duvall
Rob Brown	Transportation Engineer	City of Kent
Ingrid Gaub	Assistant Public Works Director and City Engineer	City of Auburn
Dave Hill	Mayor	City of Algona
Tracy Krawczyk	Policy and Planning Director	City of Seattle, Dept. of Transportation
Robert Lindskov (phone)	City Engineer	City of Covington
Jeff Lincoln (phone)	Public Works Director	City of Enumclaw
Eddie Low	Deputy Public Works Director	City of Bothell
Dan Marcinko (phone)	Parks and Public Works Director	City of Snoqualmie
Andrew Merges	Transportation and Engineering Services Manager	City of Des Moines
Beth Mountsier	Senior Policy Analyst	City of Redmond
Joel Pfundt (phone)	Transportation Engineering Manager	City of Kirkland
Brian Roberts	Assistant Public Works Director	City of Burien
Kurt Seemann (phone)	Transportation Manager	City of Issaquah
Jim Seitz	Transportation Director	City of Renton
Nytasha Sowers	Transportation Services Manager	City of Shoreline
Paula Stevens	Assistant Director	Transportation Department, City of Bellevue
Scott Tkach	Public Works Director	City of Maple Valley
Jude Willcher	Capital Programming	City of Seattle, Dept. of Transportation
Desire Winkler	Deputy Public Works Director	City of Federal Way

Meeting Staff

Name	Position	Affiliation
Ben Bakkenta	Program Manager	Puget Sound Regional Council
Ben Brackett	Senior Planner	Puget Sound Regional Council
Ruth Harvey	Strategic Business Operations Section Manager	King Road Services Division
Shay Huff	Project Associate	Triangle Associates
Evan Lewis	Associate	Triangle Associates
Robin Mayhew	Program Manager	Puget Sound Regional Council

Name	Position	Affiliation
Graydon Newman	Transportation Planner	King County Metro
Brian Parry	Senior Policy Analyst	Sound Cities Association
Gary Simonson	Associate Planner	Puget Sound Regional Council
Bob Wheeler	Senior Facilitator	Triangle Associates

Other Meeting Attendees

Name	Position	Affiliation
Ed Conyers	Engineering Services Section Manager	King County Road Services Division
Peter Heffernan	Intergovernmental Relations	King County Department of Transportation
Lise Kaye	Analyst	King County Council
Doug Levy	Lobbyist	Outcomes by Levy, LLC
Stephanie Pure	Governmental Relations	King County Department of Transportation
April Sanders	Legislative Aide	King County Council
John Vander Sluis	Senior Planner	King County Road Services Division