Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization
Draft TAC Meeting Summary
April 11, 2019

Attendees

Executive Board Member
Andrea Archer Parsons, City of Bremerton
Rich James, Clallam County
Mike Oliver, Clallam Transit System
Annette Nesse, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe
Frank Burns, Jefferson Transit
David Forte, Kitsap County
Edward Coviello, Kitsap Transit
Michelle Smith, Makah Tribe
Dave Smith, Mason County
Jonathan Boehme, City of Port Angeles
Judy Scott, Port of Allyn
Samantha Harper, City of Port Townsend

Staff/Guests
Theresa Turpin, WSDOT
Debbie Clemen, WSDOT

Welcome & Introductions
TAC Vice Chair Frank Burns opened the meeting; and initiated self-introductions around the table.

ACTION ITEM: TAC Recommendation for project type change request
Peninsula RTPO Coordinator Debbie Clemen commented that members were provided a copy of the City of Port Townsend’s letter requesting a project type change from a design project to a planning study. The City feels that the original project should have been for a planning study and not design. The Peninsula RTPO awarded the City of Port Townsend $95,000 for the PE, Design and Environmental of their SR 20 Pedestrian Walkway from Logan St. to Hancock St. project in 2017. This award was part of the Peninsula RTPO’s Transportation Alternatives grant selection process. Samantha Harper, Assistant Engineer from the City of Port Townsend commented that the SR 20 Pedestrian Walkway would be an extension of the sidewalk network from Logan Street to Hancock Street. This project is located on the south side of Sims Way and crosses a ravine where pedestrians must currently walk in the street. TAC members asked the following questions:

Q: The city hired an engineering firm, have they completed any work?
A: No.
Q: Has the project been obligated?
A: Yes.

Debbie commented that requesting a project type change is very unusual. In order to change the project type, the City needs approval from each of the follow entities: 1) the Peninsula RTPO; 2) WSDOT’s Olympic Region Local Programs; 3) WSDOT’s Headquarters’ Local Programs; and 4) FHWA.

Peninsula RTPO Vice Chair Frank Burns asked for a motion. Judy Scott motioned to provide a TAC Recommendation to the EB for approval of the City's request to change their project to a planning study. The motion was seconded by Annette Nesse, and carried with no further discussion.

Rich James arriving late wished to express his concerns on approving Port Townsend’s project change. Rich stated the Peninsula RTPO’s specific criteria for the TAP funds were to support construction projects only, not for planning studies. The City of Port Townsend broke the agreement with the Peninsula RTPO by switching construction funds to a planning study. TAP funds are so limited in quantity that I (Rich) wouldn’t want to fund a planning study in the future.

Member Judy Scott remarked that TAC members had already approved the TAC Recommendation for approval of the City of Port Townsend’s request.

**UPDATE: STP set-aside Transportation Alternatives Program Grant Funding Status**

Peninsula RTPO Coordinator Debbie Clemen provided the following update on the Peninsula RTPO’s Transportation Alternatives (TA) funds. She commented that the Peninsula RTPO has two active TA projects:

1) **2017 TA Grant Award**
   - **Jurisdiction:** City of Port Townsend
   - **Award:** $95,000
   - **Project:** SR 20 Pedestrian Walkway
   - **Status:** Obligated and currently seeking a project change to a planning study.

2) **2019 TA Grant Award**
   - **Jurisdiction:** Clallam County
   - **Award:** $100,000
   - **Project:** ODT – Spruce Railroad Trail and Tunnels, Segment B
   - **Status:** In the process of being transferred to Western Federal Lands for administration.

The Peninsula RTPO has $14,515 in carryover funds, the difference in the amount of funds awarded versus obligated. In addition, the City of Port Townsend returned their 2019 TA award for the construction phase of their project, and the Peninsula RTPO’s yearly TA allocation increased from $190,000 to $214,944.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{2019 TA total allocation} & \quad \text{2019 TA award} \\
$214,944 & \quad -$100,000 \quad \text{Clallam County award} \\
$114,944 & \quad \text{subtotal} \\
+$14,515 & \quad \text{carryover funds} \\
\text{2019 funds remaining} & \quad $129,459
\end{align*}
\]
Total TA Funds for 2020 Call for Projects

$129,459 (2019 funds remaining)
$214,944 (2020 TA allocation)
$214,944 (2021 TA allocation)
$559,347 Total TA available for selection process

Peninsula RTPO Coordinator Debbie Clemen commented that previously the Peninsula RTPO has awarded TA projects out four years with a new grant selection process every two years. However, this process has presented problems, and we may want to reconsider how many selection years are programmed out. A discussion followed, and members decided that one-year out would be best, but a two-year cycle is more efficient use of time. Members also decided that the best time for a call for projects is in the spring. The next call is scheduled for January 2020: with a Call for Projects in January; the grant applications due in February; and the grant application project presentations; and grant selection in March. Members were also concerned if the 2019 TA funds would carry-over into next year. Debbie checked with WSDOT headquarters Local Programs Dave Kaiser, and he confirmed that the funding would still be available for the Peninsula RTPO’s grant ranking process in the spring.

Lead Agency Transition Update

Peninsula RTPO Coordinator Debbie Clemen updated members on the lead agency transition. She commented that Kitsap Transit is proceeding with the lead agency role. Kitsap Transit will provide the meeting support for the EB and TAC meetings. Jefferson Transit is taking on the fiscal agent duties for the Peninsula RTPO. The Kitsap County Prosecuting Attorney’s office is under contract to provide legal services to the Peninsula RTPO. The Peninsula RTPO’s Inter-local agreement has been updated and will under go a final review at the working group committee meeting tomorrow prior to requesting approval at the April 19th Executive Board meeting. Executive Board members will be tasked with guiding the Inter-local Agreement through their respective board’s process for signature prior to May 30, 2019. Debbie asked Annette Nesse if there was anything that she left out of the transition update.

Annette commented that the ILA/Bylaws Working Committee is also working on updating the bylaws. The Peninsula RTPO’s legal counsel Lisa Nickel from the Kitsap County Prosecuting Attorney’s office is really efficient, enabling the Peninsula RTPO to update their documents at a faster pace. Our goal for the Inter-local Agreement is to get as many member signatures as we can.

Discussion: Regional Transportation Plan 2040 Update

Chapter 5: Financial Plan

Peninsula RTPO Coordinator Debbie Clemen commented that the Peninsula RTPO is required to include a financial component in their Regional Transportation Plan. Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 468-86-120 states that the financial component of the Regional Transportation Plan shall include the following:
1) An analysis of funding capacity including an inventory of revenue sources for regional transportation improvements, and probable funding levels available for regional transportation improvements from each source;
2) Probable funding comparisons with identified current and future needs, including identified funding shortfall; and
3) If funding shortfalls are identified, an analysis of additional funding resources to make up the shortfall, or a reassessment of the regional transportation strategies, at a minimum, to ensure that transportation needs fall within probable funding levels.

The Peninsula RTPO’s current plan version doesn’t meet the WAC criteria. Staff is proposing using the projects in the Peninsula RTPO’s R-TIP. The funded project in the STIP will represent our highest priority funded projects and the planned projects in the R-TIP will represent our future project needs.

After a short discussion, members determined that the R-TIP just doesn’t provide the best financial picture for the Peninsula RTPO. Most member agencies and tribes don’t put anything in the R-TIP. Members felt that it is better to use the information in members Tribal Transportation Improvement Plans, Capital Facilities Plan, Transit Development Plan, Transportation Improvement Program, Long Range Transportation Plan, or Comprehensive Plan. A three percent growth rate could then be added to the existing funding to show the cost of future needs.

Rich James commented that he really likes the current RTP’s text and recommends only minor updates to the Finance Chapter text, and listing the local agencies TIPs in the Appendix to meet the new WAC requirements.

Chapter 4: Trends, conditions, and performance
Peninsula RTPO Coordinator Debbie Clemen review the draft Chapter 4: Trends, conditions, and performance elements with members. She asked members what level of detail are they looking for in this chapter. This chapter provides information on trends, and the current conditions, and performance of the transportation system in the Peninsula region. Debbie stated that the demographic information was taken from the Regional Trails Plan since is was the most recent information that we had. Members didn’t like the demographic data. The data showed a 22.9 percent population growth for Mason County. The reader of this information would assume that this is an annual growth rate increase, but the population growth was between 1988 and 2018, and very deceptive.

Debbie moved on to the next section highlighting the Regional economic trends. She commented that this section features the current RTP’s text and needs to be updated. Can members provide current data to update this section? David Forte suggested using data from OFM that way the data would be consistent. The Department of Commerce also has Regional Forecast data that could be used.

In the next section Roadway preservation and maintenance, Debbie asked if members would prefer highlighting only the state highway system, or would they also like to see their local roadway system highlighted? Members preferred to have the local roadway data recorded as well as the state highway system. Jonathan Boehme from the City of Port Angeles commented
that the city has a Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for their current streets in town. Annette Nesse commented that the tribes have a Long-Range Transportation Plan that includes roadway information. Dave Smith from Mason County commented that they have current 2019 graphs of roadway conditions that he could forward to me. Members are to provide a local roadway pavement conditions summary to the Peninsula RTPO.

Moving on to Page 7, third paragraph from the top. David Forte suggested the following revisions:

The most urbanized county in the region is Kitsap County. Kitsap County is still able to funds its roadway maintenance program with an average of 36 to 44 lanes miles a year mostly of thin lift asphalt overlay, and 36 to 40 lane miles of seal coat. But the county expects that when oil prices begin to spike again after the recession is over, the county costs for roadway maintenance will increase sharply with a corresponding reduction of lane miles treated.

Mason County, which has approximately 637 centerline miles of roadway of which over half is classified as local access roadways, is having a difficult time finding funding to maintain its local access roads. Currently, the county paves approximately 50 miles of collector roads per year, this is a combination of hot mix asphalt (HMA) and chip seal.

Member would like to also see local bridge information highlighted in the Bridge preservation and maintenance section instead of state highway bridges only.

No comments were provided on the Level of service, Traffic forecasts, and Safety sections.

Public Comments & Announcements

Theresa Turpin commented that she is looking for a definition of a Tribal Transportation Route and was hoping that members could guide her in the right direction. Annette Nesse and Michelle Smith commented that it was defined in CFR 25.170. Annette will send Theresa a copy.

Meeting Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.