

**MINUTES OF THE  
JOINT MEETING OF THE  
TRANSPORTATION AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY BOARDS**

**June 10, 2004**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m. by Councilmember Julia Patterson, Chair of the Transportation Policy Board. She announced that Mayor Connie Marshall, Chair of the Growth Management Policy Board, was unable to attend and that in her absence, Commissioner Patty Lent, Vice Chair, would serve as co-chair for this meeting.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIRS**

Councilmember Patterson reported that the Executive Board did not meet in May, and will take action at its meeting on June 24 on the Policy Boards' recommendations from last month and this month.

She then reported on what is happening with transportation funding in the region. She announced that the Regional Transportation Investment District (RTID) Executive Board has decided against moving forward with a ballot measure this year. Although the board agreed 6 to 1 on a project list and funding level, there was a lack of support among business, labor and environmental communities to help fund a campaign, largely due to a poll that indicated that at this time the public would not support the ballot measure because of the level of taxes. The RTID will now look at posing a ballot measure in 2005.

Councilmember Gary Nelson, Chair of the RTID Executive Board, provided additional information about the RTID. He also pointed out that in moving to a 2005 time frame, the economy may change for the better, especially with regard to gas prices, which could be important since part of RTID's proposed revenue stream includes a local option gas tax in King, Pierce and Snohomish counties.

Next, Councilmember Patterson reminded Board members that *Destination 2030*, the region's adopted long-range metropolitan transportation plan, includes about 2,100 projects at a total cost of \$104 billion in year 2000 constant dollars. Available revenues are estimated at \$73 billion, which means the region will need approximately \$30 billion of new revenues over the next 30 years. Moreover, of the \$73 billion, only \$19 billion is anticipated to be available for capital construction; the rest is for maintenance, operations and safety projects. Councilmember Patterson told Board members, "We are planning as though we have a lot more money than we really do, and I think we need to keep that in mind."

She also reported that yesterday the King County Council disappropriated approximately \$11 million from its roads budget as a result of loss of funding from Initiative 776, which repealed the \$15 vehicle licensing fee in King County. Lastly, she noted that even if the state Legislature were to raise the gas tax by another 5 cents, it would generate only about \$2.5 billion, which would be “peanut-buttered” across the state. “It’s very unlikely that even one of our major projects in this region would receive full funding. The fact of the matter is, we have a crisis in transportation funding. I don’t want us to continue to operate without being aware of that fact, and if you would like to talk about it today, we are the appropriate body to be having these discussions. She then opened the floor for discussion.

Councilmember Pam Carter pointed out the need to inform the public about how much funding is needed for maintenance and operations. She suggested that the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) or PSRC could prepare a primer describing how transportation dollars are spent.

Commissioner Dan O’Neal asked for more information about the decision to postpone the RTID ballot measure. Councilmember Nelson explained that moving to a 2005 time frame will allow more time to better describe the many large, complex King County projects that are on the RTID project list and how they fit in with the state’s nickel gas tax package. Consideration will also be given to combining both the RTID and Sound Transit measures in a single ballot, as polling has shown the public would prefer a unified ballot for roads and transit. Additionally, the RTID measure could have fared poorly in 2004 because a potential education measure, also involving a sales tax increase, would likely be favored by voters.

Councilmember Phil Noble stressed the importance of educating the public before the 2005 ballot and that PSRC should take the lead on that effort. Councilmember Patterson recommended that staff put the issue of public education on the agenda for PSRC. She said, “I would like to recommend that we come back together as a body to analyze how it is that we most effectively help the public understand what the funding crisis in transportation is all about, and then also try to reach some conclusions on how to better inform the public about what it is we want to do.” She also directed PSRC staff to work with staff of the RTID to formulate a plan for public outreach regarding a potential ballot measure for next year. Councilmember Nelson agreed with her proposal, which was supported by members of both Policy Boards.

## **COMMUNICATIONS AND CITIZEN COMMENTS**

Will Knedlick, representing COST, addressed the Boards. He referred to a report prepared for the PSRC in 1996 by its consultant that indicated a negative net value of \$1.659 billion for Sound Transit’s Sound Move plan. He said he found two copies of the report in the Regional Council’s Information Center, one copy dated May 31, 1996, and the other dated June 7, 1996, and he alleged that PSRC withheld this “quintessential data” from the Sound Transit Board until after the Board had voted on the plan, by suppressing the May 31 version and postdating the report to June 7. He accused PSRC of a cover-up and said he hoped the Policy Boards “will insist on finding out what happened.” Councilmember Patterson asked PSRC staff to address Mr. Knedlick’s remarks (see “Least Cost Planning” section of Director’s Report below).

## DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Eli Cooper reported on the following items.

**Federal Transportation Legislation Reauthorization.** A conference committee has been appointed and held its first meeting on June 9. Information about the region's potential loss of Congestion Mitigation & Air Quality (CMAQ) funds was provided as a handout.

**PSRC Regional Funding Competition.** The PSRC's 2004 regional competitive process is well underway. The Transportation Operators Committee and Regional Project Evaluation Committee will meet within the next week to develop a recommended list of projects to receive regionally managed FTA, STP, and CMAQ funds for consideration by the Transportation Policy Board at its meeting on July 8.

**Least-Cost Planning.** In response to remarks made by Mr. Knedlick during the public comment period, Mr. Cooper noted that both versions of the 1996 case study report have been fully available since publication. He drew attention to memorandum on the subject of public comments on least-cost planning (provided as a handout) and touched on the highlights. Mr. Cooper also explained that the case study report was a technical document designed to evaluate the methods available for conducting least-cost planning. The case study tested hypothetical investment alternatives for transit, highway and pricing. The study did not test the transit system developed by Sound Transit, but rather a more generalized characterization of transit investments. In response to Mr. Knedlick's remarks regarding a \$1.6 billion negative present value for the transit alternative, Mr. Cooper referred to Table C-1 in the case study. He pointed out that the negative figure represented only a partial analysis and did not take into account commercial (freight) benefits; the results showed a net benefit of \$3.3 billion when commercial benefits were included. He noted that this information was included in both the May 31 and June 7 versions of the study. Mr. Cooper also addressed Mr. Knedlick's allegations of a cover-up, saying that he had researched minutes of PSRC board meetings at that time and had discussions with key staff who were employed at PSRC at that time, "and nowhere was there any reference to any material coming in advance of the materials that were made available to the public. We have scrubbed down the organization looking to see if there is any hint of any suppression of evidence or information, and none was found."

Councilmember Jeff Sax asked if the report provides the basis for current planning being done by PSRC. Mr. Cooper said that least-cost planning methodologies have advanced since 1996, but the application of least-cost planning to transportation is still largely uncharted territory. PSRC is continuing to work with WSDOT to advance the approach to least-cost planning.

Councilmember Gary Nelson asked when updated information related to least-cost planning would be provided to the Policy Board. Mr. Cooper said a memorandum on how least-cost planning has advanced and how it was applied in developing *Destination 2030* would be provided at next month's meeting.

**Letter from Thomas A. Heller.** Copies of a letter from Mr. Thomas A. Heller to PSRC regarding the least-cost planning memorandum provided to Policy Board members at the May 13 joint meeting, and PSRC's response, were available at the meeting.

## **CONSENT AGENDA: TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD**

- **Routine Amendment to the 2003-2005 Transportation Improvement Program\***

**ACTION: The motion was made by Councilmember Pam Carter to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion was seconded and carried.**

## **CONSENT AGENDA: TRANSPORTATION AND GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY BOARDS**

- Approval of Minutes of joint Policy Board Meeting held May 13, 2004**
- Certification of 2003 Amendments to the City of Covington Comprehensive Plan**
- Certification of 2003 Amendments to the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan – Updated North Rose Hill Neighborhood Element**

**ACTION: It was moved by Councilmember Richard Cole and seconded by Councilmember Pam Carter to approve the joint Consent Agenda. The motion carried.**

## **ACTION ON VISION 2020 UPDATE SCOPING REPORT**

Commissioner Patty Lent introduced the topic noting that the Policy Boards had reached a milestone and are now ready to recommend a scope of work for the update of VISION 2020 to the Executive Board.

Commissioner Lent said, “We have reached this point after a very rewarding ‘listening’ period that began in October 2003. A wide net had been cast and the Regional Council heard from a wide range of people through a number of outreach events; from a random sample survey, to interest groups, agencies, elected officials and their staff, and individual citizens.”

Commissioner Lent reported that this process generated more comments than is normal for a scoping process. Comments voiced strong support for building on the region’s current vision. The Regional Council was encouraged to think boldly and for the long-term, provide regional leadership, and both broaden the vision to cover other important regional issues and add additional guidance for implementation, such as measurable objectives for policies and implementation responsibilities. In addition to these major themes, there was a wide range of more specific comments, including the importance of moving forward with transportation improvements, the critical need to develop a regional economic strategy, the difficulty associated with confusing and duplicative local regulations, the importance of supporting the region’s urban centers, and the challenge of crafting a more comprehensive regional environmental strategy.

Commissioner Lent said, “Those of us that have been close to the depth of the comments are very impressed with the high value content of the comments and level of participation.”

She reminded the Policy Boards that at their May Joint Policy Board meeting, the Growth Management Policy Board reported to the Transportation Policy Board on plans for the VISION

2020 Update Scoping Report. The feedback received from the Transportation Policy Board was incorporated into the draft scoping document.

She then called on Norman Abbott, Regional Council SEPA Official to review the draft document, *Scope of Environmental Review for the Update of VISION 2020*.

Mr. Abbott provided a brief overview of the recommended scope for the environmental review and alternatives analysis for the update of VISION 2020, and the project schedule.

He said that the report summarizes the results of the public scoping process and the findings and recommendation of the SEPA Official and will end the environmental scoping process.

Mr. Abbott reported on the project schedule which includes 3-phases of work.

In Phase 1 staff will prepare the data and information needed for the environmental review. Major work components include:

- Identify and test alternatives
- Work with the Growth Management Policy Board to move key issues identified in scoping from ideas to specific proposals
- Incorporate work from new local comprehensive plans

Phase 2 will be the environmental review/impact phase:

- Produce DEIS (without a preferred alternative)
- Public review
- Publish Draft final EIS (with preferred alternative)
- Incorporate regional economic strategy, state transportation plan, Sound Transit Vision update, Monorail system plan

Phase 3 will be the review and action phase

- Review of preferred alternative
- Publish the final EIS
- Boards and committee take final action

The report identifies a variety of ways that the public can stay informed and involved in the VISION 2020 Update process.

**ACTION: The motion was made by Councilmember Bob Overstreet to recommend that the Executive Board approve the Scope of the Environmental Review for the Update of VISION 2020. The motion was seconded and carried unanimously.**

## **REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON BNSF EASTSIDE CORRIDOR PRESERVATION FROM AD HOC BNSF EASTSIDE CORRIDOR ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Councilmember Patterson introduced the topic. She noted that the Policy Boards had received a briefing at last month's meeting and would be taking joint action today on a recommendation to the Executive Board. She then called on Councilmember Pam Carter, who chaired the Ad Hoc BNSF Eastside Corridor Advisory Committee.

Councilmember Carter began by providing information about the ad hoc committee. She described its composition and acknowledged that it was a good group of dedicated people. She also reported on the committee's two meetings, noting that at the first meeting members were provided background information and were briefed by staff on the BNSF corridor, and at the second meeting the committee received a briefing from a rail/trail project staff member from King County on the complex legal and technical issues involved in the potential acquisition of the corridor. Noting that the committee reached consensus on its recommendations, she summarized the following two key points: 1) the region finds a clear interest in preserving the corridor for future potential multi-modal transportation uses, and will conduct additional technical, policy and legal analyses to explore how this could be done; and 2) the region welcomes cooperation from BNSF to help identify key data.

Councilmember Carter made it clear that the committee was not proposing any single recommendation for transportation use along the corridor. She said the corridor is very diverse – rail may work in some places, a trail may work in others, and it's wide enough that in some places both high capacity transit and trail could co-exist – or there may be other possibilities. “After looking at this very carefully we agreed it was important to preserve this corridor, and we need to know more about the cost and the technicalities involved.” She called on King Cushman to explain some additional suggestions.

Mr. Cushman described two points that did not call for formal action by PSRC's policy boards but were suggested to be communicated to BNSF. One is to indicate the region's support for projects by the cities of Redmond and Snohomish to “railbank” two spur segments of the BNSF rail line that would connect with the existing East Lake Sammamish Trail in Redmond and Centennial Regional Trail in Snohomish. The region should encourage BNSF to re-engage its work with those cities to expedite their railbanking efforts. Mr. Cushman pointed out that the Snohomish project is already moving forward and next week BNSF will file a petition of abandonment with the U.S. Surface Transportation Board for that section of the corridor.

The second suggestion deals with how to fund the additional study that is being recommended to look at the legal and technical issues involved with the potential corridor acquisition. PSRC and WSDOT have submitted a joint application for \$660,000 to the PSRC's regional competitive process to help fund the study, and it was suggested that the funding request be divided equally among the four eligible PSRC-managed funding sources: regional Surface Transportation Program (STP), regional Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and the two countywide STP/CMAQ pot of funds in King and Snohomish counties.

At this point, Commissioner Patty Lent announced that the Policy Boards had lost their quorum. It was decided that at the conclusion of the discussion, the “sense of the Boards” would be conveyed to the Executive Board with the ad hoc committee’s recommendation. In the discussion that followed, Policy Board members expressed several viewpoints.

Councilmember Jeff Sax said he could not support the recommended action because it would be studied for multimodal use; he said he would be supportive only if its use was limited to a bicycle/pedestrian trail because the total costs would be less. Councilmember Carter said, “It’s such a diverse corridor that in some places it may not be appropriate for pedestrians and bicycles, and in some places it may not be appropriate for high capacity transit.” She explained that the study is not to recommend specific modal plans but rather to explore the various costs and technicalities involved with acquiring and preserving the corridor. She said, “It may be 50 years before (anything) happens.”

Councilmember Sax said, “If staff was to bring me a fiscal analysis of how much it’s going to cost PSRC to do this analysis, then I might be ready to make a decision on whether to recommend this or not. We have a big plate of stuff to work on right now.” He said he would prefer to see staff resources applied to other issues, such as the RTID ballot discussed earlier in the meeting.

Councilmember Sax was also opposed to funding the study with monies that would otherwise go to Snohomish County jurisdictions.

Commissioner Dan O’Neal pointed out that if we don’t do the study, we can’t get to the information and answers that members are asking about.

Councilmember Richard Cole referred to the Redmond project to acquire a spur segment of the corridor. He drew attention to a sentence on Page 8-3 of the agenda packet that stated the city would preserve it “for future transportation uses.” He stated for the record, “The city has not made that decision yet, and at least some of us are arguing for trails.”

Councilmember Mike Lonergan asked if there is an actual price tag on the corridor. Mr. Cushman said the cost is unknown and that estimates have been “all over the ballpark,” ranging from \$10 million to \$300 million. Councilmember Lonergan said that as a representative from Pierce County, he could not support the recommended action because he did not feel the funding support was equitable. None of the corridor runs into Pierce County.

Councilmember John Koster also expressed opposition to spending funds to study “a trail that we may or may not use 50 years from now,” when there are so many other needs for transportation dollars.

Councilmember Tim Clark expressed strong support for the study, saying, “This is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

Margot Blacker agreed with Councilmember Clark. She said, “You look at the map and you see a north-south corridor that could eventually be a solution to our transportation problems. I can’t imagine that we wouldn’t go forward with this.”

Councilmember Terry Faherty did not feel that acquisition of the corridor should be considered a regional issue. He cited similar multi-jurisdictional efforts to acquire rights-of-way for the Interurban Trail that were not considered a regional effort. Julie Langabeer pointed out, “If we had preserved the old Interurban right-of-way in its entirety, we might have saved billions of dollars in transportation costs.”

Commissioner Lent reiterated that the 100-foot-wide corridor represents a unique opportunity, and that assisting the many jurisdictions along its route with this study would represent a regional effort.

Councilmember Patterson called the discussion to a close and asked for a vote by all Policy Board members and alternates present.

**ACTION: Although the Policy Boards did not have a quorum, a vote was taken among members and alternates who were present. A 14-5 majority supported the recommendation that the Regional Council respond to the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Company’s query about the region’s public interest in preserving the BNSF’s eastside rail corridor as follows:**

- 1. After reviewing background materials and having discussions with local jurisdictions along the rail corridor, the region finds a clear interest in preserving the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) Railway Company’s Woodinville Subdivision corridor rights-of-way between the northern portion of downtown Renton in King County and the City of Snohomish in Snohomish County. The region is interested in working with the BNSF to seek to preserve this corridor and explore future potential multimodal transportation uses, and will conduct additional technical, policy and legal analyses to explore several alternative means by which this objective may be accomplished.**
- 2. The region welcomes the continued cooperation of the BNSF to identify key data and information that will help the region understand the full implications and costs of corridor preservation. While working with the BNSF, the region will also conduct in-depth technical, policy and legal analyses, led by PSRC and WSDOT, in cooperation with all local jurisdictions along the corridor and other interested parties having current or future multimodal transportation interests. The additional studies will examine potential short- and long-term uses to be considered in the corridor and will identify potential environmental and community impacts, economic benefits and impacts, and institutional obligations that may be associated with preserving this corridor. The region will move as quickly as possible to secure funding to begin the additional technical work.**

**ADJOURN**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

## **TRANSPORTATION & GROWTH MANAGEMENT POLICY BOARDS**

**June 10, 2004**

### **TPB MEMBERS & ALTERNATES PRESENT**

(for all or part of the meeting)

Councilmember Julia Patterson, King County, Chair  
Clifford Benson, Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board  
Councilmember Jeanne Burbidge, King County Cities & Towns (Alt.)  
Councilmember Pam Carter, King County Cities & Towns  
Diana Dollar, Snohomish County EDC  
Commissioner Chris Endresen, Kitsap County/Cities / Kitsap Transit  
Councilmember Terry Faherty, Pierce County Cities & Towns  
Councilmember Jean Godden, City of Seattle  
Councilmember Jim Henry, Kitsap County/Cities (Alt.)  
Councilmember Gary Nelson, Snohomish County (Alt.)  
Councilmember Phil Noble, Metropolitan Center – Bellevue  
Commissioner Dan O’Neal, WA State Transportation Commission  
Chris Picard, WSDOT (Alt.)  
Councilmember Cathy Reese,  
Snohomish County Cities & Towns / Community Transit (Alt.)  
Councilmember Jeff Sax, Snohomish County  
Kevin Shively, Transportation Choices Coalition (Alt.)  
Mayor Lynn Walty, Community Transit  
Mark Weed, Business Representative

### **GMPB MEMBERS & ALTERNATES PRESENT**

(for all or part of the meeting)

Commissioner Patty Lent, Kitsap County/Cities, Acting Chair  
Ms. Margot Blacker, 1000 Friends of Washington  
Councilmember Tim Clark, King County Cities & Towns  
Councilmember Richard Cole, King County Cities & Towns  
Mr. Roger Contraro, Suquamish Tribe  
Councilmember David Della, City of Seattle (Alt.)  
Ms. Susan Hempstead, Municipal League of King County  
Mr. Alex Johnston, Business Representative (Alt.)  
Councilmember John Koster, Snohomish County  
Ms. Julie Langabeer, League of Women Voters of Washington  
Councilmember Mike Lonergan, Metropolitan Center-Tacoma  
Councilmember Will Maupin, Metropolitan Center-Bremerton  
Councilmember Lynn Norman, King County Cities & Towns (Alt.)  
Mr. Thomas Ostrom, Suquamish Tribe  
Councilmember Bob Overstreet, Metropolitan Center-Everett  
Councilmember Hank Thomas, King County Cities & Towns (Alt.)  
Mr. Bill Trimm, Regional Staff Committee  
Councilmember Donna Wright, Snohomish County Cities & Towns  
Councilmember John Zambrano, Snohomish County Cities & Towns (Alt.)

### **GUESTS and PSRC STAFF PRESENT**

(As determined by signatures on the Attendance Sheet)

Norman Abbott, PSRC  
Ben Bakkenta, PSRC  
Eli Cooper, PSRC  
King Cushman, PSRC  
Tom Ebsten, King County Parks  
Virginia Gunby, 1000 Friends of Washington  
Will Knedlik, COST  
Kathleen McMullen, PSRC  
Rick Olson, PSRC  
Rocky Piro, PSRC  
Karen Richter, PSRC  
Sheila Rogers, PSRC  
Cheryl Saltys, PSRC  
Don Shaffer, Kent C.A.R.E.S.

**TPB MEMBERS ABSENT (\*alternate present)**

Scott Bader, Community Representative  
Shiv Batra, Bellevue Chamber of Commerce  
Mayor Cary Bozeman, Metropolitan Center-Bremerton, Vice Chair  
Don Briscoe, Labor Representative  
Councilmember Richard Conlin, City of Seattle  
Barbara Culp, Bicycle Alliance of Washington  
\*Mike Cummings, WSDOT  
Commissioner Patricia Davis, Ports  
Councilmember Tom Dillon, King County Cities & Towns  
Councilmember David Enslow, Sound Transit  
Councilmember Bill Evans, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency  
Steve Gorcester, Transportation Improvement Board  
Senator Jim Horn, Senate Highways & Transportation Committee  
Commissioner Mary Ann Huntington, Port of Bremerton  
\*Peter Hurley, Transportation Choices Coalition  
Senator Ken Jacobsen, Senate Hwys. & Transp. Committee  
Nancy Keith, Transportation Enhancements Committee  
Roberta Lewandowski, Regional Staff Committee  
Councilmember Harold Moss, Pierce County  
Representative Ed Murray, House Transportation Committee  
Councilmember Dwight Pelz, King County  
Councilmember Kevin Phelps, Pierce Transit  
Councilmember Graeme Sackrison, Thurston Regional Planning Council  
Councilmember Tom Stenger, Metropolitan Center-Tacoma  
Councilmember Brenda Stonecipher, Metropolitan Center-Everett  
Paul Toliver, Seattle Monorail Project  
Luella Wells, League of Women Voters of Kitsap County  
Randy Witt, Regional Project Evaluation Committee  
Representative Beverly Woods,  
House Transportation Committee

**GMPB MEMBERS ABSENT (\*alternate present)**

Patricia Akiyama, Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce  
Sam Anderson, Master Builders of King & Snohomish Counties  
Mayor Katrina Asay, Pierce County Cities & Towns  
Councilmember Richard Conlin, City of Seattle  
Councilmember Dow Constantine, King County  
Chuck Foisie, EDC of Seattle & King County  
Councilmember David Irons, King County  
Commissioner Cheryl Kincer, Ports  
Mayor Connie Marshall, Metropolitan Center-Bellevue, Chair  
Councilmember Dick Muri, Pierce County  
Nancy Ousley, Washington State Office of Community Development  
Councilmember Peter Steinbrueck, City of Seattle  
Gail Twelves, Sierra Club  
Bryan Wahl, Washington Association of Realtors