1. 10:00 – 10:05 Welcome and Introductions

2. 10:05 – 10:10 Approval of Agenda

   Approval of Minutes from September 20, 2019 (Attachment)

   Consent Calendar (Attachment)
   a. Letter authorizing the Chair to grant check-signing authority to Jefferson Transit in carrying out its Lead Fiscal Agent role

3. 10:10 – 10:40 Transportation Funding 101: Federal Funding

   Transportation funding is at the heart of many issues and opportunities PRTP0 and its partners face. It’s a complicated subject in part because of the complexity of funding sources. This discussion focuses on one source of transportation revenues – federal funds – and will help prepare for a more in-depth discussion in November on an upcoming call for projects.

4. 10:40 – 10:50 Select PRTP0 Website Home Page Banner (Attachment)

   In transitioning the old PRTP0 website to its new home on Kitsap Transit’s website, a refresh of the banner is needed. Two options are presented to the Board for consideration. Direction on a preferred home page banner is requested so that Kitsap Transit can update the PRTP0 site.

5. 10:50 – 11:15 Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040 Input and Response (Attachment) The Board will discuss comments received to date on the draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040 and a strategy for addressing substantive comments. Guidance from the Board will inform final revisions to the draft plan which will be prepared for TAC review and recommendation, and Board review and approval in November.

6. 11:15 – 11:40 Planning for Effective Legislative Engagement as an RTPO

   In the upcoming months PRTP0 members will collaborate in strategic regional planning that will shape future work programs and Board activities, creating opportunities along the way to educate and inform state and federal decision-makers about regional issues and priorities.

7. 11:40 – 11:45 PRTP0 Coordination Update (Attachment)

   Short updates to keep the Executive Board apprised of PRTP0 activities not addressed elsewhere on the agenda. For discussion only if requested.

8. 11:45 – 11:50 Public Comment Period

   This is an opportunity for anyone from the public to address the Board.

9. 11:50 – 12:00 PRTP0 Member Updates and Adjourn
Upcoming Board Agenda Items

RTP 2040 Final Review and Adoption
Rollout of 2020 Transportation Alternatives (TA) Federal Funding Program
PRTPO Operating Policies and Procedures (Procurement, Public Records)
2020 Schedule and Strategic Scoping Initiative

Final Meeting of the Year: November 15, 2019 at the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe’s Red Cedar Hall, in Blyn

Can’t attend? Please join the Board meeting via your computer or smartphone for real-time access to presentations
https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/316074693

You can also dial in using your phone.
United States: +1 (786) 535-3211

Access Code: 316-074-693

New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:
https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/316074693

https://prtpo.kitsaptransit.com/
AGENDA ITEM 2

Minutes of Meeting

PRTPO EXECUTIVE BOARD
September 20, 2019
10:00 – 12:00
Jamestown S’Klallam Community Center – Red Cedar Hall
1033 Old Blyn Highway
Blyn, WA

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Annette Nesse called the meeting to order at 10:00.

ATTENDEES

Executive Board:
Jefferson County       David Sullivan
Kitsap County          Andy Nelson (via phone)
City of Port Angeles   Lindsay Schromen-Wawrin
City of Port Orchard   Bek Ashby
City of Port Townsend  Ariel Speser
City of Sequim         Dennis Smith
City of Shelton        Diedre Peterson (via phone)
Jefferson Transit      Tammi Rubert
Kitsap Transit         John Clauson
Port of Allyn          Judy Scott
Port of Port Angeles   Chris Hartman
Port of Shelton        Dick Taylor
WSDOT Olympic Region   Dennis Engel
Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe Annette Nesse
Makah Tribe            Bud Denney

Staff:
Ed Coviello, Kitsap Transit – Lead Planning Agency
Thera Black, PRTPO Coordinator

Others:
Ron Allen, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribal Chair
Gil Cerise, Puget Sound Regional Council
Wendy Clark-Getzin, TAC Chair and Jefferson County Alternate
Sara Crouch, Jefferson Transit
David Garlington, City of Sequim Alternate
Cliff Hall, WSDOT Multimodal Planning Office
Yvette Liufau, WSDOT Olympic Region
Welcome and Introductions
Chair Nesse called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone to the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe’s Red Cedar Hall. Self-introductions were made around the room. Due to the lack of a quorum at this time, action items on the agenda were deferred and Item 4 was advanced.

4. Update on Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040 Outreach

Ms. Black provided a status update on outreach activities for the draft plan, noting that the public comment period extends from September 3rd through October 18th, at the conclusion of the Board’s October meeting. She reported on the four public meetings that kicked off the review process, beginning in Port Angeles and including Port Townsend, Bremerton, and Shelton. Ms. Black advised that a second meeting in Mason County is being arranged because the Shelton open house inadvertently coincided with the regular Mason County TIP-CAP meeting, a citizen advisory group focused on transportation issues.

Some comments were submitted at the open houses and more have arrived via email. Ms. Black highlighted some common themes that have emerged to date, including:

- Concern that the plan does not reference climate change
- Support for transit and more intercity regional services
- Improved facilities for active travel and extension of the Olympic Discovery Trail and connections
- Specific consideration of freight mobility, especially in downtown corridors
- System vulnerabilities associated with reliance on US 101 with few alternate routes

Ms. Black noted that the TAC will discuss the draft plan and comments to date at its October meeting. TAC and public comments will be presented to the Board for review and discussion in October. Direction from the Board at that time will inform final plan revisions. A final draft will be presented to the TAC for review and recommendation before presenting to the Board for approval in November. She asked for any comments or questions.

Chair Nesse reported that she had attended the Port Townsend open house and found it to be well-attended. She noted that the discussions had been lively and diverse. Mr. Sullivan also attended the Port Townsend event and added that the attendees connected climate change with the need for more transit. He observed that there is much more support for expanded transit services than there is funding available for this.

Ms. Black reported that the additional meeting in Shelton will be on October 9 at the TIP-CAP meeting, which will be held at Mason County Public Works. Discussion of the RTP will be on their regular meeting agenda.

There was discussion about outreach efforts and meeting attendance. Ms. Black described the outreach and notification mechanisms. Mr. Coviello noted that the meetings appear to have gotten the word out as comments continue to arrive via email.

5. PSRC Passenger-only Ferry Study

Mr. Gil Cerise, Program Manager for the Transportation Division at the Puget Sound Regional Council, presented an overview of the upcoming Passenger-only Ferry Study that he will be leading. Board members received a copy of the presentation in the agenda packet.

Mr. Cerise began with a brief history of Puget Sound waterways, explaining that ferry routes were the highways before there were highways. He reviewed the importance of the Puget Sound Mosquito Fleet to travel and
commerce in 1900 and explained their consolidation and eventual decline as rail and auto travel outcompeted the ferries. In 1951 the state took over operation of ferries.

In the 1980s Washington State Ferries initiated its first passenger-only ferry service which it maintained for about two decades. In 2006 the Legislature determined that passenger-only ferry service is a form of public transportation and directed WSF to provide multi-modal service that accommodates vehicles in addition to passengers. WSF terminated its passenger-only service and shortly thereafter, King County and Kitsap Transit began operating their own services to fill the void. During this time, PSRC completed its first passenger-only ferry study in 2008.

Mr. Cerise advised that the 2008 PSRC study looked primarily at routes serving the Puget Sound region, but also looked at some external routes such as Port Townsend. It looked at the feasibility of routes to determine near-term, medium-term, and long-term viability. He noted that all the feasible near-term routes identified in that study are in service today. He highlighted the six current routes and the upcoming Southworth to Seattle route opening in 2020, noting that the times indicated in the slide are “dock-to-dock” times.

Mr. Cerise explained that where the passenger-only routes overlap with the WSF routes, they offer service that takes about half the time as state ferry routes. In other cases, the service connects communities that couldn’t accommodate a big state ferry. This helps to explain the significant growth in passenger-only ferry ridership over the last five years. While all ferry ridership is up, growth is strong on the King County and Kitsap Transit passenger-only routes. Mr. Clauson pointed out that the 2018 figures for Kitsap Transit ferry service include only about six months of operations of the Kingston ferry service and that 2019 figures should be quite a bit higher.

The legislature funded a $350,000 update of PSRC’s 2008 study to account for the new services and identify future needs. Mr. Cerise noted that the legislature directed that the study scope should be expanded to include all 12 counties that border on Puget Sound, regardless of whether they currently have ferry service. The evaluation will include future services and capacity needs and will look at ferry terminal locations not just on Puget Sound but also on Lake Union and Lake Washington. He added that the scope also includes consideration of some environmental measures like electrification of the ferry fleet and extensive stakeholder engagement.

Mr. Cerise reviewed the general approach for the study and the schedule, which is just getting underway with the consultant selection process. He highlighted some of the evaluation criteria outlined in the implementing legislation, adding that additional factors will emerge from the stakeholder process. PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board will be the primary group focused on this. PRTPRO Vice-Chair Bek Ashby is on the Transportation Policy Board. Most of the work will occur in 2020, with a final report due to the legislature in January 2021.

Mr. Cerise concluded by reiterating his interest in hearing what ideas and suggestions PRTPRO Board members have at this time since they can help inform the scope of work under development. He encouraged people to contact him at gcerise@psrc.org if ideas or questions come up after the Board’s meeting.

Discussion ensued about the potential of passenger-only ferry electrification, and the perceived benefit of that compared to electric vehicle ferries that are transporting gas powered vehicles. Mr. Schromen-Wawrin noted that it makes more sense environmentally and fiscally to focus on electric propulsion for passenger-only ferries than on vehicle ferries. He pointed out that transit agencies are looking at the logistics of recharging electric buses and asked whether this study will take a similar look at the logistics of recharging electric ferries. Mr. Cerise replied that it is the intent to look at the effects of electrification in order to be able to compare emissions across modes, including potential shifts between modes. While the study scope details aren’t yet defined, this is likely to include a high-level look at vessel charging though by necessity, it cannot go into great detail.
Mr. Schromen-Wawrin added that transit agencies in California are looking at hydrogen fuel cells as an electric alternative and encouraged the PSRC study to consider whether hydrogen fuel cells offer a competitive alternative to electric-power that is constrained by battery technology. Mr. Cerise noted that hydrogen-electric technologies are being deployed now and so will probably be considered. Mr. Clauson added that Kitsap Transit is about to deploy its first hybrid hydrogen ferry, explaining that the technology is similar to what is used on buses. He pointed out that electric propulsion for passenger-only ferries – especially high-speed ferries – would require so much power that an electric-only ferry would have to recharge for a few hours before it could complete the return trip. Similar to buses, hydrogen may offer a more practical clean alternative than electricity.

Mr. Clauson explained that beyond questions about fuel and propulsion, ferry operations require coordination with completely different regulatory agencies including the Coast Guard, which must approve the ferry fuel and propulsion systems. This can be a challenge.

A question came up as to whether this study will align with the Governor’s “Maritime Blue” initiative. One element of that group’s work is electrification of marine vessels, creating a possible opportunity for coordination. Mr. Cerise made note of the initiative, observing the potential overlapping interests.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the role of Sunday service in the feasibility analysis, noting the relationship with transit and the combined importance for the region’s tourism industry. Mr. Cerise responded that the feasibility analysis will look at market potential by route but will probably not get to the level of detail about Sunday service feasibility. He added that the value of passenger-only ferry service depends on landside support, primarily transit and that the study will likely speak to that. Mr. Sullivan pointed out that the ability to attract people to weekend festivals and events without relying on driving depends on having Sunday service. Vice-Chair Ashby noted that the Port Orchard-to-Bremerton ferry service offered by Kitsap Transit does not run on Sundays, but because it is important to two cities, they pitch in to fund Sunday service. While this is an important route for tourists, experience has shown that ridership is minimal unless it is a festival weekend.

Vice-Chair Ashby added that while the foot ferry serves a demand for walk-on service from Port Orchard to Bremerton for jobs at the shipyard or to pick up the Fast Ferry to Seattle, it does create parking issues in downtown Port Orchard. There are a lot of landside issues associated with passenger-only ferry service that must be considered.

The Board adjourned for a five-minute break while the conference phone was set up to accommodate remote access for some members. The Board reconvened at 10:45. Andy Nelson from Kitsap County and Diedre Peterson from Shelton joined the meeting via phone. The Board achieved a quorum and addressed action items previously deferred.

2. Approval of Agenda and Approval of Minutes from August 16, 2019
   ACTION: Ms. Scott recommended approval of the agenda and of minutes from the August 16th meeting. Vice-Chair Ashby seconded. The motion passed. Mr. Schromen-Wawrin abstained, noting he was not at the August meeting.

3. Approve 2020-2025 Regional Transportation Improvement Program
   Mr. Coviello briefed the Board on development of the draft Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP), acknowledging support from WSDOT and from the local partners as he prepared the RTIP for the first time. He explained that inclusion in an approved RTIP is a prerequisite for inclusion in the Statewide
Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). The RTIP and STIP are developed and maintained in an online database. The process, his first developing the PRTPO RTIP, went smoothly.

There are 152 projects in the RTIP, with the majority being state projects. Mr. Coviello explained that the PRTPO website has projects broken out by jurisdiction to facilitate review and commenting. A public review and comment period has been underway. Today’s action by the Board is required for funded projects in the RTIP to be advanced to the STIP.

**ACTION:** Ms. Scott moved, seconded by Vice-Chair Ashby, to approve the 2020-2025 Regional Transportation Improvement Program. The motion passed unanimously.

Vice-Chair Ashby observed that it is difficult to review 152 pages of project information. Ms. Black concurred and advised that consideration will be given to making the 2020 process more meaningful in reviewing the projects ahead of time.

6. WSDOT Update on State Projects
Mr. Engel updated the Board on WSDOT projects in the PRTPO region. He pointed out that WSDOT projects located in Kitsap County are not included in the PRTPO RTIP because they are included in the PSRC RTIP instead. Mr. Engel included those projects from the PSRC RTIP in his presentation. Mr. Engel acknowledged the work of Ms. Liufau in assembling his presentation and for her work in developing the PRTPO RTIP in previous years.

Mr. Engel referenced a handout that had been prepared listing all projects in the four-county region and explained that highlighted projects at the end of each county’s list are those longer-range projects that are outside of the four years of the STIP. He advised that some adjustment of schedules is to be expected. He also explained that some projects in this biennium will complete just one phase of a project, for example the design phase. Future biennia will include funding for right-of-way or construction, but funds have not been secured.

The presentation featured a GIS map with markers highlighting the location of each project. Mr. Engel pointed out that many of the projects are environmental retrofits primarily oriented toward fish passage barrier removal. WSDOT is hiring a consultant to complete 22 projects within the Peninsula region.

Clallam County Projects
Of the 20 WSDOT projects in Clallam County, 12 are fish passage barrier retrofits.

Vice-Chair Ashby asked about construction plans for the Elwha River Bridge replacement and how WSDOT intends to manage traffic during that project. Mr. Engel advised that WSDOT will build a new bridge parallel to the original which will enable them to keep the current bridge open during construction. Mr. Schromen-Wawrin provided more detail on the project, noting that erosion has made the existing bridge structure unstable. It was constructed in an era when foundations were not located on solid bedrock. Because of the erosion, WSDOT has expedited the schedule for the bridge replacement. Construction of the new bridge will also soften a sharp curve in the road that requires a significant speed reduction. Mr. Engel added that sensors have been installed on the existing bridge to help detect any movement and equipment is staged that will allow WSDOT to rapidly deploy an emergency bridge closure if necessary.

Mr. Engel pointed out that the East Sequim project is not included on the list. WSDOT was told it did not need to be included but they are working to confirm that. It is a pre-design project for the Simdars interchange, and funding is secured. Mr. Garlington noted that this will be a project of interest on the October 2nd Joint Transportation Committee tour.
Jefferson County Projects

Of the 15 WSDOT projects located in Jefferson County, 9 are fish passage retrofits.

Mr. Engel highlighted efforts currently underway at SR 104 and Shine and Paradise Roads to improve safety with the addition of roundabout treatments. Two open houses generated a lot of strong public sentiment. Mr. Sullivan noted that the concern most people have is congestion on the bridge and on the east side of the bridge. They typically don’t see these intersection safety issues as being the problem to solve. Mr. Engel advised that WSDOT will be installing two roundabouts at SR 104 and SR 19 at the same time, also to improve safety.

He described deck repairs slated for the Hood Canal Bridge, noting that it is structural work under the roadway and so won’t be evident to most people. Ms. Clark-Getzin inquired about timing and how WSDOT will notify local agencies and the public about traffic impacts. Mr. Engel was unaware of when the work would occur but explained that the nature of the work will not create much traffic disruption.

Mason County Projects

Of the 13 WSDOT projects located in Mason County, 7 are fish passage retrofits.

The big project in the region is the SR 3 Freight Corridor project, long known as the Belfair Bypass. This $67 million project recently got underway with some preliminary design work. This project will take several years to complete.

Ms. Scott inquired about the SR 300 / Belfair State Park project, a combination paver / ADA-ramp project. It is uncertain whether construction will be summer of 2020 or 2021. She expressed support for the project, which should make the road safer to travel.

Kitsap County Projects

Of the 8 WSDOT projects located in Kitsap County, 3 are fish passage retrofits.

SR 305 Corridor constitutes a number of safety and mobility multimodal projects between the Bainbridge ferry terminal and Hostmark Street. This is a multiyear project that is getting underway now.

Mr. Engel also reviewed the region’s programmatic paver program and guardrail safety program.

Ms. Clark-Getzin asked for insights about funding displacements when projects get pushed out of the current RTIP and rescheduled for later years. She referred to an ADA project on SR 116 that was deferred to 2027 for lack of funding and asked what other projects had been squeezed out of the current RTIP due to lack of funding until the legislature passes a new funding package. Mr. Engel wasn’t aware of other specific projects but acknowledged that the WSDOT projects are relatively fluid between biennia depending on availability of funds from different funding sources. Ms. Black asked whether RTPO input can help Olympic Region projects prioritize better in the funding process. He explained that WSDOT’s own funding priorities are programmatic preservation, safety, and fish passage needs, not improvement projects. Local agencies probably have the most influence over improvement-type projects through their legislative activities. WSDOT’s focus is on taking care of the existing system and there’s not enough money for that.

Fish passage barriers are particularly challenging, and Mr. Engel discussed the funding deficit for retrofitting the WSDOT facilities. Mr. Schromen-Wawrin noted that price tag does not include municipal and private culverts upstream and downstream from the state facilities. Municipalities were not included in the court decision, nor is
there any funding for them to proactively address those barriers. Without a systemic approach the state 
retrofits will have limited effectiveness. He asked how WSDOT considers upstream and downstream blockages 
in its prioritization of barrier retrofits in the four-county region. Mr. Engel explained that the people who 
prioritize fish passage retrofits look for those projects that generate the greatest benefit for fish habitat. 
Upstream and downstream barriers are a factor in that analysis.

Ms. Clark-Getzin reported on a $1.142 million initiative of the Washington State Association of Counties to 
evaluate methodologies for identifying and prioritizing fish passage barrier projects. She explained that some 
methodologies look at upstream and downstream habitat while others don’t. The legislature has determined 
that it needs more guidance on how to allocate state funds to other retrofit projects. This study will put forward 
some methodologies that can be used statewide to prioritize projects.

Mr. Clauson shared the experience of the West Sound Alliance, a coalition of representatives from Kitsap, 
Pierce, and Mason counties. He explained that the coalition worked together to identify mutually beneficial 
projects and then promoted those priorities jointly to the lawmakers. He noted that possibly this coalition might 
be expanded to include all the Olympic Peninsula, or some other configuration created to jointly advance 
priority regional projects and suggested this be a topic for future discussion. Mr. Engel pointed out that two of 
the projects on the list he just reviewed with the Board resulted from that effort – the $66 million SR 3 Freight 
Corridor (aka Belfair Bypass) project and the SR 305 Corridor Improvement. Vice-Chair Ashby added that the 
educational opportunity associated with the West Sound Alliance experience was very beneficial. She explained 
that they did not prioritize the projects, but each jurisdiction educated the whole group on their projects. In this 
way the whole group understood each other’s needs and how the projects worked together to accomplish their 
mutual objectives so that everyone could speak to the whole list of projects when talking with legislators.

7. PRTPO Coordination Update
Ms. Black introduced the update as a new standing agenda item for the Board. She explained that the intent is 
to keep the Board informed about on-going coordination activities in which she is participating on behalf of 
PRTPO, particularly activities that may influence issues or decisions they face as a Board or which may have 
implications for the region’s members or constituents. She advised that she will typically not speak to everything 
in the report, focusing instead on those topics that the Board wants more information.

She referenced the attached brief and advised that the monthly update will feature key highlights and links to 
additional information so that it can be easily shared with relevant staff or stakeholders. She encouraged 
members and their staff to follow up with her if they have questions or need more information on a specific 
topic. The September brief is a little longer than typical because it includes updates from the quarterly 
MPO/RTPO Coordinating Committee.

Ms. Black pointed to updates that may shape the Board’s work program in 2020. This includes two parallel 
efforts, one being an update by WSDOT of the Highway System Plan. This will be the first update since 2006. 
While it is focused on state highways, WSDOT indicated that it will be multimodal in its scope. It also appears 
that there will be an opportunity to identify programmatic needs like preservation and safety, not just 
improvement projects. There will also be an opportunity to consider off-system needs that improve highway 
system performance. The parallel effort is an initiative by the legislature to develop a statewide list of project 
needs to inform a 2021 funding package. She advised that as details of these two processes begin to emerge, 
effort will get underway within PRTPO to enable thoughtful input to the process and avoid where possible a 
rushed or uncoordinated response.
She asked if there were questions about the briefing concept in general or any topics in this first report specifically meriting discussion.

Mr. Garlington called attention to the federal funding update and the message from WSDOT that unobligated projects are at risk of losing their federal funds, including possibly the loss of county allocation authority in favor of a statewide paver program. He explained that the use of federal funds creates significant complications for project delivery that impact both cost and timing. The WSDOT Obligation Authority policy and approach seems more punitive than helpful to small local agencies faced with using those funds. He described efforts underway to allow smaller agencies to trade federal funds for state funds, concentrating federal funds on larger projects administered by large agencies and WSDOT. This opportunity is not reflected in WSDOT’s policy or approach.

Ms. Black concurred, adding that his concerns are shared across the state. She noted that this issue was identified in the Transportation Commission’s ‘WTP 2040 and Beyond’ long-range plan presented to the legislature in January. She advised that the TAC will be discussing the status of federally funded projects across the region when it meets in October. Ms. Black explained that this concern about the color of money available for projects in rural areas and small communities is an example of something that the Board may identify in early 2020 as a strategic priority of concern to communities across the region.

Chair Nesse acknowledged the arrival of Ron Allen, the Jamestown S’Klallam Tribal Chair and Chief Executive Officer. Mr. Allen greeted the Board, and welcomed everyone.

Chair Nesse turned back to the funding discussion, agreeing with Mr. Garlington’s concerns. She expressed concern about WSDOT’s expectations of moving projects faster through the project delivery process. Ms. Black advised that much of this requires hard consideration of whether to even put federal funds on a project and then being realistic about when it will actually get underway. Sometimes agencies are overly optimistic about how quickly they’ll be able to get a project obligated. When it slips from a current year to a later year in the TIP problems can arise. Ms. Black referred to the update report and noted that there are links in these blurbs to details on the WSDOT site that can provide more insights into the existing funding status of individual projects.

Vice-Chair Ashby described the PSRC process through which Kitsap County communities get their federal funding. She explained that the PSRC process requires applicants to identify the start year of their projects. In the 2020 funding process, PSRC will allocate funds for 2023 and 2024, not for 2020; those projects were selected earlier so that they will be ready to proceed in 2020. The first time PSRC implemented this process was in 2016. In that first round, over $35 million worth of projects missed their obligation deadlines. PSRC had to go through a complicated but expedited process to shuffle project funding in order to meet that obligation target on time. It was not an easy process and in order to meet the deadline, a number of planning projects were funded. Vice-Chair Ashby underscored the importance of meeting the obligation target deadlines and added that PSRC has committed to not lose any of its federal funds because of missed deadlines.

Mr. Garlington remarked that adjacent states have figured out how to concentrate their federal funds onto a smaller number of large projects and suggested that Washington could learn from those examples. Discussion ensued about the rationale behind the policy and the challenges WSDOT faces in trying to meet its own statewide funding targets. It makes investment plans based on what local agencies commit to delivering in a given year. When projects don’t advance as planned it creates the need for a last-minute scramble to keep Washington from losing federal funds to other states. Key is streamlining the administration of federal funds without diminishing the funding availability and decision-making authority currently enjoyed by regions and counties.
Mr. Clauson added that another challenge to using federal funds is that they have a time limit. Once a project gets started, it has ten years to complete. This is straightforward with a bus acquisition or plan or paver project, but it gets more complicated with construction projects that may take longer than ten years to complete. Using federal funds for design or right-of-way commits the agency to completing construction within that ten-year window. Agencies need to be confident that they will be able to secure construction funding or they may have to repay the federal funds already spent. This ten-year rule was an issue recently for Port Orchard.

Ms. Clark-Getzin noted that the Transportation Commission discussed the need to defederalize funding with Clallam County agencies on its tour of the peninsula in fall of 2018 and even included this as a key issue in its annual report. Ms. Clark-Getzin added that the legislature’s Joint Transportation Committee will be meeting in Port Angeles on October 3rd, and that this topic will be part of that discussion with lawmakers.

Mr. Sullivan asked about the opportunity to advance this with federal lawmakers like Derek Kilmer. Mr. Hall responded that this would be a very good opportunity to educate them about the challenges rural and small agencies face in using federal transportation funds. He explained that the “take back” from states not spending fast enough is a recent federal initiative that WSDOT must comply with. Federal lawmakers may be able to fix that but only if they know it is a problem. Mr. Sullivan added that federal lawmakers like to know what local agencies need. Some brief talking points could be helpful for Board members in educating their representatives. Mr. Hall concurred, adding that this kind of legislative engagement is part of the power of RTPOs when they speak with one voice on an issue like this. He concluded by noting that if the federal policy were to change this “use it or lose it” issue at the local level would go away though the rest of the challenges remain.

Chair Nesse inquired about the November meeting to be convened by Local Programs and asked if they plan to meet individually with each region. Ms. Black explained that as described, this will be a single meeting with RTPO and MPO staff for a coordinated status update and next steps. She noted that if she learns anything ahead of time that may be relevant to local agencies, she will push out an email message. Otherwise she will report back on the results of that meeting.

Ms. Black briefly reviewed the other topics on the report. Mr. Hall provided historical context for the RTPO planning funding topic. Board members affirmed that this concept will be useful in helping them to stay informed about PRTPO activities between meetings and communicate with colleagues and the public.

8. Public Comments
No members of the public were present to speak.

9. PRTPO Member Updates
Mr. Schromen-Wawrin reported that Port Angeles is completing an overlay of Laurideon Boulevard, a primary east-west corridor. The project includes pedestrian facilities and the design better reflects the community’s commitment to safe multimodal mobility.

Mr. Sullivan reported that Jefferson Transit is taking a position against I-976. The agency is concerned about the lack of information out there for people to learn what it will do and its impacts to transit services. It will prepare materials to inform local voters about the effects of this initiative. He noted that local agencies have the ability to take positions on voter issues like this as long as the follow the correct procedures.

Chair Nesse advised that the next Board meeting will be on October 18th at the Bremerton Airport and the next TAC meeting will be on October 10th at the Jamestown S’Klallam facility in Blyn. There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:53.
Dear Ms. Rubert,

This letter affirms the authority of Jefferson Transit to delegate PRTPO check signing responsibilities to appropriate staff in carrying out Lead Fiscal Agency duties on behalf of PRTPO.

An executed agreement is in place between PRTPO and Jefferson Transit Authority designating Jefferson Transit as the Lead Fiscal Agent responsible for administering financial duties outlined in the Interlocal Agreement. Those duties include making deposits and payments on behalf of PRTPO. Checking signing is integral to those duties.

This letter serves to acknowledge this check signing responsibility and certify Jefferson Transit’s authority to assign this responsibility to designated staff tasked with administering PRTPO’s fiscal needs.

Thank you for your important contribution as Lead Fiscal Agency in supporting PRTPO’s activities.

Sincerely,

Annette Nesse
Chair, PRTPO Executive Board
ACTION ITEM

To: PRTPO Executive Board  
From: Thera Black  
Subject: Select PRTPO Website Home Page Banner

REQUESTED ACTION:

Identify a preferred PRTPO website banner design.

Overview

In transitioning the old PRTPO website to its new location hosted by Kitsap Transit, an overhaul of the home page banner is warranted. Kitsap Transit’s graphic design team developed two concepts which are presented on the next page. Kitsap Transit’s IT department requests guidance from the Board as to a preferred design.

Upon the Board’s approval the PRTPO home page will be updated with the new banner.

For More Information:

Thera Black | 360.878.0353 | thera@3ptransport.com
The Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization is . . .

The Regional Transportation Planning Organization for Clallam, Jefferson, Mason and Kitsap Counties, located in Northwestern Washington State on the Olympic Peninsula. We are a voluntary association of cities, towns, counties, ports, tribes, transit agencies and major employers that work together to develop transportation plans designed to meet the region's future economic and population growth.
AGENDA ITEM 5

DISCUSSION ITEM

To: PRTPO Executive Board  
From: Thera Black  
Subject: Discussion of Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040 Outreach and Next Steps

REQUESTED ACTION:

No action. This update is for your information and discussion.

Overview

Public review and comment on the draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040 got underway on September 3rd and concludes with the Board’s meeting on October 18th. At that time edits will be made to the draft plan and presented to the TAC for review and recommendation in November followed by Board review and approval on November 15th. This Board meeting is an opportunity to review comments received to date and to discuss a proposed approach for responding to them within the RTP and overall PRTPO planning process.

As noted in September, the public review process convened with an open house in each of the four counties. A second follow-up meeting was held on October 9th with the Mason County TIP-CAP, a citizen advisory board whose September meeting was on the same night as the RTP open house. The TIP-CAP discussion built upon comments that have already been received and are integrated into themes highlighted in the public review process. A summary of comments and themes from the open houses is included followed by the raw comments we’ve received.

Discussion

Final revisions will be made to the plan before it is presented to the TAC and Board for final review in November. The Board’s October discussion will provide useful insight as to the best approach for completing those revisions.

The substantive nature of the comments received suggest that people are looking for a more ambitious direction than what is presented in the draft plan that has been out for review. Adequately responding to such substantive observations at this stage of the process is difficult. Topics address major issues that PRTPO has not yet discussed or taken a position on. Some of these are consequential and could shape policy or investment decisions in the future.

As presented, the draft plan requires little change to satisfy state planning requirements. In light of these considerations and the nature of the transition phase that PRTPO is concluding, we propose that final edits to the draft document focus on correcting any errors that may be in the plan and explain in Chapter 7 how the substantive comments are being addressed.

Those substantive comments will provide the starting point for strategic planning activities the Board will engage in starting in 2020. They merit broader consideration than merely adding a sentence or two to the plan. They are a logical springboard for the consequential issues and opportunities the Board will identify and evaluate in defining a strategic regional direction. Results of that strategic planning process will then inform the PRTPO work program going forward and can provide the framework for a future rewrite of the long-range plan.

There are several benefits to this approach.

- Completion of an updated plan before year end that satisfies state compliance requirements
It will create momentum for regionally determined initiatives that address mutual issues and opportunities
It can demonstrate how public feedback directly informs regional policy discussion and direction
It would provide the Board, TAC, and other stakeholders with more time to delve into substantive topics before determining a regional position or priority without delaying completion of the current draft plan
It illustrates the iterative nature of the long-range plan and the short-range work program, and how one informs the other in a comprehensive regional planning process

The TAC discussed this approach at its October 10th meeting after reviewing comments to date. TAC members have concerns about some aspects of the plan, such as the finance chapter, that were not fully resolved in the public review draft. They recognize that creating an opportunity for in-depth regional engagement can yield more benefit than trying to “fix” the draft plan. The long-range plan and the regional planning process are iterative processes, and the existing draft plan can serve as a catalyst for the next evolution of that process.

The discussion of strategic planning opportunities in 2020 generated interest, but it was also met with some cautionary notes that the regional plan cannot get too far out ahead of local Comprehensive Plans and the update cycles that they are on. As that regional process progresses in 2020, coordination with members will be important to ensure local, regional, and state plans continue to work together in a consistent manner to advance regional priorities.

Next Steps

The Board is asked to review and discuss the range of comments generated by the draft plan and whether the proposed approach makes sense at this time. If the approach is generally favorable, staff will address a relatively short punch list of quick corrections to the plan and explain in Chapter 7 the bigger themes and how they will be addressed in the regional planning process. That final draft will be presented in November to the TAC for final recommendation and to the Board for final approval. The Board’s draft 2020 work program will show how the substantive input is incorporated into the strategic planning activities. Efforts on that would get underway at the Board’s first meeting in 2020.

If instead the preference is to try to tackle the big topics as a part of the final revisions, we would likely not have a draft ready for final review in November. Instead, we would petition WSDOT for an extension which they have already indicated they would likely grant. The TAC and Board work program in the first part of 2020 would focus then on revising the plan to incorporate substantive changes. This may trigger another round of public review. Once the plan is adopted in spring or early summer, the Board’s attention could then redirect to new activities.

For More Information:
Thera Black | 360.878.0353 | thera@3ptransport.com
Big Ideas Not Addressed in the Draft Plan – Discussion Themes from the Public Meetings

- The draft plan is woefully inadequate in its consideration of and response to climate change. Recognize, though, that climate change emphasis can still generate strong negative sentiment in some communities. Focusing on system resiliency and increasing travel choice can be a more effective way of getting broad support for critical measures without alienating those for whom this is a politicized topic.

- Efficient, connected inter-regional transit service on Sundays is key to increasing tourism and other travel by means other than driving. Don’t forget to emphasize the importance of intercity route connectivity – it is hard for people to rely more on transit without these connections.

- There are inherent conflicts between reliable and efficient freight mobility and the ability to create a walkable, people-centric downtown environment that will require innovative strategies to resolve.

- Communities with limited ingress/egress routes are particularly vulnerable when one of those routes fails due to slides or a serious crash. The region has a wealth of public ports and boat launch facilities. It would be prudent to think about how these facilities may be pressed into service on short notice to provide emergency access and services to isolated communities when US 101 is ruptured in one or more locations or SR 3 sloughs off into Hood Canal.

- It is useful to plan for electric vehicles but remember that we are planning for a highly rural region. Do not put forward punitive measures that punish people who don’t or can’t drive electric vehicles. Recognize that electric vehicles also have an impact on the environment – dams that provide clean hydroelectricity have negative impacts on salmon and that ecosystem.

- The region should be proactive in trying to attract new mobility partners like ride-share companies or electric vehicle sharing programs.

- Intersection safety is a region-wide issue.

- Concerns about equitable access were raised as well as the effects of travel costs on housing affordability and opportunity.

- The region has an opportunity to think about rural resiliency in a comprehensive way, for example, adopting agreed-upon standards regionally that require new signals to include uninterruptable power packs that will continue to function for a long time after the power is out.

- People were interested in learning about PRTPO and the nature of coordinated regional planning, and expressed support for more opportunities for public collaboration and participation.

- Kitsap County surfaced in all meetings as an important part of the region with facilities, services, and issues that have effects regionwide.

- Completion of the Discovery Trail and extending the regional non-motorized network from that network backbone supports local and regional economic vitality. Focus more on multi-use facilities like the Olympic Discovery Trail and other paved routes than on off-road mountain bike facilities. In terms of all-around regional mobility needs, these paved facilities provide more beneficial utility than primitive off-road facilities.

- Partnerships and collaboration as a means of getting things done – this was a recurring theme in every meeting.

In addition to the following comments submitted by email or directly at the meetings, one comment came in through Kitsap Transit’s Facebook page:

We need a better way to move about the Peninsula other than by car or transit bus. It would be great if a conversation about a train or other form of rail system was included in the conversation. [John Garrison]
WHAT DO YOU THINK?

Mobility – the ability to get from here to there and back again – is critically important to so many of our broader regional objectives like economic vitality, community livability, and environmental health. The region’s transportation system will face big challenges in the next couple of decades. These challenges that will test the resilience of the region and its communities, and the ability of our transportation system to support our broader objectives.

- Deferred preservation leads to system deterioration and makes it more vulnerable to failures, but there isn’t enough money to keep up with preservation needs.
- Uneven economic opportunities push people to commute ever further to earn a living, straining household expenses and increasing demand for new mobility services.
- Extreme weather events and earthquakes will undermine our infrastructure, disrupt services, and possibly displace some existing homes and businesses.
- Deployment of new transportation technologies will change how we think about mobility and access to services, but those opportunities won’t be equally available to all communities.

These are just some of the things we’re thinking about. What do you think we should be considering as we look ahead to 2040 and beyond? Please take a few minutes to share your ideas about the issues and opportunities you think merit a regional approach and the challenges we face. We want to know what you think. Thank you!!

- Continued improvement in access from P.A. to ferry terminals (Kitsap/Bainbridge) that do NOT involve use of passengers on (i.e. buses, Rapid Transit, etc)
- Improved bike lanes + finishing Discovery Trail to Forks/Enfield on all things
- Electric Ferry? P.A. - Port Townsend - Edmonds?
  (Passenger only to save weight?)
- Electric Car Charging Stations around complete loop

Reference Map of the Peninsula RTPO Region
YOUR PERSPECTIVE ON REGIONAL MOBILITY ISSUES
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- Uneven economic opportunities push people to commute ever further to earn a living, straining household expenses and increasing demand for new mobility services.
- Extreme weather events and earthquakes will undermine our infrastructure, disrupt services, and possibly displace some existing homes and businesses.
- Deployment of new transportation technologies will change how we think about mobility and access to services, but those opportunities won't be equally available to all communities.

These are just some of the things we're thinking about. What do you think we should be considering as we look ahead to 2040 and beyond? Please take a few minutes to share your ideas about the issues and opportunities you think merit a regional approach and the challenges we face. We want to know what you think. Thank you!!

Truck route or cross town route through Port Angeles east toward Sequim. Morse Creek is only route between Sequim and Port Angeles. Increase redundancy in transportation network.
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- Deployment of new transportation technologies will change how we think about mobility and access to services, but those opportunities won’t be equally available to all communities.

These are just some of the things we’re thinking about. What do you think we should be considering as we look ahead to 2040 and beyond? Please take a few minutes to share your ideas about the issues and opportunities you think merit a regional approach and the challenges we face. We want to know what you think. Thank you!!
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Thera Black

From: Edward Coviello <EdwardC@KitsapTransit.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 10, 2019 8:52 AM
To: edavidt Tk
Subject: RE: Peninsula Regional Transportation Plan 2040

Good morning Dave,

We have recorded your concerns. We will brief our Executive Board in September and make our best efforts to incorporate this into the current Plan.

I do appreciate the time you have taken to construct the email below. Your comments are a measure that will influence not only this version of the Plan but future versions as well.

Ed

Edward Coviello, AICP
Kitsap Transit
60 Washington Ave, Suite 200
Bremerton WA, 98337
360-824-4919

From: edavidt Tk [mailto:edavidt@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 07, 2019 9:37 AM
To: Edward Coviello
Subject: Peninsula Regional Transportation Plan 2040

Dear Edward,

Thanks so much for the Open House in Port Townsend last week. It was great to meet everyone and get a chance to get updated on your work. Subsequent to the Open House, I reviewed your draft plan 2040. I did not read the entire draft in detail, so I may have missed something. However, I want to offer some feedback. Thanks for reading.

The first thing I noticed that the document lacked an emphasis on "data driven decision making." That I see that some data was referenced in the document in terms of planning. And that data helped shape some of the conceptual framework of the document. But what I did not see was a mandate, or at least a strong encouragement that data be a driving force in day to day, month to month, and year to year decision making. This data would include traffic studies (flow and frequency data), as well as surveys. Survey data goes way beyond just surveying transit users because one obvious goal is to get current non users out of their vehicles and onto transit, bicycles and other alternatives. And good survey data is very difficult to obtain. But it is not impossible, and it will go a long way in transforming any system involving human services into a more useful and productive system. Traffic data will help planners re think routes, and be able to offer incentives to move more people out of their cars. Finally, carbon emission data analysis would offer a clear path to decisions that reduce carbon emissions.

Secondly, I noticed a complete lack of any discussion whatsoever on carbon reduction. Carbon dioxide (and its connection to transportation) is the fundamental challenge for our region, the nation and the planet, at the moment. Yet, it is not even mentioned in this document.
One page 1, under a graphic, I found the following text:

"The primary objective of the Peninsula RTPO is to facilitate cooperative decision-making by the agencies within the region in order to bring about a coordinated and comprehensive transportation planning process. It seeks to ensure that all local plans are coordinated and consistent with the regional plan. This is accomplished through the participation of all jurisdictions in the technical analysis and policy approvals of the plan."

My alternative would be “The primary objective of the Peninsula RTPO is to facilitate cooperative decision-making by the agencies within the region in order to prioritize carbon reductions as part of the transportation planning process. It seeks to ensure that all local plans similarly focus on carbon reduction and are coordinated and consistent with the regional plan. This is accomplished through the participation of all jurisdictions in the technical analysis and policy approvals of the plan.”

On page 3, the first bullet should address climate change and carbon reduction.

On page 5, the first point should be “address carbon reductions.”

The statement on Page 8: “The transportation system in the region efficiently and safely connects people and goods with places, offering choices, and ensuring accessibility. This vision emphasizes a long-term quality of life by promoting economic growth, recreational resources, community services, active transport, and public transit.” should be replaced with “The transportation system in the region efficiently and safely connects people and goods with places, offering choices, and ensuring accessibility with low carbon alternatives. This vision emphasizes a healthy outlook for our region and the planet, and long-term quality of life by promoting economic growth, recreational resources, community services, active transport, and public transit.”

I could go on. In short, the entire plan needs to be re written with carbon reduction as the core and over riding theme. The current focus of the plan sounds like a “compliance” documents. In the meantime, the most fundamental threat to humanity, and the world’s biota, climate breakdown, is at hand. Transportation in Jefferson County contributes at least 39% of the carbon here, and this plan does not even mention climate or CO2.

Please consider re writing this document with an emphasis on reducing carbon as the primary focus. We cannot afford to wait until after 2014 to bring carbon reductions and climate breakdown into our regional plan.

Thanks so much.

Dave Thielk
611 Rose Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368
360-301-6005
Good afternoon Scott,

Thank you for taking the time to review the draft RTP and suggest improvements. We will log your comments for our Board to review. Please do not hesitate to add to your comments between now and October.

Sincerely,
Ed

Hi Edward,

The plan looks very good on paper with its inclusion, finally after many years without, of active transportation goals. Funding those goals is always the crux. It’s somewhat of a zero sum equation: the more we fund for motor vehicle transportation facilities, the less convenient, safe, and inviting active modes become. Much of the document is taken up by motor vehicle facility planning, though there is the possibility of instead investing deeply in active transportation and transit. Plus, we know now that congestion relief and safety improvements for motor vehicles results in more motor vehicle use. Thus, it would appear this plan does little to nothing to reduce vmt as required by

**RCW 47.01.440: Adoption of statewide goals to reduce annual VMT,**

which is the only way to reduce the 40% of GHG emissions from transportation sources and ultimately address the looming climate chaos.

Otherwise, as a document, it’s very good looking.

Scott G. Walker
Good morning Fran,

Thank you for reaching out to us. I will document your concerns.

I’ll keep you posted as to the status of your comments in the coming months.

We plan to brief our Executive Board in September of all the comments received. Keep an eye on our website for the meeting agendas at: https://prtpo.kitsaptransit.com/meetings.htm

Sincerely,

Ed

Edward Coviello, AICP
Kitsap Transit
60 Washington Ave, Suite 200
Bremerton WA, 98337
360-824-4919

Hello Edward -
The email below are comments I wanted to voice. My last paragraph addresses comments on this in particular issue from the draft:
"The long-term expectation for this regional active transportation system is that it will provide a practical alternative to a road based trip thereby reducing vehicles miles traveled and promoting public health.
Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization
Active travel is
further enhanced within the region through transit and park-and-ride facilities at convenient intervals along the state highway system that facilitate and expedite a seamless and convenient change of mode between walking, bicycling, transit, and auto."

My comment:
"Lastly we need COST-EFFECTIVE shuttles to trail heads. I have been advocating for this since I moved here. Perhaps the Elwha Tribe could partner with Clallam Transit to provide a shuttle to Salt Creek, Spruce Railroad, and other trails that the bus does not reach. Currently Jamestown partners with CTS to provide a shuttle to Jamestown Campus, the same could be done with the Elwha (if pick up was at their store it would boost
business). This may also boost the tourist economy. Other regions that offer shuttles have found it very popular - in fact many have had to increase trips to accommodate passengers! This is probably a seasonal suggestion for the peninsula.

Thank you,
Fran Mason

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: Fran Mason <piptrade@yahoo.com>
To: "LSWawrin@cityofpa.us" <LSWawrin@cityofpa.us>
Sent: Thursday, August 29, 2019, 5:34:43 PM PDT
Subject: Re: 2040 Regional Transportation Plan Open House Flyer

Hello Lindsey-

I received this email from Olympic Climate Action - alas, I will not be able to attend this meeting - I would need to leave at 5:00 to connect with the bus for home.
I am hoping you will voice my concerns for me!

First did you receive the letter from the last Clallam Transit meeting asking for later bus service? Kevin (manager) received the original and I gave a copy to Mark Ozias who was chairman of the transit board. It was signed by nearly 200 people in this area and I think it needs to be addressed - I do have a copy if needed, but hopefully Mark or Kevin still have that letter.

Second we need to boost bus ridership in the area and that could be accomplished by offering incentives. Transit companies (or city councils!) could partner with local businesses to offer discounts or such - or free dessert, free popcorn - if person shows proof of riding the bus. Bus drivers could hand a slip to passengers. For example many people from Highland Commons eat at the cafeteria at Olympic Medical Center - the bus picks up at Melody Lane and stops at the Medical Center. A 10% discount may incentivise people to leave their car at home and ride the bus.

Lastly we need COST-EFFECTIVE shuttles to trail heads. I have been advocating for this since I moved here. Perhaps the Elwha Tribe could partner with Clallam Transit to provide a shuttle to Salt Creek, Spruce Railroad, and other trails that the bus does not reach. Currently Jamestown partners with CTS to provide a shuttle to Jamestown Campus, the same could be done with the Elwha (if pick up was at their store it would boost business). This may also boost the tourist economy. Other regions that offer shuttles have found it very popular - in fact many have had to increase trips to accommodate passengers! This is probably a seasonal suggestion for the peninsula.

Thank you - I hope you bring attention to these issues at the meeting!

One less car-

Fran Mason

On Thursday, August 29, 2019, 12:02:13 AM PDT, OlyClimate <olyclimate@olyclimate.org> wrote:

From: Lindsey Schromen-Wawrin <LSWawrin@cityofpa.us>

Next Tuesday in Port Angeles and Wednesday in Port Townsend is an open house for the Peninsula Transportation Plan (for both the Olympic Peninsula and Kitsap Peninsula). This is the big picture long term plan for how transportation (all transportation, not just buses) will work on the peninsulas, so it is a great place for people to come and voice the need for more greenhouse gas emission mitigation measures in our transportation system (which second to our forestry practices is the largest source of CO2 on the Olympic Peninsula).

Note that these meeting times are likely bus-accessible.
Please spread the word about them.

Thank you,

Lindsey Schromen-Wawrin
Port Angeles City Council
(360) 406-4321

NOTICE: This email and any attachments may be subject to disclosure as a public record under the Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56.

The Draft RTP is posted on the PRTPO website.
https://prtpo.kitsaptransit.com/default.htm
Edward Coviello, AICP
Kitsap Transit
60 Washington Ave, Suite 200
Bremerton WA, 98337
360-824-4919

NOTICE: This email and any attachments may be subject to disclosure as a public record under the Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56
Ed,

Thank you for soliciting comments on the draft 2040 Regional Transportation Plan. After reviewing the plan, I have a few comments.

It is great that the four county region works collaboratively on planning for the long term for transportation. However, I was surprised that the plan does not mention the large role that transportation has in generating greenhouse gases in the regional area, nor the threat of climate change to the regional transportation system. Jefferson County did a greenhouse gas inventory based on 2005 data a while ago, and transportation was 39% of the carbon footprint. That was at a time when Puget Sound Energy provided electricity to most of the county, which had a higher greenhouse gas footprint than the BPA electricity that is now supplied. It is likely that the percent of greenhouse gases from transportation is even higher now.

The increased urgency of reducing greenhouse gases worldwide is a well established fact, and was most recently described in the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change reports. And it certainly is acknowledged by our governor. There is work going on across this regional area regarding climate change, including with the Jefferson County / Port Townsend Climate Action Committee, in Clallam County, etc. It is time to call a spade a spade and include climate change language in the Regional Transportation Plan, and note the large role transportation has in the opportunity to reduce our regional carbon footprint.

Similarly, the risks of climate change to this regional transportation plan are considerable, and I strongly recommend that any long term plan of regional transportation include this in the analysis. WSDOT has studied the impacts of climate change on the state highway system, and that is a good starting point. There is also a Planning for Climate Change on the North Olympic Peninsula report that identified additional secondary roads that were vulnerable to climate impacts. I am one of the co-authors on that study.

A broader greenhouse gas view in this transportation plan would likely lead to more consideration of electric vehicles as one strategy for helping reduce greenhouse gases across the region, both for individual vehicles as well as fleets, buses, etc. Incentives and charging stations for these could be considered in this plan. WSDOT's effort to electrify our ferry system could also be mentioned. And the climate view increases the need for active transportation to be well integrated into our regional transportation system.

I also believe that a review of the latest software technology regarding ridesharing, and promoting it across the region, should be considered as a way to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) trips. With the number of people driving to the ferry terminals from the region, a good rideshare app could help pair drivers and passengers in real time to reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle trips.

Thank you for considering this input.
Cindy Jayne

(Current chair of the Jefferson County / Port Townsend Climate Action Committee, and member of Local 20/20 Climate Action, but these comments are my own.)
Dear Edward,

I attended the recent PRTPO Open House in Port Townsend, where it was helpful to have the opportunity to speak with DOT representatives and ask questions.

As a nurse practitioner, my primary interest in transportation is fueled by a desire to improve public health.

Considering that the destruction of our climate is the greatest threat to public health and that transportation is responsible for 42% of Washington state's GHG emissions and over half of that is from "road gasoline use", I expected to see GHG reduction strategies as one of the plan’s goals. However, there was no real mention of the impact of transportation on climate destruction at all, only oblique references to promoting environmental health.

Although increasing the transportation modes of walking, biking and transit would most significantly reduce GHG emissions and improve public health, and are referred to several times in the plan, the funding to accomplish the desired changes is almost completely lacking. Not funding transportation for modes other than cars seems particularly odd for Washington state as governor Inslee stated in June 2019 "I will make defeating climate change the number one priority of my administration."

We have a very short amount of time to reverse the effects of man made climate destruction. We know that promoting electric cars is not enough and that we must make every change possible.

I strongly encourage you rewrite this plan to make GHG reduction and public health improvement its first priority.

Respectfully,

Rebecca Kimball ARNP
REQUESTED ACTION:

No action. This update is for your information. Topics of interest identified by the Board will be discussed at the meeting.

The Month in Review

SR 3 Freight Corridor/Belfair Bypass — PRTPO was represented at the Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting #2 on September 24th for this regionally significant project by John Clauson and Thera Black. This meeting was intended to be strictly an advisory group meeting but about three dozen members of the public also attended with questions and concerns. The consultant team reviewed the project purpose, underscoring that regional mobility is its primary purpose, and presenting a status update on forecast analysis and modeling. They discussed consideration of the north and south endpoint connections. Decisions regarding the southern terminus are of keen concern to the adjacent neighborhood. The consultant team offered to meet separately with staff interested in technical details about forecasting and growth assumptions, directional splits and traffic patterns once a new corridor is opened, and how freight forecasts were developed and considered in the analysis.


FY 2019 Federal Funding Obligation Status — in preparation for the TAC discussion on October 10th about Obligation Authority we talked with Local Programs staff who confirmed that all local projects in the region that were due to obligate by September 30th or risk losing their funds successfully met the obligation deadline. Congratulations!

The Outlook

- OPEN HOUSE ANNOUNCED – THURSDAY, OCTOBER 17 – SR 3 FREIGHT CORRIDOR PROJECT (“Belfair Bypass”)
  
  WSDOT announced an open house for public review of early investigation for the SR 3 Freight Corridor. The open house will be in the Commons at North Mason High School and will run from 5:30 – 7:30 pm.

- We anticipate a meeting in November convened by WSDOT Local Programs to address the state’s position on federal funding Obligation Authority and the status of at-risk funds. That date has not yet been set.

- We are scheduling a Title VI training session with the WSDOT Title VI coordinator. At the state’s request we have expanded the PRTPO training to include all four transit agencies in the region. We expect this training to take place in mid-December before the Christmas holidays. If any local agency staff are interested in joining the training session, please let me know.
Of Possible Interest to PRTPO Members

There will be a free regional training workshop hosted by the Federal Planning Division of the American Planning Association in collaboration with the Federal Lands office in Portland on November 25 and 26. The workshop is intended to improve coordination and collaboration among federal, state, and local agencies, particularly in areas where there are large federal land tracts such as the Olympic National Park / National Forest. The workshop is organized around three different tracks including public process, new planning products, and transformative technologies. Nominations for presentations are also being solicited. While attendance is free, registration is required. The attached flyer provides more detailed information.

For More Information:

Thera Black  |  360.878.0353  |  thera@3ptransport.com
The Federal Planning Division (FPD) of the American Planning Association (APA) is pleased to host the fourth regional training workshop to provide a venue for participants to share their planning successes and concerns with colleagues from tribal nations as well as federal, state, and local agencies in a focused way that provides opportunities for learning, dialogue, and collaboration. In previous regional workshops, participants considered the theme of interagency collaboration for sustainable landscapes (Denver, 2011), interagency collaboration in changing political, economic, and regulatory environments (Washington DC, 2016), and a variety of federal planning issues related to resiliency and development (San Diego, 2017). We now hope to examine transformative models for planning federal lands.

To be transformative is to cause change. Planners working with and for federal agencies are stewards of our national lands and they have opportunities to create change in many areas. They can craft new ways to manage federal lands - from regional river ecosystems to remote military installations. They can develop new ways to engage a distracted yet oftentimes vocal public. And they can create new methods of analytics to ensure technology is harnessed for the public good. Of course, these changes occur today within the context of limited fiscal resources, intense public sentiment, and evolutionary climate change.

While federal agencies have different agendas and visions, they may benefit from the application of similar transformational strategies. Moreover, when agendas intersect, as is the case today with the federal focus on sustainability, resiliency, energy-efficiency, and resource conservation, understating ways in which positive transformation can occur becomes a way to succeed together.
About the workshop

In this FPD Regional Workshop, planners who work with and for federal, state, and local agencies will have opportunities to share their stories and learn from their colleagues. The workshop will attract an interdisciplinary and interagency group of participants from around the region working in related disciplines including planning, engineering, ecology, biology, cultural and natural resource management, architecture, landscape architecture, and environmental studies. They will deliver presentations related to the following three tracks:

**Track 1. Reframing Public Processes**

From the planning of national parks to the restoration of urban brownfields, planners use public processes to develop plans, prepare budgets, write policies, construct projects, and engage with the public. How have planners reframed their processes to more closely align with the public’s interests and the changing needs of federal landscapes? What processes do planners use that best attract public engagement? Where are examples of successful processes in the past? How do we start or improve them? What can we learn from what they embarked on their own efforts? Who has been leading the federal government in terms of new processes and what do they have to teach us? How can planners move beyond “analytical paralysis” in their processes and create something meaningful and useful to guide the stewardship of public lands? Presentations in this track will focus on unique, innovative, and creative planning processes used at any scale that address ways to better manage federal lands.

**Track 2. Revolutionary Planning Products**

In the past, planners have been known at times to produce voluminous reports that simply collect data on some obscure shell in a remote corner of a federal building. Text-heavy documents, cumbersome fold-outs, and boring graphics do little to spark interest and even less to convey the compelling stories of success when it comes to planning federal lands. What are the original and engaging approaches to dissemination in this new era dominated by social media and digital devices? How have planners crafted compelling and clear products to tell their stories in ways that attract interest, support, and funding? What opportunities and limitations exist with the use of digital media, websites, social media, photorealistic imagery, and the increasing reliance on GIS mapping to produce planning products? In this track, we invite planners to question the typical mode of production or to at least critique examples of planning products in constructive and educational ways.

**Track 3. Transformative Technologies**

Amazon, Google, Apple, and many other major corporations use data analytics to document, track, and forecast trends in their worlds. The resulting statistics can be both enlightening and, at times, frightening. But as Mark Twain reminded us, there are liars, damn liars, and statisticians. While Mr. Twain was perhaps rightly skeptical of the use and interpretation of data to make an argument, planners cannot afford to neglect the power of data analytics and other technologies to inform and support their own work. How can planners use technology to better balance public access demands on federal lands where resource development is likely? How can data analytics help planners model the value of ecosystem services such as flood storage, carbon sequestration, and biodiversity? How can data analytics be used to improve asset management methodologies? Presentations in this track should explore these questions and others as they relate to the use of technology to transform the conservation and use of federal lands.

Submission Requirements

**Key Dates**

Deadline for abstract submission: October 24, 2019

Acceptance letter for abstracts (via email): October 28, 2019

Workshop: November 25, 2019, 8:00am to 6:30pm

**Workshop Location**

The Edith Green-Wendell Wyatt Federal Building (LEED Platinum)

**Workshop Fee**

None

**Workshop Organizing Committee**

Mark L. Gillem, PhD, FAICP, FAAI, Workshop Chair; University of Oregon and The Urban Collaborative

Paula Loomis, PhD, FAIA, FSAE, AICP, LEED AP, GPG, Workshop Co-Chair, The Urban Collaborative

Holly Workman, AICP, Workshop Coordinator; The Urban Collaborative

Jenny Zieken, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

R. Brett James, MLA, AICP, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

Rena Schlachter, AICP, NASA

Steve Lettau, RLA, GISP, LEED GA, Onyx Group

Kim Leitl, RLA, ENVI SP, INS

Todd Buchanan, P.E., PM, GEO Consultants Corp

L. Leonard Webber, PLA, Stanley Consultants

Shawn Frearcombe, Idaho State University

Gary Archin, AICP, Naval Special Warfare Command

Travis Willer, Joint Base Langley-Eustis

**Workshop Sponsors**

The APA Federal Planning Division (confirmed)

Oregon Chapter of the APA (tentative)

Oregon Chapter of the American Institute of Architects (tentative)

Oregon Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects (tentative)

Portland State University (tentative)

Oregon State University (tentative)

The University of Oregon (confirmed)

**Submission Requirements**

Anyone interested in submitting a proposal must do so in Microsoft Word format. The submission must include the following items:

1. A presentation title of no more than 20 words
2. The presenter’s name, title, agency affiliation, email, and phone number
3. An abstract of no more than 300 words that describes how the presentation meets AICP Certification Maintenance requirements

**Justification for AICP Certification Maintenance (CM) Credit**

Criteria for the Content of CM activities: The content of CM activities must be designed to 1) meet a specific planning-related training objective; 2) teach subject matter in an appropriate depth and scope for the level of the typical AICP member; 3) be relevant and useful to practitioners of planning and public policy; 4) address demonstrated educational needs of AICP members; 5) be non-promotional in nature – program content must be unbaised – an organization’s services or products may be discussed prior to or after the completion of the CM credit portion of the activity; 6) address demonstrated educational needs of AICP members; and 5) communicate a clearly identifiable educational purpose or objective. If participants would like their presentations to fulfill the AICP Ethics or Law requirements, please contact the Workshop Coordinator:

Criteria for the delivery of CM activities, CM activities must be led by one or more experts on the subject matter discussed during the activity. An expert as defined by the AICP is a professional who has made a contribution to the profession through practice, teaching, research or publications; completed works that proclaim individuality and mastery of the principles of planning taught; and whose work demonstrates outstanding originality and professionalism. CM activities must use learning methodologies and formats that are appropriate to the activity’s educational purpose or objectives. The delivery of CM activities must involve the use of materials that do not include any proprietary information. Materials used during the CM credit portion of the activity must be solely for educational purposes.

The delivery of CM activities must be timed in a manner that is consistent with the time for which the activity was registered. The delivery of CM activities must include an announcement in which AICP members are notified that their attendance is required for the duration of the activity in order to receive CM credit.

Individual presentations will be allotted 15-minutes maximum. Sessions will consist of presentations followed by a question-answer period.

Interested presenters shall email the completed proposal to Interested presenters shall email the completed proposal to the Workshop Coordinator: Holly Workman, AICP (holly@urbancollaborative.com)

Following a blind peer-review process, presentations may be accepted for delivery at the workshop. All presentations must be in English. All presentations will be submitted to the American Planning Association for approval for continuing education credit. It is expected that attendees will be eligible for up to 8 hours of CM credit over the course of the workshop.

The workshop is open to presenters and non-presenters. Contributions whose presentations are accepted must pre-register for the workshop and prepare their presentation for delivery using Microsoft PowerPoint software. Participants who wish to attend but not present, must preregister as well.

Please note that expenses associated with hotel accommodations, travel, and additional excursions are not covered and must be paid directly.

**Questions**

Please use the following information when making inquiries regarding the workshop:

FDL OR 2019, 800 Williamette, Suite 700, Eugene, OR 97401
Phone: 925.389.6177 Fax: 510.892.2953
E-mail: holly@urbancollaborative.com
Website: https://www.planning.org/divisions/federal/portland