PRTPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

November 7, 2019 | 10:00 – 12:00
Kitsap Transit
60 Washington Ave, Suite 200
Bremerton WA, 98337

1. 10:00 – 10:05  Chair’s Welcome and Introductions

2. 10:05 – 10:10  Approval of Agenda
Action
Approval of Minutes from October 10, 2019 (Attachment)
Wendy Clark-Getzin

3. 10:10 – 10:30  DRAFT 2040 PRTPO Regional Transportation Plan (Attachment)  The Draft Plan is scheduled to present to the Executive Board on November 15th. The Draft Plan is available at https://prtpo.kitsaptransit.com/default.htm
Action
Thera Black

4. 10:30 – 11:15  Transportation Alternatives Grant Process (Attachment)  BRIEFING
PRTP0 staff will provide an update on the available funding and schedule to begin the Grant Process
PRTP0 Staff

5. 11:15 – 11:45  Input on Draft 2020 Legislative Focus Areas (Attachment)  DISCUSSION
For the last several years PRTPO has developed a list of legislative priorities – generally projects and statements of program support developed with input from the TAC. We are updating the 2019 list for next year’s session information
Thera Black

6. 11:45 – 11:55  2020 Meeting Schedule (Attachment)  DISCUSSION
PRTP0 Staff

7. 11:55 – 12:00  Member Updates and Adjourn  DISCUSSION
Wendy Clark-Getzin

Parking Passes are attached to the meeting email notice. Please park in the Kitsap Transit designated parking area on level P1.  We encourage utilization remote meeting connection or public transit connections. Information is below:

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.
https://global.gotomeeting.com/join/859308653

You can also dial in using your phone.
United States: +1 (312) 757-3121

Access Code: 859-308-653 New to GoToMeeting? Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:
https://global.gotomeeting.com/install/859308653
Welcome & Introductions

TAC Chair Wendy Clark-Getzin opened the meeting and initiated self-introductions around the table.

Approval of October 10, 2019 TAC Agenda and the August 8th TAC Meeting Minutes
The TAC approved the draft minutes from the August 8th meeting.
Update on Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040 Outreach

Thera Black gave a detailed update of the outreach completed thus far. She noted the public comment period is open until October 18th.

Comments have been received regarding climate change, greenhouse gas emissions, statewide goal of reduced vehicle miles traveled and the need to balance the Plans message in regards to the diversity of the Region. The PRTPO staff reached out to the Mason County TIP-CAP and the TIP-CAP noted the need for system resiliency as much of the Region has limited access to transportation choices. Additional comments received were regarding interregional transit connections to facilitate simple transit options to reach destinations in the Region without the need to drive. There is recognition of the need for Sunday transit service to allow the Region’s tourism to thrive. Without Sunday service, the ability to access the National Park, ferries and local attractions is nearly impossible without a car. Waterway connections were highlighted as an underutilized mode of transportation given the amount of ports in the Region.

The PRTPO staff informed the TAC of the intent to conduct minor revisions to the current draft Regional Transportation Plan. However, many of the comments received need to be addressed by the Executive Board at a strategic level to properly address in a substantive method. This method will establish a foundation for a new Regional Transportation Plan.

The comments received will be presented for consideration to the Executive Board on the 18th of October. The corrected Plan will be brought before the TAC at its November 7th meeting for recommendation to move towards adoption by the Executive Board.

David Forte asked a question about the 2020 update and the local Comprehensive Plan update schedules. Thera explained that the Comprehensive Plans can feed off of the RTP as needed. David noted that the next RTP is planned as a major update and that may impact the local plans. Thera described the planning process and how the plans are being updated to feed each other. David again highlighted that the Regional Transportation Plan should be in step with the Comprehensive Plans in the Region to the extent possible. Chair Clark-Getzin noted that there could be some redundancy of the public processes. Thera described how the RTP is linked to the Comprehensive Planning process. David cautioned the TAC about how the RTP could have an impact on the Comprehensive Planning process and the PRTPO should be careful about this. Thera acknowledged this, especially the link to the Growth Management Act.

Chair Clark-Getzin noted that transits Transportation Development Plans also impact the Region. She also asked what local staff should be doing in the next few days to prepare their Board members for the Executive Board meeting on the 18th. Thera reiterated the strategy to be presented to the Executive Board.

Chair Clark-Getzin explained how the finance chapter is the weak link in the RTP. Thera proposed that the Plan will satisfy the State requirement at this time but there is room for improvement.

Further discussion occurred regarding improved outreach techniques.
Upcoming Transportation Alternatives Grant Process

Edward gave an update of the potential funding available. He explained that we need to meet with WSDOT local programs to confirm the amount of funds available. Thera then gave an overview of the funding process and the need to gain a clear picture from WSDOT to ensure we start the program off correctly. She recommends that we look forward to later years to increase the utility of the grant application/award process. Edward explained that we have been given dollar amounts by WSDOT looking out to 2021. Thera asked the TAC if they are comfortable programming out three years ahead and that gives applicants time to prepare. The risk is if an awarded project has an issue preventing delivery there is a risk of losing funds to the Region.

Chair Clark-Getzin asked that the WSDOT staff should give us the obligation dates by year to allow for applicants to view the risks associated with the given years funding. She also asked about the TACs participation in the last funding round a few years ago. Mike Oliver noted that for transit agencies the funds can be difficult given that strings attached to the funding. He noted the advantage of shovel ready projects to move quickly. He noted that the reimbursement process was not as fast as expected. Further discussion ensued about the process at the State level.

David Forte asked about the timing of the funding and the problems associated with the 2020 funding year? Did WSDOT give us targets about what needs to be spent in 2020? Thera noted that we are trying to clarify with the WSDOT staff. David asked why this is happening this late in the year. Mike Oliver explained that we go for the four year amount to allow for better project delivery. Detailed conversation about prior efforts was brought forth. David then suggested that the project selection and award process should be fast to allow for obligation by the end of the fiscal year. Thera described the needed timeline for the selection and award process.

Jonathan Boehme from Port Angeles discussed that the City is only really interested if we look forward four years to allow for project management to happen properly. The TAC talked about the details associated with the funding. Tricia DePoe asked why prior awarded projects have not been completed. Mike Oliver reiterated the point of shovel ready projects. Edward Coviello brought up the Port Townsend project and its history. The chair asked for a project update.

A question was brought up about the eligible use for Transportation Alternatives funding. Thera asked if we can go forward with a four year funding horizon. Mike Oliver stated that the four year process may help. Chair Clark-Getzin explained the history of the Olympic Discovery trail and its ability to utilize the entire amount of funding available.

Thera briefed the TAC what we will bring to the agenda next month at the TAC. David asked for a proposed TAC program schedule.

The Chair asked for an update of unspent prior year funds.

Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding Discussion

The TAC went over the Surface Transportation Program. Chair Clark-Getzin led the discussion about the STP funding. Edward Coviello of the PRTPO staff noted that the PRTPO does not manage these funds but that the item was brought forth as an education effort for the TAC.
Thera Black extended the conversation about the allocation of the funds and how the PRTPO wants to serve as a communications resource for member jurisdictions. She gave an overview of the State’s program and the associated risks of not completing projects in the agreed upon timeframes.

The TAC went over additional grant funds available and the concept of using State funds for rural areas rather than Federal funds to facilitate project delivery.

Chair Clark-Getzin gave an overview of the Highway Infrastructure Fund program. She passed along the concern about the limited amount of funding available for this program at the rural level. She linked the program and its limited funding to the need for rural projects to be funded with State funds rather than Federal funding which is difficult for the small staffs to implement.

David Forte presented the possibility of a WSDOT program to help local jurisdictions deliver Federal projects. Thera asked if this outreach can be applied to a rural area. Mr. Bateman of Poulsbo explained the value of training to prevent mistakes in projects.

Tricia DePoe gave an overview of the Makah Tribe’s projects from BIA funding and how those funds flow directly from BIA. When the funds reach the end of their life they are sent back to BIA for future reallocation. She gave an example of a TIGER Grant award for the dock improvement.

**Election of Technical Advisory Committee Vice Chair**

Chair Clark-Getzin opened the process up for nomination for Vice Chair. The TAC nominated and approved Dave Smith from Mason County to be the Vice Chair with a ceremonial “ding”. It passed with a unanimous vote and Dave Smith accepted.

**Member Updates and Adjourn**

Chair Clark-Getzin announced the Executive Board meeting on the 18th and that we should help our staff prepare.

An announcement was made by Matt Klontz of Sequim to look at the RTIP process and what is a Regional project. Thera responded that we will be looking at this for the next RTIP process. A discussion followed. Thera explained that the PRTPO can define regionally significant projects and what those criteria are.

The next meeting is Thursday November 7th at Kitsap Transit in Bremerton.
DISCUSSION ITEM

To: PRTPO Technical Advisory Committee
From: Thera Black
Subject: Final Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040

REQUESTED ACTION:

The TAC is asked to recommend approval of the Final Draft Regional Transportation Plan 2040 to the Executive Board.

Overview

In October the TAC discussed the draft plan, comments generated during the public review process, and the approach to completing the 2040 plan. The focus at this time is on completing the plan so that efforts can shift to more substantive discussions about strategic direction, informed in part by comments received on the draft plan.

The final draft plan is included in this agenda packet for TAC review. A track-change version is available for those who may want it.

Edits to the public review draft are fairly minimal. They primarily entail small changes to clarify confusing language as well as formatting, grammar, and punctuation edits. The most substantive changes are in Section 7 – Next Steps and the addition of Appendix B – Public Engagement, which provides much of the content for Section 7 edits.

The TAC is asked to provide a final review of this draft plan and forward a recommendation to the Executive Board on its approval.

For More Information:

Thera Black  |  360.878.0353  |  TheraB@PeninsulaRTPO.org
DISCUSSION ITEM

To: PRTPO Technical Advisory Committee
From: Thera Black and Edward Covello
Subject: Transportation Alternatives Grant Process

REQUESTED ACTION:

No formal action is requested, but TAC input on the overall general direction will inform the Board’s decision in November.

Overview

Over the next several months PRTPO will identify one or more priority regional projects to fund with an award of federal Transportation Alternatives program funding, better known as TAP funds.

The TAC will play an important role in helping to develop the process used to support a Call for Projects, evaluating the merit and feasibility project proposals, and in recommending a priority funding array to the Executive Board. In your local and tribal agency capacities, TAC members will also assess your agencies’ needs against funding opportunities, develop grant applications for candidate projects, and be responsible for delivering the selected projects as described.

This kick-off to the 2020 Call for Projects is a chance for an updated look at the Transportation Alternatives program and its eligible activities. We know the current balance of funds available for programming and minimum required distributions. With that we can take stock of the previous process. What worked well in that process and what didn’t work as intended? With that assessment we can better know if the old process just needs a quick refresh for 2020 or whether it’s worth rethinking the region’s approach to this funding source.

Refresher on the Transportation Alternatives Program

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a reimbursable federal aid program for community-based transportation projects that is administered by PRTPO. The legislative intent of the program is to expand travel choice, strengthen local economies, improve quality of life, and protect the environment by supporting a wide range of “non-traditional” transportation projects.

People often think of TAP funding as restricted to bicycle and pedestrian projects but in reality, TAP funds can be used on a wide array of projects and programs, and don’t have the same Federal Aid route restrictions as STBG funds. Eligible applicants are also diverse and include local, tribal, and transit agencies as well as school districts, land management agencies, planning organizations, and non-profits. A full list of eligible applicants and activities is attached as well as eligibility questions that the feds have formally answered. Note that there are embedded links to highlighted references for more detail on such things as the Regional Trails Program and Safe Routes to School programs.

PRTPO Funding Availability

PRTPO is authorized to allocate $214,944 in TAP funds. This 2020 process will allocate funds for FFY 2020-2023. It will also reallocate $224,459 in returned and carryover funds from earlier processes.

A new consideration with this process is that there is a minimum amount of those funds that must be spent in “rural areas” defined as either unincorporated or urban areas with less than 5,000 people. There is also a minimum amount
that must be spent in “urban areas” defined as cities with a population in excess of 5,000 people. The remainder of the funds can be spent anywhere in the region. This requirement was applied retroactively to the region’s previous allocations and even without intentionally trying, the region satisfied this requirement.

The intent going into this process is to fully program the funds available for the 2020-2023 time period. In 2022 the region will program ahead another two more years, establishing a biennial funding cycle at that time.¹

The following table summarizes the current status of the region’s funding availability going into this process. It is followed by a reckoning from Local Programs as to the region’s previous compliance with those minimum rural/urban distributions, just for your reference.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Anywhere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening Balance*</td>
<td>$224,459</td>
<td>$224,459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2020</td>
<td>$214,944</td>
<td>$72,675</td>
<td>$54,282</td>
<td>$87,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2021</td>
<td>$214,944</td>
<td>$72,675</td>
<td>$54,282</td>
<td>$87,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2022</td>
<td>$214,944</td>
<td>$72,675</td>
<td>$54,282</td>
<td>$87,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFY 2023</td>
<td>$214,944</td>
<td>$72,675</td>
<td>$54,282</td>
<td>$87,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unprogrammed $$</td>
<td>$1,084,235</td>
<td>$290,700</td>
<td>$217,128</td>
<td>$576,407</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes pending reimbursement of $24,299 from Port Townsend.

Summary of FFY 2010-2019 Allocation Distributions
Actual allocations compared to minimum required distributions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Min Required</th>
<th>Actual Alloc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Allocation</td>
<td>$482,499</td>
<td>$1,451,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Allocation</td>
<td>$360,381</td>
<td>$529,321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAP Obligation Targets

Ed and I met with Brian Moorehead (Local Programs) and Debbie Clemen on October 25th to talk through program details and funding reconciliations. A couple of points from that discussion pertaining to obligation targets are worth highlighting here because they reveal a little more programming flexibility than we’d first envisioned.

- Per Brian and Dave Kaiser, the Peninsula region is in no jeopardy of losing funds if a TAP project is not obligated in 2020. This is important because it means that we can focus on selecting the right project instead of a project that can obligate within just a few months of being selected. Trying to find a construction-ready project in this CY 2020 process would change the dynamics from focusing solely on project priorities. We would find support for delaying obligation until 2022 even, if it means that we are targeting funds to the right project(s) and that the projects are proceeding as planned. This is not to say we cannot identify a project to obligate in 2020, just that we’re not required to.

- Because the Peninsula region’s total funding is so low, the region does not need to restrict its funding awards to the yearly amounts. The region can select many projects with this funding or put it all onto a couple of projects

¹ We’re aware that the FAST Act expires September 30, 2020 and that it is unlikely a new bill will be passed before then. We’ve looked at the current outlines of transportation bills working their way through various caucuses in the House and see no evidence that there will be diminished support for this program in the next bill. A brief survey of other regions indicates that they are confident there will be something approximating the TA program in future bills as they are programming past FFY 2020. Local Programs affirmed that this is the approach others are taking, too, which is why we’re recommending programming out past the FAST Act deadline.
that obligate all funds at once. What will drive the region’s funding awards should be project priorities, not the specific dollar amount for each year.

- This same flexibility is true for the urban / rural allocations. We just need to be able to demonstrate that at the end of the multi-year program we’ve hit the two targets. Again, the fact that PRTPO has so few funds to allocate enables Local Programs to give us a little more flexibility than if we were programming large amounts of funding.

With this TAP funding cycle, we will establish a regular check-in on the RTPO federal funds with the TAC so that as a region we can better manage the flow of federal funds and position the region to receive additional funds that other regions can’t spend. It does happen. We’ll get quarterly reports from Dave Kaiser on all federally funded projects in the region including any turnback amounts when projects close and pass that information along to the counties administering regional STBG funds since those funds can be reprogrammed.

PRTPO CY2014 TAP Allocation Process

In 2014, PRTPO programmed TAP funds for years 2015-2017 and created a contingency list of unfunded projects. A weighted process was used and TAC members helped to evaluate and rank project proposals.

A copy of the prior grant application materials and evaluation/ranking forms is included in this packet for reference.

- What worked well in that application process, from your standpoint?
- What turned out differently than expected, or was an issue that couldn’t be resolved with the process?

We’re asking the TAC to reflect back on that process and share insights that we can incorporate into the CY 2020 process.

Planning Ahead for the 2020 TAP Process

Our intent is to work with the TAC and Board to develop a suitable process, implement a call for projects and prioritization process, and complete Board approval of funding priorities in June 2020, in time for selected projects to be included as Funding Secured in local TIPs before they are adopted. This will minimize the need for amendments later on.

While it seems like a long time, PRTPO will resume its bi-monthly meeting schedule in 2020. The TAC will meet in Jan-March-May and the Board will meet in February-April-June. We need to be efficient with our process between now and then to make this happen, which is why we’re looking for input and preferences on the process at this time.

*Should we dust off the previous process, fine-tuning it as needed so that it can be used for the CY 2020 process?*

OR

*Should we take what was good from the previous process and start with a fresh approach that better meets the region’s current needs?*

There are pros and cons to each approach. Your discussion – with the insights and experience you bring from prior processes as well as with managing federally funded projects – will provide important input to the Executive Board discussion and direction on November 15th. With that direction and your insights, Ed and I will pull together draft process materials for the TAC to review and refine in January and for the Board to consider in February.

**For More Information:**

Thera Black | 360.878.0353 | TheraB@PeninsulaRTPO.org

Edward Coviello | 360.824.4919 | EdwardC@KitsapTransit.com
ELIGIBLE ENTITIES (23 U.S.C. 133(h)(4)(B))

Under 23 U.S.C. 133(h)(4)(B), the entities eligible to receive TA Set-Aside funds are:

1. a local government: Local government entities include any unit of local government below a State government agency, except for an MPO. Examples include city, town, township, village, borough, parish, or county agencies.

2. a regional transportation authority: Regional transportation authorities are considered the same as the Regional Transportation Planning Organizations defined in the statewide planning section (23 U.S.C. 135(m)).

3. a transit agency: Transit agencies include any agency responsible for public transportation that is eligible for funds as determined by the Federal Transit Administration.

4. a natural resource or public land agency: Natural resource or public land agencies include any Federal, Tribal, State, or local agency responsible for natural resources or public land administration. Examples include:
   - State or local park or forest agencies;
   - State or local fish and game or wildlife agencies;
   - Department of the Interior Land Management Agencies; and
   - U.S. Forest Service.

5. a school district, local education agency, or school: School districts, local education agencies, or schools may include any public or nonprofit private school. Projects should benefit the general public and not only a private entity.

6. a tribal government.

7. a nonprofit entity responsible for the administration of local transportation safety programs: Examples include a nonprofit entity responsible for:
   - a local program implementing construction, planning, and design of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs; and
   - a safe routes to school program.

8. any other local or regional governmental entity with responsibility for, or oversight of, transportation or recreational trails (other than an MPO or a State agency) that the State determines to be eligible, consistent with the goals of this subsection.

State DOTs and MPOs are not eligible entities as defined under 23 U.S.C. 133(h)(4)(B) and therefore are not eligible project sponsors for TA Set-Aside funds. However, State DOTs and MPOs may partner with an eligible entity project sponsor to carry out a project.
Nonprofit organizations are not eligible as direct grant subrecipients for TA Set-Aside funds unless they qualify through one of the eligible entity categories (e.g., where a nonprofit organization is a designated transit agency, school, or an entity responsible for the administration of local transportation safety programs). Nonprofit entities are eligible to partner with any eligible entity on an eligible project, if State or local requirements permit.

The RTP set-aside funds retain the RTP eligible project sponsor provisions under 23 U.S.C. 206 (23 U.S.C. 133(h)(5)(C)).

ELIGIBLE PROJECTS (23 U.S.C. 133(h)(3))

TA Set-Aside funds may be obligated for projects or activities described in 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) or 213, as such provisions were in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the FAST Act. See TAP Eligible Projects Legislation as in effect prior to enactment of the FAST Act.


1. Transportation Alternatives as defined in section 101 [former 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29)]:
   The term “transportation alternatives” means any of the following activities when carried out as part of any program or project authorized or funded under this title, or as an independent program or project related to surface transportation:

   A. Construction, planning, and design of on-road and off-road trail facilities for pedestrians, bicyclists, and other nonmotorized forms of transportation, including sidewalks, bicycle infrastructure, pedestrian and bicycle signals, traffic calming techniques, lighting and other safety-related infrastructure, and transportation projects to achieve compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

   B. Construction, planning, and design of infrastructure-related projects and systems that will provide safe routes for non-drivers, including children, older adults, and individuals with disabilities to access daily needs.

   C. Conversion and use of abandoned railroad corridors for trails for pedestrians, bicyclists, or other nonmotorized transportation users.

   D. Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.

   E. Community improvement activities, which include but are not limited to:

      i. inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising;

      ii. historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities;

      iii. vegetation management practices in transportation rights-of-way to improve roadway safety, prevent against invasive species, and provide erosion control; and

      iv. archaeological activities relating to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under title 23.
F. Any environmental mitigation activity, including pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to:
   i. address stormwater management, control, and water pollution prevention or abatement related to highway construction or due to highway runoff, including activities described in sections 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(3) [as amended under the FAST Act], 328(a), and 329 of title 23; or
   ii. (ii) reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality or to restore and maintain connectivity among terrestrial or aquatic habitats (Former 23 U.S.C. 213(b)(2)-(4)).


3. The safe routes to school program eligible projects and activities listed at section 1404(f) of the SAFETEA-LU:
   o Infrastructure-related projects.
   o Noninfrastructure-related activities.
   o SRTS coordinator. SAFETEA-LU section 1404(f)(2)(A) lists “managers of safe routes to school programs” as eligible under the noninfrastructure projects.

4. Planning, designing, or constructing boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.
   o See Boulevards from Divided Highways for examples.

TA Set-Aside projects must benefit the general public (23 CFR 1.23 and 23 CFR 460.2).

Not Eligible: TA Set-Aside funds cannot be used for the following activities because there is no authorization under the Federal-aid Highway Program:

- State or MPO administrative purposes. Exceptions:
  o See FHWA’s Memo Allocating Indirect Costs to Projects, dated September 4, 2015.
  o RTP administrative costs of the State for RTP set-aside funds. [RTP = Recreational Trails Program]
- Promotional activities, except as permitted under the SRTS (2 CFR 200.421(e)(3)).
- Routine maintenance and operations, except trail maintenance as permitted under the RTP.
- General recreation and park facilities, playground equipment, sports fields, campgrounds, picnic areas and pavilions, etc.

Location: There are no location restrictions for TA Set-Aside infrastructure projects; they are not required to be located along highways. Activities eligible under the TA Set-Aside also are eligible for STBG funds (23 U.S.C. 133(b)(15)). Under 23 U.S.C. 133(c)(3), projects eligible under the TA Set-Aside funded with STBG funds are exempt from the location restriction in 23 U.S.C. 133(c). Some aspects of
activities eligible under the TA Set-Aside also may be eligible under other Federal-aid Highway Programs. See [STBG Eligibility](#).

For [SRTS noninfrastructure projects](#), traffic education and enforcement activities must take place within approximately two miles of a primary or middle school (Kindergarten through 8th grade). Other eligible SRTS noninfrastructure activities do not have a location restriction. SRTS infrastructure projects do not have location restrictions because SRTS infrastructure projects are broadly eligible under other TA Set-Aside eligibilities.

---

### TA SET-ASIDE PROJECT ELIGIBILITY QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

The following questions and answers relating to project eligibility come from previous MAP-21 guidance and questions and answers, updated to be consistent under the FAST Act. See [TAP Eligible Projects Legislation](#) as in effect prior to the enactment of the FAST Act for the text from the former 23 U.S.C. 213(b) and 101(a)(29). Eligible TA Set-Aside projects must be sponsored by an [eligible entity](#) and selected through the [competitive selection process](#).

**Archaeological Activities: What archaeological activities are eligible?**

Archaeological activities must relate to impacts from implementation of a transportation project eligible under title 23 (Former 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29)(E)(iv)).

**Bike Sharing: Are bike sharing systems eligible?**

Yes. Bike sharing systems are eligible for Federal-aid Highway Program funds, under several Federal-aid programs, including the STBG and TA Set-Aside. In addition to bike sharing docks, equipment, and other capital costs, FHWA funds may be used to purchase bicycles that are integral to a bike sharing system. Federal-aid Highway Program funds cannot be used for operational costs (Former 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29)(A) and (B)).

**Historic Preservation: What historic preservation projects are eligible?**

Historic preservation activities are limited to historic preservation and rehabilitation activities relating to historic transportation facilities. Operation of historic transportation facilities is not eligible (Former 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29)(E)(ii)).

**Land Acquisition: Is land acquisition eligible?**

Land acquisition is allowed for eligible TA projects, such as right-of-way or easements for pedestrian and bicycle projects; turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas; historic transportation facilities; or environmental mitigation. FHWA’s [Real Estate Guidance for Enhancement Projects](#) remains a useful resource to address real estate and property management issues. However, MAP-21 eliminated eligibility for acquisition of scenic easements and scenic or historic sites (including historic battlefields), scenic or historic highway programs (including tourist and welcome center facilities), or museums.

**Landscaping: Is landscaping and scenic enhancement eligible as an independent project?**

Under the “community improvement activities” category, projects such as streetscaping and corridor landscaping may be eligible under the TA Set-Aside if sponsored by an [eligible entity](#) and selected through the required [competitive process](#). Landscaping and scenic enhancement features, including...
junkyard screening and removal under 23 U.S.C. 136, may be eligible as part of the construction of any Federal-aid highway project, including eligible TA-funded projects (23 U.S.C. 319).

**Lighting: Is lighting eligible?**
Yes. Lighting is eligible for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and may be appropriate as part of other eligible categories. Project sponsors should consider energy-efficient methods and options that reduce light pollution (Former 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29)(A)).

**Planning: Is planning eligible as an independent TA Set-Aside project?**
Yes. Planning for pedestrian and bicycle activities is eligible as an independent project. Former 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29) did not specify if “construction, planning, and design” limits planning to a component of a project, or whether planning may be an independent project related to eligible projects. Title 23 has sections that use “and” to describe both related and unrelated types of activities, therefore FHWA believes that section 101(a)(29) supported both planning components and independent planning projects.

**Resilience: Are resilience improvements eligible?**
Making transportation systems more resilient to changing environmental conditions is an important aspect of maintaining a state of good repair. Federal-aid highway planning and projects, including activities funded via the TA Set-Aside, may include climate and extreme weather resiliency elements to make transportation systems more reliable. For further information, please see FHWA guidance [Eligibility of Activities to Adapt to Climate Change](#).

**Road Diets: Are road diets eligible?**
Road Diets are among FHWA’s [Proven Safety Countermeasures](#). If work to benefit activities eligible under the TA Set-Aside that are associated with a road diet (such as widening sidewalks or installing separated bike lanes) would require incidental highway reconstruction, then TA Set-Aside funds may cover those costs (Former 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29)(A) and (B)).

**Safety Education Activities: Are safety education activities eligible?**
Safety education activities are eligible for TA Set-Aside funds if they are eligible as SRTS projects, targeting children in Kindergarten through 8th grade (Former 23 U.S.C. 213(b)(3)). STBG funds may be used for carrying out nonconstruction projects related to safe bicycle use under 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(6) and 217(a).

**Turnouts: What is eligible under “construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas”?**
The activity “construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas” may use the criteria for “scenic overlooks” described in 23 CFR 752.6: “Scenic overlooks may provide facilities equivalent to those provided in safety rest area[s]” described in 23 CFR 752.5 (Former 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(29)(D)).

**Utilities: Is utility relocation eligible?**
Utility relocation that is necessary to accommodate an eligible project may be eligible for Federal reimbursement only if permitted under State law or policy. Federal law and regulation (23 U.S.C. 123, Relocation of utility facilities, and 23 CFR 645, Utilities) recognize that some States, by State law or policy, prohibit using public funds to relocate utilities; in these States, it is illegal to use funds to relocate utilities. (23 U.S.C. 123, Relocation of utility facilities, and 23 CFR 645, Utilities)
ATTTACHMENT B

Peninsula RTPO’s Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP)
GRANT APPLICATION FORM

Which TAP grant allocation year are you applying for: ____________

Total TAP funds requested:______________

TAP Grant Allocations

2015: $282,918
2016: $190,000
2017: $190,000

Part 1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description: <em>(One to two sentences)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Location:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Contact:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phone Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

SPONSORING AGENCY *(must have Certification Acceptance (CA) status)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA Agency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA Representative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA Agency:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA Representative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CA Signature:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Part 1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION continued

Type of Project or Program: *(Check all that apply)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles</th>
<th>Rehabilitation and operation of historic transportation buildings, structures, or facilities, including historic railroad facilities and canals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversion and use of abandoned railway corridors for trails.</td>
<td>Archaeological activities relating to impacts for implementation of transportation projects eligible under title 23.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, planning, design of infrastructure-related projects and systems that provide safe routes for non-drivers.</td>
<td>Environmental mitigation activity related to highway construction due to highway runoff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of turnouts, overlooks, and viewing areas.</td>
<td>Environmental mitigation to address water pollution prevention and pollution abatement activities and mitigation to reduce vehicle-caused wildlife mortality while maintaining habitat connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory, control, or removal of outdoor advertising.</td>
<td>Eligible projects also include any project eligible under the Recreational Trails Program and the Safe Routes to School Program. (See Transportation Alternatives Program: Eligible Activities Handout for more details).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic preservation and rehabilitation of historic transportation facilities.</td>
<td>Vegetation management practices in transportation right-of-ways.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2. PROJECT FUNDING SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Project Cost:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total TAP Request:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the project funds be fully obligated by June 30th of the year requested?

Is the project open for public access?

Is the project consistent with the Peninsula RTPO’s Regional Transportation Plan?

Is the project included in the adopted TIP?

Is the needed right of way secure?

Which phase is the project in?

Costs by Project Phase

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Elements:</th>
<th>Program or Operational Element:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Engineering/Design</td>
<td>Program or Service Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way Acquisition</td>
<td>Other Costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction / Restoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Project Cost** *(Sum of all costs identified above):* $
Part 2. PROJECT FUNDING SUMMARY continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Commitment:</th>
<th>From Project Applicant</th>
<th>$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From Project Partner(s)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Revenue (Sum of all revenues above):</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Timeline: This project should be fully obligated by June 30th of year requested.
- Preferred Start Time (Month/Year)
- Estimated Completion (Month/Year)

Part 3. PROJECT NARRATIVE

**SUMMARY DESCRIPTION**
(Brief summary of proposal including partnerships and local match of 13.5% (required). Project description, not to exceed one page. Identify any measurable outcomes or indicators of success that should be considered. Applicants may include letters of community support, letters of financial commitment, vicinity maps, or applicable illustrations with this packet, as appropriate.

**PROGRAM GRANT CRITERIA**

1. Does the project have a local match of 13.5%?
2. Does the project help achieve an identified/planned need; what are project benefits, including how it complies with the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) eligibility activities & requirements?
3. Is the project consistent with local plans and the Peninsula RTPO Regional Transportation Plan goals and policies?
4. Does the project enhance connections to local or regional system?

**Project Verification and Endorsement**

Note: Funding will be removed and reallocated from projects not obligated by June 30 of the allocation year. Construction phases must advertise for bids within six weeks of obligation.

Costs identified above represent accurate planning level estimates needed to accomplish the work described herein. Local commitments identified above are available and will be applied to the project if it receives the requested Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) grant. I realize that the use of federal funds for this project entails administrative and project compliance requirements over which the PRTP has no control, and for which this agency or organization will be responsible. This project has the full endorsement of the governing body/leadership of this agency or organization.

Name and Title of Designated Representative

Signature of Designated Representative     Date

Please submit your signed grant application by Sept. 30, 2014, via email to clemend@wsdot.wa.gov
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Priority Order</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>TAP Request</th>
<th>Total Points</th>
<th>TAP Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clallam Transit: Peninsula &amp; Bicyclist Underpass Enhancements for US 101 @ Owl Creek</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$60,550</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$60,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe: Highway 101 Olympic Discovery Trail Diamond Point West</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$201,628</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$153,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mason County: Clifton Lane Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$101,205</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$68,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mason County: Old Belfair Highway Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$19,030</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Shelton: SR 3 Entryway Corridor Enhancements</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clallam Transit: Bicycle Lockers, Transit Centers/Discovery Trail</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$84,750</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Funds Awarded**

- Clallam County = $285,000
- Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe = $153,528
- Port Townsend = $95,000
- Mason County = $68,840
- Clallam Transit = $60,550

Port Townsend needs to pay back WSDOT denied it despite PRTPPO approval. Will need to pay back by December.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Available Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$282,918 Available</td>
<td>$310,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$190,000 Available</td>
<td>$517,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$190,000 Available</td>
<td>$446,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Phase</td>
<td>TAP Request</td>
<td>Match</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranking Priority Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grant Applications</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2015 Applications</strong></td>
<td>$282,918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clallam Transit: Peninsula &amp; Bicyclist Underpass Enhancements for US 101 @ Owl Creek</td>
<td>CN $60,550</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Clallam Transit: Bicycle Lockers, Transit Centers/Discovery Trail</td>
<td>CN $84,750</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe: Highway 101 Olympic Discovery Trail Diamond Point West</td>
<td>CN $201,628</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mason County: Old Belfair Highway Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>PE $19,030</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mason County: Clifton Lane Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>CN $101,205</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shelton: SR 3 Entryway Corridor Enhancements</td>
<td>CN $50,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requested</strong></td>
<td>$517,163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 Applications</strong></td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clallam County: ODT - Spruce Railroad Trail Segment</td>
<td>CN $190,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jefferson County: Non-motorized Planning for Multiple Locations</td>
<td>PLAN $83,905</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Mason County: Old Belfair Highway Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>ROW &amp; CN $52,765</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Port Townsend: SR 20 Pedestrian Walkway Logan St to Hancock St.</td>
<td>PE $120,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requested</strong></td>
<td>$446,670</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2017 Applications</strong></td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Clallam County: ODT - Spruce Railroad Trail Segment</td>
<td>CN $190,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Port Townsend: SR 20 Pedestrian Walkway Logan St to Hancock St.</td>
<td>PE $120,000</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Requested</strong></td>
<td>$310,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Contingency List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking Priority Order</th>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>Project Phase</th>
<th>TAP Request</th>
<th>TAP Awarded</th>
<th>Amount Remaining</th>
<th>Year Funds Requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe: Highway 101 Olympic Discovery Trail Diamond Point West</td>
<td>PE &amp; CN</td>
<td>$201,628</td>
<td>$153,528</td>
<td>$48,100</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mason County: Clifton Lane Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$101,205</td>
<td>$68,840</td>
<td>$32,365</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mason County: Old Belfair Highway Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$19,030</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$19,030</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shelton: SR 3 Entryway Corridor Enhancements</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clallam Transit: Bicycle Lockers, Transit Centers/Discovery Trail</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$84,750</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$84,750</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mason County: Old Belfair Highway Sidewalk Improvements</td>
<td>ROW &amp; CN</td>
<td>$52,765</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$52,765</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jefferson County: Non-motorized Planning for Multiple Locations</td>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>$83,905</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$83,905</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Clallam County: ODT - Spruce Railroad Trail Segment</td>
<td>CN</td>
<td>$190,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Port Townsend: SR 20 Pedestrian Walkway Logan St to Hancock St.</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$442,815

**BACK TO THE TOP**
DISCUSSION ITEM

To: PRTPO Technical Advisory Committee
From: Thera Black
Subject: Input on Draft 2020 Legislative Focus Areas

REQUESTED ACTION:

No action is requested. This item is for your discussion and input.

Overview

For the last several years PRTPO has developed a list of legislative priorities – generally projects and statements of program support developed with input from the TAC. We are updating the 2019 list for next year’s session information. At a minimum that entails a format update, but also updates due to changes in project status and gathering momentum on new projects and initiatives.

Attached is a draft 2020 legislative brief that repackages much of the 2019 folio and adds some new structure. Most projects were carried forward pretty much intact from the 2019 folio with a bit of wordsmithing.

The reformatting highlights “policy imperatives” – encompassing some earlier statements and adding a few new ones – and it introduces “coordination needs” on a regionally significant topic that is bigger than PRTPO can tackle but which is consequential for the region. The need is a coordination strategy for improving predictability and possibly scheduling of Hood Canal Bridge openings. Content was gleaned from meeting recaps, presentations, and other recent resources.

Gone in this draft is the Elwha River Bridge Replacement as that is funded and underway. In its place is a map that can be replaced with a project. Or, depending on the outcome of the I-976 decision, the map can be replaced with a statement about the impacts on local partners.

At this time everything is draft. The Board wants to consider a draft package at its November 15th meeting. Insights and suggestions from the TAC discussion will be used to modify this working draft into a draft folio for the Board to consider and refine when it meets. Please bring ideas and specific edits to help improve this initial working draft.

For More Information:

Thera Black  |  360.878.0353  |  TheraB@PeninsulaRTPO.org
Regional Policy Imperatives
Legislative policy backing for the following will have far-reaching benefits in communities all across the four-county Peninsula Region.

De-federalize transportation funds for local projects
Federalizing small rural and urban projects increases project delivery costs, time, and risk. It doesn’t make sense to federalize small local projects, keep it on big projects. Neighboring states have figured this out. Washington can, too.

Shore up funding support for rural and intercity public transportation
Overshadowed by big urban transit is the indispensable role that rural transit plays in connecting far flung communities to jobs, health care, schools, and urban centers located far away. Rural transit systems help keep rural communities intact and offer the only connections for some people to urban services outside their region.

Align funding and policies to increase use of zero-emission vehicles
We know emissions reduction is needed. To support that we need consumer incentives for vehicle purchase, EV infrastructure funding to support those vehicles, and model plans to guide small government investments in EV technology.

Maintain support for state and local ferry systems
No region in the state relies more on the marine highways than the Peninsula region. Ferries move people and vehicles, connecting people and places while lessening roadway burden.

Restore 2019 RTPO funding levels
The 2019 legislative budget included an increase in RTPO funding to help meet more of the demands placed on regional planning, but it was for one year only. Responsibilities are on-going and mounting. Extend or increase 2019 funding levels.

Featured Coordination Need
Some issues are bigger than a rural region can tackle on its own. Legislative support for these pressing issues will create the kind of momentum needed to bring the right stakeholders together to devise the right strategies.

Hood Canal Bridge Opening – A Coordinated Approach to Low-Cost Strategies
There may be some very low cost coordination and scheduling tactics related to Hood Canal Bridge closures that could alleviate much of the headache and economic impacts currently felt.
Priority Transportation Projects  DRAFT

SR 16/3 at Gorst – Recommended Near-Term Priority Improvements to Capacity, Connectivity, Resiliency

Add mainline capacity and non-motorized connectivity to SR 3 and SR 16 with practical solutions to improve efficiency, safety, and throughput as identified in the “SR 16, Tacoma Narrows Bridge to SR 3 Congestion Study.” Critical bottleneck has wide economic and security impacts that will be alleviated.

Jefferson County SR 19/20 - Port Townsend Entryway Improvements

WSDOT’s 2011 SR 19/SR 20 Corridor Plan identifies projects of special interest for mobility, safety and economic vitality (M/S/EV) on this critical corridor. Improvements include:

• Port Townsend Entryway intersection study for safety & efficiency consolidation;
• Intersection control for access to the Airport, Four Corners, Irondale, and Port Hadlock.

Port Angeles - Peabody Creek / Lincoln St. Culvert Retrofit

This $3.2 million project will repair the culvert’s failing invert, stabilize adjacent soil and improve fish passage. This is a critical culvert that runs under Lincoln Street/US 101. Culvert failure has a high potential for property damage and loss, and will sever an essential lifeline route for the Olympic Peninsula.

Tribal Transit Service

Tribal transit service is a critical part of the rural mobility system, serving tribal and non-tribal communities. The region’s tribal transit systems connect people to essential services like jobs, health care, and school, and coordinates with other transit systems to complete essential lifeline connections across the region.

US Highway 101 East Sequim Corridor Improvements

$3 million is needed for design and permitting of area improvements that will complete the Simdars Road interchange, construct an interchange frontage road, and landscape the Sequim Bypass. This partnership project of Sequim, Jamestown S’Klallam Tribe, and Clallam County will improve safety, mobility, and support economic development in the Sequim Opportunity Zone.

Hood Canal Bridge Reliability

Legendary backups occur when the Hood Canal Bridge opens for marine traffic, as it does 400 times a year. Backups affect SR 3 and SR 104, impede emergency vehicles and transit, impact non-bridge traffic, and obstruct driveway access for east end properties. An operational study will identify practical solutions for improving reliability and east end access. Hood Canal Bridge reliability has direct impacts for residents and businesses on the Kitsap and Olympic Peninsulas.

Connecting Washington Commitments

Follow through on funding for
• SR 3 Freight Corridor
• North Mason Park and Ride Lot
• US 101 Big Quilcene Bridge Painting
• US 101 Harlow Creek Fish Barrier Removal
2020 PRTPO TAC Meetings

In 2020, the Technical Advisory Committee will resume bi-monthly meetings. Following is the anticipated schedule of TAC meetings, all from 10-12. Our goal is to provide remote access to all meetings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 9, 2020</td>
<td>Jamestown S’Klallam – Red Cedar Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 12, 2020</td>
<td>Bremerton – Kitsap Transit Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 14, 2020</td>
<td>Jamestown S’Klallam – Red Cedar Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 9, 2020</td>
<td>Bremerton – Kitsap Transit Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 10, 2020</td>
<td>Jamestown S’Klallam – Red Cedar Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12, 2020</td>
<td>Bremerton – Kitsap Transit Offices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that if a meeting is not needed it will be cancelled. And while every effort will be made to avoid additional meetings or lengthening existing meetings, it may be necessary to address an emerging or unanticipated issue. We will work to provide as much advance notice as possible if a meeting will be cancelled, added, or changed.

https://prtpo.kitsaptransit.com/default.htm

Contact us:
Thera Black  | TheraB@PeninsulaRTPO.org  | 360.878.0353
Edward Coviello | EdwardC@KitsapTransit.com | 360.824.4919