

# Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council

Draft TransTAC Meeting Agenda October 10, 2019 | 2:00 – 3:00 PM Call in: 206-456-6050; 1; 60497#

pic	Documents
A. Welcome	9/12/19 TransTAC
Phone introductions	meeting summary (pg 2
Reminder to review 9/12/19 TransTAC meeting summary	
B. Regional Project Evaluation Committee and other PSRC	CMAQ and STP
Updates	Streamlining Proposal:
Objective: Share updates on recent regional planning related developments at Puget Sound Regional Council.	PSRC Review (pg 8)
• Discuss proposal made at RPEC to award all CMAQ funds	PDWG Strategies Slides
through the Regional Competition and all STP through the	from 9/27 RPEC
Countywide Competitions	Meeting (pg 9)
Update on Project Delivery Working Group's recommended	
strategies for improving project delivery	Summary of Strategies
	from 9/6 PDWG
	Meeting (pg 11)
C. Review 2020 KRCC Transportation Work Plan	2020 KRCC
Objective: Prepare for 2020 Transportation Committee	Transportation Work
meetings.	Plan and Meeting
<ul> <li>Review 2020 KRCC Transportation Work Plan items and meeting schedule</li> </ul>	Schedule (pg 13)
Recommend changes as needed	
D. Announcements and Next Steps	Transportation Project
Objective: Ensure follow up on proposed ideas and tasks.	Status Report (link)
<ul> <li>Next TransPOL meeting: Thurs, October 17</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>Reminder to update the Annual Transportation</li> </ul>	
Project Status Report for KRCC TransPOL review	

\*Supporting document provided



#### Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TransTAC) Meeting Summary September 12, 2019 / Kitsap Transit, Bremerton v. 9/24/19

#### **Decisions and Actions**

Decisions									
No decisions were made at TransTAC									
Actions	Person Responsible								
Work with the Executive Committee to determine how best to coordinate on land use and transportation considerations associated with Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Plan updates on staff and policy levels.	KRCC staff								
Provide the link to the KRCC Reference Manual which contains the 8 Year Land Use Timeline in the meeting follow up.	KRCC staff								

#### A. Welcome & Old Business

Mishu Pham-Whipple, facilitator of the KRCC Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TransTAC), welcomed the group and reviewed the meeting's agenda (see Attachment A for a list of participants).

- June 13, 2019 TransTAC meeting summary: Mishu noted that the summary was posted on the KRCC website following its distribution to the committee.
- <u>2019 TransTAC Work Plan</u>: Bryan Dias, WSDOT, will present at the next meeting on the upcoming funding cycles. TransTAC will also develop a draft list of regional transportation projects for the next funding cycle.

#### **B.** Regional Project Evaluation Committee and other Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Updates

<u>Updates from PSRC regarding Project Tracking and 2020-2022 rebalancing; Project Delivery</u> <u>Working Group update; upcoming progress reporting; and VISION 2050:</u>

Mitch Koch, PSRC, provided the following updates regarding project tracking for the 2020-2022 transportation projects.

- There were \$33 million in extensions (40% of Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funds programmed in 2019) resulting in a \$43 million total gap.
- The Project Delivery Working Group (PDWG) has been discussing new strategies to fill the gap including:
  - o Advancing funds from later years
  - Exchanging federal funds for local funds between phases or stages of a project, or between projects within the same agency
  - Immediately funding ready-to-go projects from the current adopted contingency lists
  - o Increasing federal share of awarded projects
- There were \$23 million in supplemental funding actions, including \$1.3 million in hardship funding for Port Orchard.
- All 2019 projects that did not receive extensions have obligated their funds.
- The Final Delivery Target was \$86.8 million, and the region delivered \$102.3 million.
  - Over-delivery is a result of:

- buffer created from supplemental funding action
- projects that received an extension delivering before the August 1<sup>st</sup> State delivery deadline
- WSDOT allowing additional 2020 programmed projects advanced to 2019 in order to meet the State delivery deadline
- PSRC is still working to finalize 2020-2022 rebalancing, which should be complete before RPEC's next meeting.

Mitch also provided the following updates regarding the Project Delivery Working Group (PDWG).

- The PDWG has been working over the past few months to find ways to reduce the need for annual rebalancing of the Surface Transportation Program (STP)/Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) project delivery (project obligation). They explored strategies to improve project delivery and made recommendations related to:
  - Education and monitoring
  - Timing of PSRC deadlines
  - Extension policies
  - o Project selection
- At the September 4, 2019 meeting, the PDWG narrowed down the list of recommendations, which will be discussed at the September RPEC meeting and acted on at the October RPEC meeting.

Mitch shared that the October Amendment is the last Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) amendment of the calendar year. TIP applications are due September 13<sup>th</sup>. TransTAC members had the following comments related to TIP amendments.

- The first come, first serve model to advance projects provides the most flexibility for project sponsors and is preferred.
- At the last Project Delivery Working Group meeting, the most controversial issue was the proposal to shorten the obligation extension deadline. Ultimately, the PDWG opposed the proposal but is considering establishing criteria to allow exceptions and require early identification of projects risks in order to be eligible for an extension. Getting an extension will be a more burdensome process that requires an interactive process with PSRC to work to resolve project risks and requires Transportation Policy Board approval.
- Depending on the nature of the project, some projects are just more difficult to know the timing of when they are going to be able to be delivered.
- Accurately predicting project delivery timelines is becoming increasingly difficult, which is problematic when working within prescribed deadlines.
- There are unintended consequences associated with reordering the sequence for which millions of dollars' worth of projects are implemented as well as with moving the obligation deadlines.
- If project sponsors are honest about the risks associated with their projects, PSRC can better manage funding.

As a reminder, Mitch also shared that upcoming progress reporting requests will be distributed in October.

Lastly, Mitch provided the following updates regarding VISION 2050.

- The draft VISION 2050 Plan is now available for public review.
- PSRC invites feedback on the plan, including the region's multicounty planning policies and actions, as well as the Regional Growth Strategy.
- The public comment period is from July 19, 2019 September 16, 2019.
- The Growth Management Policy Board held a public hearing on September 5<sup>th</sup>.

#### Preservation and Maintenance presentation:

Gary Simonson, PSRC, provided a presentation on PSRC's work to improve the collection and analysis of maintenance and preservation data. He shared that having better data allows for better communication of needs to the legislature, and therefore better investments. TransTAC members had the following comments responding to the presentation.

- Small jurisdictions tend to not have the staff capacity to apply for funding for road preservation even if a need is identified and there are funding sources available.
- Small jurisdictions tend to not have the financial resources to keep up with road maintenance needs, even after the needs are identified through costly analysis. The data is not valuable if there are not resources to apply that data.
- Small jurisdictions tend to not have the resources to collect significant amounts of data on road maintenance needs and tend to use a basic road maintenance classification of red, yellow, and green.
- Jurisdictions could utilize economies of scale by collectively having a road maintenance analysis conducted. However, the data from these analyses is typically only valid for three years.
- Transit Agencies do not typically measure the pavement quality of their property.
- Jurisdictions prioritize pavement preservation differently so coordinating on a collective analysis may be difficult.
- A costly data analysis is not realistic for small jurisdictions to conduct.

#### View presentation here. (link)

C. PSRC Transportation Competition Coordination: Policy Framework Elements Update on preparations for 2020 Project Selection Process from PSRC:

Mitch Koch, PSRC, provided the following milestones for the 2020 Project Selection process:

- September December 2019 Project Selection Taskforce Develops the Policy Framework
- January 2020 Policy Framework Adoption
- February 2020 Call for Projects
- July 2020 Project Recommendations to PSRC Boards
- August October 2020 Development of 2021-2024 TIP & Public Comment
- October 2020 January 2021 TIP Adoption and Federal, State Approval

Mitch provided the following updates for the Rural Town Centers & Corridor (RTCC) Program:

- The PSRC Transportation Policy Board approved the recommended projects for the RTCC Program.
- Projects in Kitsap County that were recommended for funding include the Poulsbo Complete Streets Plan and Kitsap County's SR 104 realignment project in Kingston. These two projects were the highest scoring projects in the competition.

<u>Hear from Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC) members on status of discussions</u> <u>around the Policy Framework Elements:</u>

RPEC members from the Kitsap delegation reported that:

- Project readiness has been discussed as a potential scoring criteria but there is uncertainty regarding whether raise it again, as "project readiness" is difficult to define and develop a criteria around.
- The City of Bellevue representatives were interested in moving all CMAQ money to the regional fund and all STP money to the countywide fund.
- There was discussion around whether Preservation Set Aside projects should be used to balance by year since they are theoretically easier to deliver. However, these projects tend to have just as many extensions as normal projects. Therefore, they do not expect further discussion on this topic.

#### Discuss recommendations to RPEC on the Policy Framework Elements:

TransTAC had no further recommendations on the Policy Framework Elements, as the current framework has proven beneficial to Kitsap jurisdictions.

#### D. Operations Coordination: ADA Transition Plans

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

#### E. Corridor Updates

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

#### F. Solutions and Support

Report out on jurisdiction Transportation Plan updates:

TransTAC members shared that some Cities are beginning discussions on the next Comprehensive Plan updates, which includes updates to functional plans for water, sewer, and stormwater, as well as transportation. They noted that this cycles' Comprehensive Plan updates will be more significant than the last cycle due to the increased population projections and Urban Growth Area changes, which did not previously occur due to the economic crash. They emphasized the importance of communicating the level of effort and funding required for the next Comprehensive Plan update to the policy level. TransTAC recommended coordination with the land use committees to discuss what resources are needed for Transportation Plan and Comprehensive Plan updates.

KRCC staff will work with the Executive Committee to determine how best to coordinate on land use and transportation considerations associated with Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Plan updates on staff and policy levels. KRCC Staff will also provide the link to the KRCC Reference Manual which contains the 8 Year Land Use Timeline in the meeting follow up.

#### PSRC Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC):

Although KRCC is the designated appointing body for BPAC members and alternates representing Other Cities and Towns in Kitsap County, KRCC does not need to play a role in the non-voting member approval process. TransTAC members on BPAC requested the guidance from TransTAC on the non-voting BPAC membership. BPAC members shared that PSRC has reorganized BPAC committee membership from a previously ad-hoc committee to a more formalize committee. In the process to formalize the committee, there has been discussion on how to have non-voting members. BPAC developed criteria for non-voting members and had a nomination process for non-voting members. For the Kitsap delegation, two nominations were made, both of which were Bainbridge Island residents. Nominees must have an endorsement from current BPAC members to act as a non-voting member and, although BPAC members are not required to endorse any nominees, TransTAC members valued the volunteerism of the nominees and recommended endorsing one of the nominees. Some TransTAC members offered to personally meet with the incoming non-voting BPAC member to onboard them. At the

next the next BPAC meeting, the committee will vote on endorsing non-voting members. BPAC members are responsible for coordinating to confirm their endorsements.

#### G. Announcements and Next Steps

- The next TransPOL meeting will be held on Thursday, October 17. Agenda items include reviewing the annual Transportation Project Status Report, hearing updates on the Project Selection Task Force, and a preliminary discussion on the draft list of regional projects.
- The next TransTAC meeting will be held on Thursday, December 12. Agenda items include a report out on ADA Transition Plans, a WSDOT presentation on grant cycles, and preliminary planning for the next funding cycle.

Attachment A: TransTAC Meeting Participants

Member Name	Member Affiliation (alphabetical)					
Chris Wierzbicki	Bainbridge Island					
Shane Weber	Bremerton					
Jeff Shea	Kitsap County					
David Forte	Kitsap County					
Steffani Lillie	Kitsap Transit					
Fred Salisbury	Port of Bremerton					
Diane Lenius	Poulsbo					
Michael Bateman	Poulsbo					
Dennis Engel	WSDOT					
Mishu Pham-Whipple	KRCC Staff					
Gary Simonson	Puget Sound Regional Council					
Pavithra Parthasarathi	Puget Sound Regional Council					
Mitch Koch	Puget Sound Regional Council					
Catherine Kato	Puget Sound Regional Council					

#### IMPACT TO COUNTYWIDE FUNDING IF ALL CMAQ IS IN THE REGIONAL COMPETITION

Assumptions - using 2018 figures as a comparison; no STP at the regional competition; no CMAQ in the countywide competitions; all other set-asides and procedures in place

STP Amount to each County (in millions)									
		Revised under							
	Original from the 2018	Regional CMAQ							
County	process	Scenario							
King	51.7	49.3							
Kitsap	9.42	9.42							
Pierce	20.63	19.67							
Snohomish	18.95	18.07							

Explanatory note: the total amount of CMAQ available is greater than the total amount in the regional competition (in 2018, \$51.8m total CMAQ available vs. \$47.57m total for the regional competition); by moving all CMAQ to regional, that pot is increased, thereby reducing the countywide amounts

#### ADDITIONAL PRELIMINARY IDEAS FOR STREAMLINING OPTIONS

1. Reduce burden of pre-application eligibility review

This is an important function, but takes a lot of time for applicants, countywide groups and PSRC staff. Are there options to streamline this component for all concerned, while retaining the benefit?

**2.** Eliminate the two-step process for the Regional Competition, by removing the required countywide forwarding of applications and removing the application cap.

This may result in a greater number of regional applications, but initial feedback suggests we may not be overwhelmed with an extreme number of projects.

# **Project Delivery Working Group**

- Proposals for process improvements:
  - Changes to obligation deadline extensions
    - No longer automatically granted identification of reasons not allowed
    - Earlier date for requesting extensions
    - Two tiered process for approving extensions
      - First deadline = July 15<sup>th</sup>, for projects needing only a short extension after the June 1<sup>st</sup> deadline
      - Second deadline = tbd, for projects needing more time; requires PSRC Board approval
  - Enhanced education and monitoring



# **Project Delivery Working Group**

- Other ideas:
  - Work with WSDOT on implementing a first come / first served process within the first two years of the TIP
    - In a "need" year, this could help with delivery
    - In a strong delivery year, this could impact projects programmed in year 1
    - Could offer a "reset" of the full TIP by year, with new expectations
      - Projects in years 1 and 2 are equal for first come / first served
- Incorporate delivery into project selection
- Stand-alone preservation program, perhaps conducted annually



### DRAFT RPEC PROJECT DELIVERY WORKING GROUP STRATEGIES FOR IMPROVING PROJECT DELIVERY

At the September 6<sup>th</sup> meeting the RPEC Project Delivery Working Group discussed the various ideas for improving project delivery brought forth over the last several months, and the PSRC staff analysis of each. From that discussion the group appeared to reach consensus on the following strategies.

#### **Education and Monitoring**

There was consensus to move forward on the following education and monitoring strategies: (1) continue to improve PSRC materials and resources related to delivery, (2) partner with WSDOT and FHWA to provide a project delivery summit, (3) improve coordination of PSRC and WSDOT progress reporting to the extent possible, and (4) conduct three in-person project monitoring discussions during regularly scheduled countywide meetings throughout the fiscal year.

#### **Timing & Extensions**

There was consensus that extensions should no longer be automatically granted regardless of the reason for delay. Instead, the proposal is to identify the reasons when extensions *would not* be granted, rather than determining on a case by case basis what reasons for delay are justified. An initial assessment suggests that these reasons would include staff turnover, shifting priorities within the agency, insufficient funding, lack of certification acceptance status, or that work was not begun in a reasonable time to meet the deadline. This list will need further review and consensus before being finalized.

There was also general agreement that PSRC's extension deadlines should be moved up earlier in the year to better align with the federal fiscal year, and potentially reduce the impact on annual delivery. While the specific dates will need additional refinement, under the revised scenario discussed at the September 6<sup>th</sup> meeting the existing June 1<sup>st</sup> obligation deadline would be retained (or potentially moved up one to two months), but the deadline to request extensions would be moved up two to three months. The extended obligation deadline would also be moved up, and would include two pathways. The first, "standard" extension would set a deadline of July 15<sup>th</sup>, which would provide a two-week buffer for the August 1<sup>st</sup> state delivery deadline and allow for those projects that need a bit more time past June 1<sup>st</sup> but do not need until the end of the calendar year to deliver. These extensions would remain within the current fiscal year and minimize any impact to the delivery target. The second pathway would allow more time for those projects that are facing a greater delay, outside of the reasons noted above for which an extension would not be granted. These projects could request a longer extension but would require approval by PSRC's boards.

#### Other Ideas Discussed

There were several other ideas discussed by the working group for which consensus was not reached. However, there was consensus that these ideas should not be eliminated from consideration, but that more analysis and discussion is required.

Implementing a "first come, first served" approach to obligating funds is one idea that warrants additional analysis. Projects would still be awarded funds to a specific year, however projects with PSRC funding in the current or subsequent year of the TIP would be able to obligate the funds on a first come, first served basis. This proposal will require review and approval by WSDOT, as PSRC does not have authority in this area.

There did not appear to be consensus for moving forward with any of the strategies that would incorporate delivery into the project selection process. However, the idea of converting the preservation set-aside to more of a a stand-alone preservation program was briefly discussed. While there appeared to be little interest in moving forward with this strategy in the near-term, the group asked that the author of this idea be given time to elaborate on the concept at the next meeting.

### III. KRCC <u>Transportation</u> Program 2020 Work Plan Narrative

The proposed transportation program work plan items for 2020 are outlined in the table below. KRCC staff will support the KRCC Board, Transportation Policy Committee (TransPOL), and Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TransTAC) in completing these action items.

	Action Item		TransTAC's Role		TransPOL's Role		Board's Role
			Transportatio	n Educ	ation		
18. Learn about transportation issues of common interest. (2018 Board Retreat)		TransTAC addresses cross-jurisdictional transportation issues as needed. TransTAC members prepare educational updates on these topics at TransPOL meetings.				***	KRCC Board reviews relevant transportation topics as needed.
			Countywide and Regiona	l Trans	portation Competitions		
19.	Develop recommendations for PSRC's Project Selection Taskforce. (2018 Competition Debriefs)		Develop draft recommendations for TransPOL review regarding the issues facing the PSRC Project Selection Taskforce.	<u></u>	Review TransTAC's recommendations regarding the key issues facing the PSRC Project Selection Taskforce.	<u>*</u>	Approve recommendations to Kitsap members of the PSRC Project Selection Taskforce.
20.	Discuss how Kitsap wants to address topics such as geographic equity, equity-based on density, and projects of countywide importance in the 2020 Kitsap Countywide Competition. (2018 Competition Debriefs)		Conduct research related to topics based on guidance from TransPOL.		Provide guidance to TransTAC related to research needed to support discussions on desired topics. Review data related to selected topics and propose an approach for KRCC Board review.	2	Approve the approach to selected topics as part of the Call for Projects in 2020.

21.	Develop and approve Countywide Competition Call for Projects and Application.		Develop draft recommendations of Countywide Competition Call for Projects and Application for TransPOL review.		Review TransTAC's recommendations of Countywide Competition Call for Projects and Applications.	2	Approve the Countywide Competition Call for Projects and Application.
22.	Develop and approve Kitsap's Regional Projects to PSRC.		Develop the list of Kitsap's Regional Projects for TransPOL review.	• <b>'</b> [	Review TransTAC's list of Regional Projects.	<u>*</u>	Approve Kitsap's Regional Projects for PSRC review.
23.	Conduct Countywide project selection workshop and recommend Countywide Projects to PSRC.	***	Score Countywide projects based on criteria outlined in the Call for Projects and recommend project awards to TransPOL.		Review TransTAC's recommended Countywide project awards.	<u>*</u>	Approve Kitsap's Countywide Projects for PSRC review.
24.	Debrief the Regional and Countywide Competitions.	onal and Discuss best practices and recommendations for the next funding cycle.			Discuss best practices and recommendations for the next funding cycle.		Review best practices and recommendations for the next funding cycle.
			KRCC Op	oeratio	ns		
25.	Ensure messaging consistency between policy and technical committees. (2018 Board Retreat)	***	KRCC staff will serve as the liaison.		TransPOL meetings have TransTAC updates as a standing agenda item.	<b>**</b> *	KRCC Board meetings have TransPOL and TransTAC updates as a standing agenda item.

# IV. 2020 Calendar with an Overview of Expected Meetings

# Draft 2020 Meeting Schedule

Draft v.9-20-19

		January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
Executive	<b>Board*</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> Tues. 10:15AM-12:15PM Norm Dicks Gov. Center	<b>Jan. 7</b> Board Meeting	Feb. 4 Board Meeting	March 3 Board Meeting	<b>April 7</b> Board Meeting	May 5 Board Meeting	June 2 Board Meeting	July 7 Board Meeting		Sept. 1 Board Meeting	Oct. 6 Board Meeting	Nov. 3 Board Meeting	Dec 1 Board Meeting
	Executive Committee 3 <sup>rd</sup> Tues. 11:00AM-1:00PM Kitsap Transit	Jan. 21 Executive Committee Meeting	Feb. 18 Executive Committee Meeting	March 17 Executive Committee Meeting	<b>April 21</b> Executive Committee Meeting	May 19 Executive Committee Meeting	June 16 Executive Committee Meeting		Aug. 18 Executive Committee Meeting	Sept. 15 Executive Committee Meeting	Oct. 20 Executive Committee Meeting	Nov. 17 Executive Committee Meeting	Dec. 15 Executive Committee Meeting
Transportation	TransPOL* 3 <sup>rd</sup> Thurs. 3:15-4:45PM Kitsap Transit		Feb. 20 TransPOL Meeting		April 16 TransPOL Meeting		June 25 TransPOL Meeting		Aug. 20 TransPOL Meeting		Oct. 15 TransPOL Meeting		Dec. 17 TransPOL Meeting
Transp	TransTAC 2 <sup>nd</sup> Thurs. 12:30-2:30PM Kitsap Transit	Jan. 9 TransTAC Meeting		March 12 TransTAC Meeting		<b>May 14</b> TransTAC Meeting		<b>July 9</b> TransTAC Meeting		Sept. 10 TransTAC Meeting		Nov. 12 TransIAC Meeting	
Land Use	PlanPOL* 3 <sup>rd</sup> Tues. 1:30-3:00PM Kitsap Transit		Feb. 18 PlanPOL Meeting		April 21 PlanPQL Meeting		June 16 PlanPOL Meeting				Oct. 20 PlanPOL Meeting		
	LUTAC 2 <sup>nd</sup> Thurs. 9:30-11:30AM Poulsbo City Hall	Jan. 9 LUTAC Meeting		March 12 LUTAC Meeting		May 14 LUTAC Meeting		<b>July 9</b> LUTAC Meeting		Sept. 10 LUTAC Meeting			

\*Open to the public