



Transportation Technical Advisory Committee (TransTAC)

DRAFT Meeting Summary

November 12, 2020 | 12:30 – 2:30 PM

Remote: Zoom Meeting

Actions	Person Responsible
Upload the 9/10/20 TransTAC meeting summary to the KRCC website.	KRCC Staff
Provide feedback on which of the items in the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) that are not required by GMA or PSRC should be kept or removed from the CPPs. Feedback can be included in the right-hand column of the crosswalk document and provided to KRCC staff by December 11.	TransTAC members
Send feedback on the methodologies for maintenance and preservation data collection to Gary Simonson to help inform the survey he is developing to collect maintenance and preservation cost data from jurisdictions.	TransTAC members
Complete the Annual Transportation Project Progress Report for the KRCC Board to review.	Project sponsors

A. Welcome and Administration

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). Mishu introduced several guests: Kizz Prusia, KRCC; Kelly McGourty and Gary Simonson, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC); Clay White, LDC; and Alicia McIntire, Parametrix. Following introductions, TransTAC reviewed and approved the September 10, 2020 TransTAC meeting summary.

B. Briefing on Updates to Countywide Planning Policies

Mishu introduced the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) briefing by reminding the group KRCC is responsible for updating Countywide Planning Policies by the end of 2021. TransTAC is involved in the process because the CPPs have components related to transportation. The Countywide Centers relate to the funding received through the Countywide Competition and the Element H: Transportation of the CPPs contains 6 pages of policy language. Kizz Prusia, KRCC Land Use Coordination Lead, then introduced Clay White from LDC, the consultant hired by KRCC to lead the CPP update process.

Clay shared a presentation intended to serve as an introduction to the CPP process, identify TransTAC’s role in the update process, and gather preliminary feedback on some of the transportation policies within the CPPs. The purpose of the CPPs is to provide a countywide framework for City/County coordination and ensure City and County comprehensive plans are consistent with each other where there are shared goals. He noted, the CPP update process is driven by the deadline to complete and ratify the update by the end of 2021. The CPP update process has five main goals:

- 1) Growth Management Act (GMA) consistency
- 2) PSRC VISION 2050 consistency
- 3) PSRC Regional Centers Framework consistency (Element C)
- 4) Refresh document formatting
- 5) Add definitions of key terms

[View the presentation slides linked here.](#)

Clay noted that the CPP update process is intended to be an update and not a re-write. He then outlined the role of the LUTAC/TransTAC, PlanPOL/TransPOL committees and the Executive Board in the process:

- LUTAC/TransTAC:
 - Provide feedback and direction on the project charter and draft policy recommendations.
 - Assist with the engagement of elected officials throughout the process. Limit “policy surprises” as the process moves forward.
- PlanPOL/TransPOL:
 - Guide the development of the new and revised CPPs based upon direction and parameters set by elected officials.
- KCC Executive Board:
 - Provide feedback and direction on the draft policy recommendations.
 - Provide a final recommendation to Kitsap County.

He explained the policy gap analysis was complete, and the next phase is to prepare draft policy changes for consideration. Alicia McIntire, Parametrix reviewed the policies with direct and indirect impacts on transportation and asked for initial feedback from TransTAC. TransTAC provided the following comments regarding the policies:

- General: Mark Dorsey, Port Orchard, shared that climate change was a contentious topic during the last update and cautioned to be prepared for similar conversations in the future.
- DP-Action-5: David Forte, Kitsap County, asked whether the reference to concurrency is for state or local highways. Alicia responded that the policy deals with both. David and Diane Lenius, Poulsbo, expressed concern that the policy could be interpreted that Cities and Counties need to meet multimodal levels of service connecting to highways. They agreed it will be important to track the conversations PSRC has with the Legislature regarding concurrency.
- MPP-T-31: Stefani Lillie, Kitsap Transit, noted the competing interests the agency faces when it comes to disaster planning and fleet electrification since back up diesel vehicles are necessary to provide service during a disaster.
- MPP-T-33 and MPP-T-23: David was interested in providing specificity and intentionality to these policies since transportation technologies ultimately rely on infrastructure and require careful planning. Clay reminded the group that some of the policies could be framed as “should do” rather than “shall do”.
- Diane asked Stefani what the time frame was for Kitsap Transit’s Long Range Plan update. Stefani responded that the update is planned to be completed by the end of 2021 but may be delayed due to COVID-19. She does not anticipate significant changes to existing plans for High Capacity Transit. Alignment with Kitsap Transit’s Long Range Plan will be important when updating the CPPs.

Clay and Alicia recommended any further feedback on the policies be channeled through KRCC staff. The ask of TransTAC now is to review the crosswalk document, which was prepared by KRCC staff at the direction of the Executive Committee, and provide feedback on which of the items in the CPPs are not required by GMA or PSRC should be kept or removed from the CPPs. Feedback can be included in the right-hand column of the crosswalk and provided to KRCC staff by December 11. Any conflicting recommendations will be elevated to the policy level for discussion.

Kizz clarified the crosswalk document is different from the Gap Analysis document, which was not distributed to TransTAC and is primarily focused on VISION 2050 relative to the current CPPs. The crosswalk document will be reviewed by all KRCC Committees and inform the 2021 KRCC Work

Program. He also clarified that a policy framed as “should” means an intention without being bound to implement that policy while “shall” is a binding commitment.

Mark expressed concern that staff may not have the capacity to complete the request to provide feedback on the crosswalk document. KRCC staff committed to redistributing the crosswalk with flags marking the priority items for TransTAC members to provide feedback on. Clay shared that TransTAC will have more opportunities to provide feedback on the draft policies, including at the January TransTAC meeting, but that gathering early feedback now would help the LDC team prepare CPP discussions in 2021.

C. Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC) and other PSRC Updates

Kelly McGourty, PSRC, shared the Project Selection Task Force will convene in February 2021. She joined the meeting to hear feedback from TransTAC on discussion topics that have been discussed at RPEC and may make their way to the Project Selection Task Force for consideration. She described the topics below and received the following comments:

- **Making the Regional Competition exclusively for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds**
 - The proposal from King County would streamline their internal review process for Surface Transportation Program (STP) projects, which is complex due to the number of jurisdictions within King County.
 - An unintended consequence of this policy would be that transit agencies and other large project sponsors would be more competitive and dominate the competition.
 - The policy change would mean Kitsap would not be eligible to compete in the Regional Competition since Kitsap is not eligible for CMAQ funds and not receive the Kitsap Set-Aside, both of which would be detrimental to Kitsap.
 - Perhaps King County can adjust its internal project vetting process since there may not be support from other countywide groups for this policy.
 - There was an agreement to not support this proposed policy.

- **Eliminating the cap on the number of applications each countywide group could submit into the Regional Competition**
 - The proposal from King County would streamline their internal review process for Regional projects, which is complex due to the number of jurisdictions within King County.
 - The number of slots may not be a significant issue given that King County receives 12 project slots and typically fills the 12 from 18-20 potential projects.
 - The dynamics of the Regional Competition could shift significantly if application caps were removed. King County could overwhelm the competition with the number of projects it puts forward or the characteristics of the contingency list, for example.
 - There was an agreement to not support this proposed policy.

- **Where approx. \$15 million in Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) Funds are directed: Funding the West Seattle Bridge or the current contingency list**
 - HIP dollars are unique funds that are not usually part of STP and CMAQ processes, so the distribution of these funds does not necessarily follow the standard process of distributing funds to the contingency list.
 - The City of Seattle is expected to propose to the Transportation Policy Board to direct funds to the West Seattle Bridge for emergency repairs.
 - There was an agreement to not support using the HIP funds for the West Seattle Bridge because distributing funds on the contingency list was considered more equitable.

The Regional Project Evaluation Committee (RPEC) met on October 23 and will meet next on December 4.

D. Presentation on Local Maintenance and Preservation Expenditure Estimates for the 2022 Regional Transportation Plan

Mishu introduced Gary Simonson, PSRC, by sharing that work to update the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) by 2022 is underway. The plan, updated every 4 years, outlines the objectives and actions for the Region to meet its mobility needs. Gary's presentation is on one piece of the RTP's Financial Strategy, which is the draft methodologies for maintenance and preservation costs data collection.

To view the presentation slides, visit the [KRCC TransTAC webpage](#).

Gary requested TransTAC members send feedback on the methodologies to him to help inform the survey he is developing to collect maintenance and preservation cost data from jurisdictions.

E. Corridor Updates

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

F. Solutions and Support

This item was postponed to a future meeting.

G. Announcements and Next Steps

Mishu reminded project sponsors to complete the [Annual Transportation Project Progress Report](#) for the KRCC Board to review. The KRCC Legislative Reception is on the evening of November 12 and is free and open to the public. The next TransPOL meeting is on Thursday, November 19 and the next TransTAC meeting is on Thursday, January 14.

H. Adjourn

Attachment A: TransTAC Meeting Participants

Member Name	Member Affiliation (alphabetical)
Chris Wierzbicki	Bainbridge Island
Shane Weber	Bremerton
David Forte	Kitsap County
Jeff Shea	Kitsap County
Joe Rutan	Kitsap County
Steffani Lillie	Kitsap Transit
Sara Oliveira	Naval Base Kitsap
Fred Salisbury	Port of Bremerton
Mark Dorsey	Port Orchard
Diane Lenius	Poulsbo
Dennis Engel	WSDOT
Clay White	LDC
Alicia McIntire	Parametrix
Gary Simonson	PSRC
Kelly McGourty	PSRC
Mishu Pham-Whipple	KRCC
Vivian Ericson	KRCC
Kizz Prusia	KRCC