

2022–2050

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Amendment Review and Final Action

Transportation Policy Board
April 14, 2022



Puget Sound Regional Council

Today's Actions

- Continued board review of individual amendment packages under **Group 2** and staff response by topic – *actions requested*
 - *Board action will direct staff to make subsequent document changes*
- Action to recommend final plan as amended to the Executive Board



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: F-1

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
Topic: Financial Strategy				
F-1	Rep. Wicks	p. 166; p. 184	Add language to Financial Strategy: “Make policy decisions on collection and distribution of user fees, <u>aligning pricing and revenue expenditures with achieving regional climate, equity, and mobility goals</u> ”	<p>Board direction requested</p> <p>Staff response: The RTP Financial Strategy assumes implementation of a Road Usage Charge (RUC) starting in 2030 to begin replacement of the state motor fuel tax. As modeled for the plan, mileage charges are assessed at ten cents per mile in peak periods and five cents in non-peak periods. The Washington State Transportation Commission’s RUC studies <u>assume a flat 2.5 cent per mile charge at all times</u>, generally equivalent to current motor fuel tax rates.</p> <p>These and other pricing mechanisms (state facility / express lane tolls, etc.) do have a demand management impact, reducing vehicle miles traveled and associated emissions. These pricing mechanisms are also part of the region’s 4-Part GHG strategy. The Financial Strategy assumes that a RUC would be designed and administered in a manner that addresses potential inequities for lower-income motorists and those without access to transportation alternatives.</p> <p>The RTP Financial Strategy states the assumption that revenues from a RUC would not be restricted to highways and roadways and would therefore be available for investments in all transportation modes, including transit and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on the additional language proposed.</p>

Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: BP-1

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
Topic: Bicycle/Pedestrian				
BP-1	CM Gelder / Rep. Wicks	p. 53	Support updates and analysis of the Active Transportation Plan, in addition to regional capacity projects, to close substantial gaps in the facility network; Include <u>Leafline Trails Network</u>	<p>Board direction requested</p> <p>Staff response: The current (2018-20240) RTP includes an “Active Transportation Plan” appendix. This is a lengthy document that includes a substantial amount of background and historical information, and over the past several years it was determined that this document has not been well utilized in further planning work. In coordination with PSRC’s Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee, the approach for the draft (2018-2050) RTP was to integrate bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and needs more fully into the full plan, recognizing its importance and alignment with other elements such as access to transit. The Transportation System Visualization Tool was also developed, with a much more robust data set for existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and inclusion of forecast and planned investments. The intent was to update and maintain this visualization tool over time and utilize the BPAC and PSRC’s website as ongoing repositories of these bicycle and pedestrian products. In addition, regarding specific projects, the draft RTP includes an estimate of programmatic bicycle/pedestrian needs in the financial strategy and identifies priorities for connectivity, safety, and access to transit; further, projects meeting the threshold for inclusion on the Regional Capacity Projects list are represented in the plan, but only if they are derived from and included in a local, transit or state planning document.</p> <p>Board direction is requested if this approach should be modified for future updates.</p>

Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: BP-2

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
BP-2	CM Gelder	p. 53; p. 180	Add a “Regional Active Transportation Network” section to Chapter 4 that outlines the value of completing active transportation spines and networks, regional needs, work to date, and PSRC role	<p>Board direction requested</p> <p>Staff response: Page 180 of Chapter 4 includes “What’s Ahead” steps related to the bicycle and pedestrian element of the plan, including ongoing improvements to connectivity particularly to the transit system; addressing equity; emphasizing safety; and refining performance metrics.</p> <p>Please note an additional amendment related to expanding the implementation steps from the RTP is proposed under BI-6 that may address this proposal in further detail.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on the inclusion of additional elements as noted.</p>

Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: BP-3

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
BP-3	CM Gelder	N/A	Prioritize development of qualitative and quantitative active transportation performance measures and objectives to analyze regional access to “all ages and abilities” facilities; address in regional capacity projects	<p>Board direction needed</p> <p>Staff response: As noted in the preceding section, page 180 of Chapter 4 includes “What’s Ahead” steps related to the bicycle and pedestrian element of the plan, including ongoing improvements to connectivity particularly to the transit system; addressing equity; emphasizing safety; and refining performance metrics.</p> <p>In addition, the analysis of the RTP includes mobility metrics such as walk/bike trips and proximity of households within walk/bike distance of jobs and transit. Design level details are not applicable at the scale of the regional analysis, however every project submitted for inclusion in the RTP must respond to the adopted “RTP Prioritization Measures,” which address nine policy objectives: emissions, freight movement, jobs, multimodal alternatives (i.e., transit and bike/ped), Puget Sound land and water, safety and security, equity and access to opportunity, <u>centers</u> and travel/congestion.</p> <p>Staff proposes to continue coordination with PSRC’s Bicycle / Pedestrian Advisory Committee on working to improve the region’s understanding and implementation of context specific investments and the evaluation of projects at the long-range RTP vs. project selection scale.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p>

Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: C-1a-c

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
Topic: Climate				
C-1a	Pierce County / Tacoma / CM Upthegrove	p. 128	Include reference to the region's 2030 greenhouse reduction goal as an interim step to achieving the 2050 reduction goal	<p>Board direction requested – Proposed Plan amendment and future PSRC work</p> <p>Staff response: Each of these comments relate to development of a work program for PSRC to work with partners and develop an interim year analysis and plan, consistent with the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy, towards achieving not just the 2050 climate goal but the 2030 climate goal.</p>
C-1b	CM Balducci / Pierce County / Tacoma / Rep. Wicks	p. 128; p. 170	Identify actions needed to support achievement of the interim 2030 greenhouse gas reduction goal as a future work program; monitor progress towards achievement of the 2030 and 2050 goals	<p>Staff proposes to add language committing to this future work program that would develop an interim 2030 analysis year, in coordination with the region's transit agencies and other partners including PSCAA. Please note the timeframe for completion of the 2030 analysis is <u>tbd</u>, since additional information related to land use, transit networks, shorter-term EV trends and other data will need to be obtained and assessed.</p> <p>Also, as a reminder ongoing work is currently underway and reflected in the plan in the Climate and What's Ahead sections related to the Regional Electric Vehicle Collaborative, which is building a clearinghouse and technical assistance to advance the implementation of electric vehicles throughout the region, as well as the Puget Sound Regional Emissions Inventory project, which is updating the region's greenhouse gas emissions inventory and developing climate 'wedges' from all sectors to assess planned and necessary actions to achieve climate goals. This project is expected to conclude in 2022.</p>
C-1c	CM Balducci	p. 128; p. 170	Develop Climate Implementation Strategy. Continue to collaborate with PSCAA and other regional and state partners to develop an implementation plan to achieve both 2030 and 2050 greenhouse gas reduction goals.	

Potential board action on proposed amendment and future PSRC work



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: C-2

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
C-2	Pierce County / Tacoma	p. 141; p. 124	Increase PSRC capacity to analyze resiliency and environmental justice impacts and to engage affected populations. Consider hiring an environmental/climate justice specialist	Board direction requested Staff response: The draft RTP includes commitment to the continuation of PSRC's resilience work and ongoing engagement and equity work across our planning programs. This includes the ongoing partnership in the Puget Sound Climate Preparedness Collaborative. Staff proposes to strengthen this language and commitment on the pages referenced to the right. Board direction is requested on this topic related to further priority and emphasis in the work program. At board direction, PSRC would work to identify and incorporate resources in the budget and work program to support this planning work.

Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: C-3

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
C-3	Rep. Wicks	p. 133	Provide regional analysis and assistance to local jurisdictions to ensure local planning and growth targets are consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy	Board direction requested - Staff Proposed No Action Needed Staff response: PSRC's Growth Management Planning Division actively works with counties and cities in the development of local growth targets and evaluates consistency with the VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy. PSRC is in the process of developing guidance for how to address a variety of policy areas in local comprehensive plans. Further, once local growth targets have been adopted consistent with VISION 2050, PSRC will review and update the regional land use dataset and incorporate in future regional analyses.

Staff proposed no action needed;
Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: S-1

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
Topic: Safety				
S-1	Bellevue	p. 108, 182	Adopt a goal of zero fatalities and serious injuries with a Safe Systems Approach	<p>Board direction requested</p> <p>Staff response: VISION 2050 calls for the region to “Improve the safety of the transportation system and, in the long term, achieve the state’s goal of zero deaths and serious injuries.” The draft RTP includes <u>a number of</u> implementation actions and ongoing work to help support this goal and recognizes the Safe Systems Approach.</p> <p>Board direction is requested regarding the adoption of the goal as described.</p>

Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: S-2a-d

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
S-2a	CM Balducci / Bellevue / Pierce County / Tacoma	p. 103	Develop a regional safety plan as a future work program item. Include actions, targets, and performance indicators. Seek funding from USDOT.	<p>Board direction requested - Proposed Plan amendment and future PSRC work</p> <p>Staff response: The Safety section of the plan identifies ongoing and future work related to safety, including ongoing and improved data collection and monitoring; prioritization of safety and equity in project development; continued assessment of PSRC's project evaluation criteria; development of best practices and resources; and convening of regional partners and stakeholders on meeting safety goals with the lens of a Safe Systems Approach.</p> <p>Staff proposes to update this section of the plan to reflect the specific proposals for PSRC's future work program that are reflected here.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic related to further priority and emphasis in the work program. At board direction, PSRC would work to identify and incorporate resources in the budget and work program to support this planning work.</p>
S-2b	Bellevue / Rep. Wicks	p. 103	Convene regional partners and stakeholders to set an aspirational target year for achieving zero traffic fatalities and serious injuries and develop a regional plan with best practices for achieving the safety goal. Address full spectrum of safety elements and a Safe Systems Approach	
S-2c	Bellevue	p. 103	Publish an annual regional safety progress report	
S-2d	Bellevue	p. 103	Pursue resources for safety projects and programs	

Potential board action on proposed amendment directing future PSRC work program as described



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PE-1a-c

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
Topic: RTP Project Evaluation				
PE-1a	Pierce County / Tacoma	p. 176	Create policy addressing inclusion of adequate bike/walk/transit/roll infrastructure in regional capacity projects; consider an “all ages & abilities” minimum standard	<p>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed future work program</p> <p>Staff response: These three proposals relate to the evaluation of projects submitted for inclusion on the RTP Regional Capacity Projects list. As a reminder, every project submitted must respond to the adopted “RTP Prioritization Measures,” which address nine policy objectives: emissions, freight movement, jobs, multimodal alternatives (i.e., transit and bike/ped), Puget Sound land and water, safety and security, equity and access to opportunity, <u>centers</u> and travel/congestion.</p> <p>It is important to note that the RTP addresses the full transportation system, and recognizes the integrated nature of each component of the system – transit, bicycle/pedestrian, freight, <u>streets</u> and highways, TDM, etc. No one element or project is expected to accommodate all users, and the RTP and transportation system <u>as a whole</u> is focused on addressing the combined needs of all users of the system. Individual investments are proposed to address specific needs within the context of specific locations.</p> <p>Staff proposes to work with the board on updating and refining the RTP Prioritization Measures prior to the next plan update, addressing the evaluation of future projects for inclusion into the RTP.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p>
PE-1b	<i>From public comment</i>	p. 176	Require a Safe Systems Approach be used for all projects	
PE-1c	<i>From public comment</i>	p. 176	Commit to a plan to revisit the RTP Prioritization Framework	

Potential board action directing staff to identify future PSRC work program as described



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS-1

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
Topic: Project Selection				
PS-1	CM Balducci	p. 177	Develop a plan to sequence the RTP and federal funding processes; address alignment so the RTP guides upcoming funding cycles	<p>Board direction requested</p> <p>Staff response: To date, the RTP has not been directive to the PSRC project selection process; the funding process has been directly guided by the adopted VISION plan, and Policy Frameworks are developed prior to each cycle per recommendation from a Project Selection Task Force.</p> <p>The RTP is updated on a 4-year cycle, and PSRC's project selection processes are updated every 2 years. To align the timing as described and have the RTP guide the subsequent funding cycles, two options could be considered.</p> <p>For context, the 2022 project selection process was launched in January 2022, with preparation of the Policy Framework conducted between April and December 2021. The development of the RTP began by the board in January 2020, with adoption scheduled in May 2022.</p> <p>Option 1 – advance the schedule for the next RTP update so that adoption is well in advance of the Policy Framework and Project Selection Task Force work. This would suggest that the 2026-2030 RTP would need to be adopted by June 2025, a full year earlier than normal. To do so would have the next update begin in 2023, only one year after adoption of the 2022 plan. Staff believes this schedule would hamper the implementation activities of the RTP that are expected to begin after plan adoption in May 2022.</p> <p>Option 2 – advance the schedule for the next RTP update so that adoption is scheduled for December 2025, six months earlier than normal. In order for the RTP to guide the funding process, this means that decisions on the Policy Framework would need to become part of the overall RTP development process. Staff presumes this work would then influence both the 2026 and 2028 funding cycles. The subsequent RTP adoption would be in 2029/2030.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p>

Potential board action on proposed amendment as described



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS-2

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-2	Rep. Wicks	p. 61; pp. 150-152	Require all bikeways funded through PSRC to be designed for all ages and abilities; establish corresponding design standards	<p>Board direction requested</p> <p>Staff response: Project evaluation criteria are established for each project selection process that includes elements related to the safety and comfort of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, recognizing the unique context-specific needs and attributes of each project location. In addition, there are specific state and federal standards that projects must adhere to regarding specific design elements and setting design standards is outside of PSRC's expertise and authority.</p> <p>PSRC's Bicycle / Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) has provided guidance to the regional and countywide project evaluation committees in prior funding cycles to help guide the scoring and recommendation of bicycle and pedestrian projects. Staff proposes that the ongoing education and assessment of "all ages and abilities" as it relates to project evaluation would continue under the auspices of BPAC and the countywide forums responsible for recommending project funding.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p>

Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS-4

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-4	Rep. Wicks	p. 177	Set aspirational goal that each funding round will reduce GHG emissions in line with 2030 and 2050 targets	<p>Board direction requested</p> <p>Staff response: Every project submitted into PSRC's project selection process is evaluated for potential emission reductions. However, staff believes the evaluation of emissions in line with the overall regional climate goals is more relevant and appropriate at the full system scale. Projects are submitted by sponsors into PSRC's funding competitions every two years based on specific local timing decisions and other needs, and every project must be derived from and consistent with adopted comprehensive plans. Further, there is a wide diversity of individual projects submitted at any given time, addressing various modes, needs and locations. The interaction of the full transportation system, reflective of all modes, networks, land use and other attributes and factors is a more realistic and feasible assessment of GHG emissions.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p>

Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS-9

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-9	Rep. Wicks	p. 177	Make low-scoring projects ineligible for funding until resubmitted/reevaluated	<p>Board direction requested</p> <p>Staff response: In every funding cycle, prioritized lists of contingency projects by forum are adopted should additional funds become available prior to the next project selection process. In addition, given the annual delivery target requirements for PSRC's FHWA funds, these contingency lists are used to fund immediately ready-to-go projects when necessary to ensure the region is not at risk from losing federal funds.</p> <p>Board direction is requested to address this proposed policy decision regarding contingency list policies and funding.</p>

Potential board action on amendment as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS multiple

Proposed amendments PS-3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10

Staff proposed no action needed;

Potential board action on amendments as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS-3, 5, 6

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-3	Rep. Wicks	See note	Encourage local jurisdictions to package complete networks of bicycle, pedestrian, and ADA infrastructure into single project applications when seeking STP and CMAQ funding	<p>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</p> <p>Staff response: This proposal is outside of the RTP and addresses the strategic decisions made by sponsors on what projects are submitted into PSRC's competitions. Staff cannot guarantee that packaging as described would result in high scoring and recommended projects, as each project is evaluated based on the specific grant application against the adopted criteria.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p>
PS-5	Rep. Wicks	p. 177	Require all highway capacity project applications to estimate GHG emissions	<p>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</p> <p>Staff response: Every project submitted into PSRC's project selection process is evaluated for emission reductions, using PSRC's project-level emissions estimation tool. This tool is provided as a resource as part of the published Call for Projects, and PSRC staff performs the evaluation of every project for this criterion.</p>
PS-6	Rep. Wicks	p. 177	In alignment with the Regional Growth Strategy, prioritize walking, bicycling, and ADA infrastructure within designated regional growth centers, and in proximity to HCT stations	<p>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</p> <p>Staff response: The policy focus of PSRC's funding is directed in VISION 2050 to be support for centers, with the distinction of regionally designated centers for regional funds and countywide and local centers for countywide funds. In addition, the project evaluation criteria incorporate provision of walk and bike access to transit, as well as equity considerations for a variety of community groups.</p>



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS-7, 8

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-7	Rep. Wicks	p. 177	Require higher level of scrutiny for highway capacity projects in areas with higher proportions of historically marginalized communities	Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed Staff response: The 2022 Policy Framework significantly strengthened the criteria related to equity that is applied to all projects competing for PSRC's federal funds.
PS-8	Rep. Wicks	p. 177	Require all projects funded by STP and CMAQ dollars to utilize "practical design" and "Safe Systems Approach," following best safety practices	Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed Staff response: The 2022 Policy Framework significantly strengthened the criteria related to safety, including providing resources related to FHWA's Safe Systems Approach, that is applied to all projects competing for PSRC's federal funds.



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS-10

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-10	Rep. Wicks	p. 177	Create a regional project list for smaller walk, bicycle, ADA, and transit projects that are eligible for PSRC funding and are not subject to the Regional Capacity Projects requirements	<p>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</p> <p>Staff response: Projects are not required to be on the Regional Capacity Projects list in order to be eligible to compete for PSRC's federal funds. The majority of the investments in the RTP are included programmatically in the plan's financial strategy and are eligible to compete for funding as long as they are consistent with local comprehensive or other plans. In fact, the majority of PSRC funds are awarded to those investments that fall below the threshold of requiring to be on the RTP Regional Capacity Projects list (refer to page 12 of the 2021-2024 Regional TIP documentation, https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/tip2020-overviewof2021-2024regionaltip.pdf).</p> <p>In addition, there are multiple funding processes in which these types of investments may compete, e.g., the recent Transportation Alternatives Program, the Rural Town Centers and Corridors Program, the WSDOT Coordinated Grant Program, etc. Also as a reminder, the countywide forums conduct their processes for PSRC funding based on supporting countywide and local centers.</p>

Proposed amendments PS-3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10

Staff proposed no action needed;

Potential board action on amendments as proposed



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS-11-13

Forwarded from public comment; no current amendments proposed

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-11	From public comment	p. 177	Require 75% of PSRC funding each project selection round be targeted for bike/walk/transit/roll investments in transit sheds and growth centers, consistent with VISION 2050 RGS 65%/75% goal	Board direction requested Staff response: Noted earlier is the policy focus and project evaluation criteria that address active transportation and transit supporting regional and local centers. Board direction is requested on this funding priority topic.

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-12	From public comment	p. 177	Adopt a <u>policy prioritizing investments</u> in transit and sidewalk connectivity in areas with high concentrations of people with specialized transportation needs	Board direction requested Staff response: Noted earlier is the policy focus and project evaluation criteria that address active transportation and transit supporting regional and local centers. Board direction is requested on this funding priority topic.



Group 2 – Proposed Amendments: PS-13

Amendment ID	Sponsor	RTP Page	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-13	From public comment	p. 177	Require all PSRC funded projects to have VMT reduction plan	<p>Board direction requested</p> <p>Staff response: As noted in the response to PS-4, there is a wide diversity of individual projects submitted into the funding competitions each cycle, addressing various modes, needs and locations. Projects are submitted by sponsors into PSRC's funding competitions every two years based on specific local timing decisions and other needs, and every project must be derived from and consistent with adopted comprehensive plans. Not every project will address or have an impact on VMT reduction, and other factors such as land use and other area programs such as TDM may contribute to VMT reduction within a given area. As noted earlier, the interaction of the full transportation system, reflective of all modes, networks, land use and other attributes and factors provides a more robust and realistic assessment of VMT and emissions.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p>

Forwarded from public comment; no current amendments proposed



Final Action on RTP

The Transportation Policy Board recommends approval of the draft Regional Transportation Plan, as amended with the actions on March 31 and April 14, to the Executive Board



An aerial photograph of a coastal city, likely Seattle, showing a large bridge crossing a body of water, a marina filled with boats, and a dense urban area with mountains in the background.

Thank you.

