Transportation Policy Board
Thursday, January 11, 2018 • 9:30 AM – 11:30 AM
PSRC Board Room • 1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500, Seattle, WA 98104

The meeting will be streamed live over the internet at www.psrc.org

1. Call to Order (9:30) - Councilmember Rob Johnson, Chair
2. Report of the Chair
3. Communications and Public Comment
4. Staff Report
5. Consent Agenda (9:50)
   a. Approve Minutes of Transportation Policy Board Meeting held November 9, 2017
   b. Routine Amendment to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
   c. Recommend Authorizing a Change in Transportation 2040 Project Status for the Sound Transit Tacoma Link Extension Project
   d. Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Carnation
   e. Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for Arlington, Duvall, Granite Falls, and Pacific
6. Action Item (9:55)
   a. Recommend Approval of Funding for Projects through PSRC's 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program -- Sarah Gutschow, PSRC
7. Action Item (10:05)
   a. Recommend Approval of Policies and Procedures for the 2018 Project Selection Process for PSRC Funds -- Kelly McGourty, PSRC
8. Action Item (10:50)
   a. Recommend Adoption of Regional Safety Performance Management Targets -- Gary Simonson, PSRC
9. Next Meeting: February 8, 2018, 9:30 - 11:30 a.m., PSRC Board Room
   Major Topics for February:
   -- Regional Transportation Plan--Summary of Public Comments
   -- VISION 2050--Briefing on Draft Scope
10. Adjourn (11:30)

Board members please submit proposed amendments and materials prior to the meeting for distribution. Organizations/individuals may submit information for distribution. Send to Cheryl Saltys, e-mail csaltys@psrc.org; fax 206-587-4825; or mail.

Sign language and communication material in alternate formats can be arranged given sufficient notice by calling (206) 464-7090 or TTY Relay 711. 中文 | Chinese, 한국 | Korean, Русский | Russian, Español | Spanish, Tagalog, Tiếng việt | Vietnamese Call 206-587-4819.
MINUTES OF THE
TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD

November 9, 2017

[To watch a video of the meeting and hear the full discussion, please go to: http://psrcwa.iqm2.com/Citizens/Default.aspx.]

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 9:35 a.m. by Councilmember Rob Johnson, Chair. Following self introductions around the table, Chair Johnson made a change in the order of agenda items to put Communications and Public Comment before the Report of the Chair.

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC COMMENT

Alex Tsimerman, StandUP-America, addressed the board.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR

Chair Johnson recognized the following board members who did not run for re-election and will be leaving the board at the end of the year, and thanked them for their service:

- Issaquah Mayor Fred Butler, representing Sound Transit
- Bremerton Councilmember Dino Davis
- Auburn Councilmember Rich Wagner, representing Other Cities & Towns in King County

Also acknowledged were Bainbridge Island Mayor Val Tollefson and Bellevue Councilmember Kevin Wallace, who were not present at the meeting.

STAFF REPORT

Kelly McGourty, Senior Program Manager–Transportation Planning:

- Gave a brief update on the work of the Project Selection Task Force and noted that the Task Force will hold its third meeting today at noon and its final meeting on December 14.
- Reported on the PSRC sold-out event held November 8 for local planners and transportation professionals on “Where We’re Growing: Planning Together for a Sustainable Region.”
CONSENT AGENDA

a. Approval of Minutes of Transportation Policy Board Meeting held October 12, 2017
b. Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Tukwila
c. Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for the Towns of South Prairie and Wilkeson

ACTION: The motion was made by Councilmember Terry Ryan and seconded by Mayor Fred Butler to adopt the Consent Agenda. The motion passed.

RELEASE FOR PUBLIC COMMENTS PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR FUNDING THROUGH PSRC’S 2017 TRANSPORTATION ALTERNATIVES PROGRAM

Sarah Gutschow, Senior Planner, gave an overview of the competitive process PSRC recently conducted to award funds from the Federal Highway Administration’s Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), which provides funding for community based transportation improvements. Twelve projects, including 11 bicycle/pedestrian projects and one historical preservation project, have been recommended for $17.5 million, along with a prioritized contingency list of projects should additional funds become available prior to the next competitive process.

ACTION: The motion was made by Commissioner Rob Gelder and seconded by Councilmember Mike O’Brien to release for public comment the list of projects recommended for funding through the 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program as identified in Attachment A, along with the list of recommended contingency list projects, in accordance with PSRC’s public participation plan. The motion passed.

RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF FUNDING FOR PROJECTS ON PSRC 2016-2017 COORDINATED GRANT PROGRAM CONTINGENCY LIST

An additional $178,712 in Federal Transit Administration (FTA) Section 5310 funds has become available for special needs transportation in the region. Gil Cerise, Principal Planner, briefed the board on a recommendation to award the funds to six projects on the 2016-17 PSRC Special Needs Transportation Contingency List that will support specialized transportation for seniors, youth, people with disabilities, and people with low income.

ACTION: The motion was made by Councilmember Kate Kruller and seconded by Commissioner Don Johnson to recommend that the Executive Board approve $178,712 in FTA Section 5310 funds to award to projects on the 2016-17 PSRC Special Needs Transportation Contingency List as shown in Attachment A. The motion passed.

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN – PUBLIC COMMENT RELEASE

Kelly McGourty reviewed with the board the overall content and structure of the draft Regional Transportation Plan, formerly referred to as the Transportation 2040 update. Kimberly Scrivner, Senior Planner, briefed the board on public engagement efforts conducted to date, including the methods of engagement, specific organizations targeted for outreach, new public engagement features for this plan update, and some of the key findings. A 45-day public comment period is
anticipated from mid-December through the end of January. Comments received will be compiled and presented to the Transportation Policy Board in February and March.

**ACTION:** The motion was made by Councilmember Dino Davis and seconded by Councilmember Ryan Mello to direct staff to prepare the draft Regional Transportation Plan and release it for public comment in December. The motion passed.

**FEDERAL SAFETY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TARGETS**

Sean Ardussi, Senior Planner, provided an overview of the target setting process for the federally required Safety Performance Management Final Rule. Targets must be set for the following five performance measures:

- Number of fatalities
- Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
- Number of serious injuries
- Rate of serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries

State Departments of Transportation were required to report statewide targets to the Federal Highway Administration by August 31, 2017. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs), such as PSRC, have until February 27, 2018, to establish quantifiable targets specific to their Metropolitan Planning Area.

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) developed statewide targets based on the State’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Target Zero, to reach zero fatalities and serious injuries by the year 2030. PSRC has been working with WSDOT to develop regional targets that align with the state targets. Mr. Ardussi briefed the board on the state and regional targets for each of the five performance measures, and the evaluation process for the targets. The board will be asked to recommend adoption of the regional targets in January 2018.

**2017 TRANSIT INTEGRATION REPORT**

On an annual basis, PSRC develops a Transit Integration Report documenting transit coordination activities underway and anticipated in the region. Alex Krieg, Senior Planner, presented the newly released 2017 Transit Integration Report. He described integration efforts among the region’s transit agencies over the past year as well as coordination between transit and local jurisdictions, and how this work overlaps with the Regional Transportation Plan. Highlights included coordination on a next generation fare card system, bus fleet electrification, and the continued expansion of light rail and bus rapid transit. Board members provided input on potential integration opportunities in the year ahead.

**ADJOURN**

Chair Johnson announced that the Transportation Policy Board will not meet in December.

The meeting adjourned at 11:14 a.m.
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To: Transportation Policy Board

From: Kelly McGourty, Senior Program Manager, Transportation Planning

Subject: Routine Amendment to the 2017-2020 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)

IN BRIEF

Five agencies submitted eight projects this month for routine amendment into the Regional TIP. These projects are summarized in Exhibit A. These projects were awarded local, state and federal funding through various processes, such as Connecting Washington funds managed by the Washington State Department of Transportation. PSRC staff reviewed the projects for compliance with federal and state requirements, and consistency with VISION 2040 and Transportation 2040.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Transportation Policy Board should recommend Executive Board adoption of an amendment to the 2017-2020 Regional TIP to include the projects as shown in Exhibit A.

DISCUSSION

Under the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, PSRC has project selection authority for all projects programming regional funds from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) - Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) - and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) - Urbanized Area Formula Program (5307), State of Good Repair (5337), Bus and Bus Facilities Formula (5339), and Enhanced Mobility of Seniors and Individuals with Disabilities (5310).

While PSRC does not have project selection authority for other types of federal, state, or local funds, the Executive Board does have responsibility for adding these projects to the Regional TIP. Each project must comply with requirements regarding plan consistency, air quality, and financial constraint. The attached Exhibit A illustrates the action needed to amend the Regional TIP.
The recommended action would approve the TIP amendment request based on a finding of consistency with VISION 2040, Transportation 2040, and the air quality conformity determination of the Regional TIP. Approval is also based on a determination that funding is reasonably expected to be available to carry out the project. Information describing plan consistency, air quality conformity, and the funding basis for approving the request is described further below.

Consistency with VISION 2040 and Transportation 2040

The projects recommended for action were reviewed by PSRC staff and have been determined to be consistent with the multicounty policies in VISION 2040 and Transportation 2040.

Air Quality Conformity

The projects in Exhibit A were reviewed and it has been determined that a new air quality analysis and conformity determination is not required because each project falls into one or more of the following categories:

- It is exempt from air quality conformity requirements.
- It is an existing project already included in the current air quality modeling.
- It is a non-exempt project not able to be included in the regional model.

Funding Reasonably Expected to be Available

For the projects in Exhibit A, PSRC confirmed that the funds are reasonably expected to be available.

PSRC’s Project Tracking Policies

This month’s amendment includes no Project Tracking actions.

Federal and State Fund Source Descriptions

The following is a list of state and federal funding sources that are referenced in Exhibit A.

STP(BR) WSDOT-managed Local Bridge Program, providing assistance for eligible bridges on public roads.

CWA State Connecting Washington Account.

FBP Federal program for the Construction of Ferry Boats and Ferry Terminal Facilities.

HSIP WSDOT-managed Highway Safety Improvement Program.

NHPP National Highway Performance Program funds to support construction of new facilities on the National Highway System.

For more information, please contact Chris Peak at (206) 464-7536 or cpeak@psrc.org.

Attachments:
Exhibit A

Doc ID 2149
## Project(s) Proposed for Routine Amendment to 2017-2020 TIP

### Exhibit A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title and Work Description</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>PSRC Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Covington</strong></td>
<td><strong>SR 516 - Jenkins Creek to 185th Place SE</strong>&lt;br&gt;This project modification adds a new construction phase to widen SR516 (Kent-Kangley) from a two-lane rural road to a 5-lane arterial road from Jenkins Creek to 185th Place SE.</td>
<td>$6,180,000 Local&lt;br&gt;$13,269,782 Connecting Washington&lt;br&gt;$19,449,782 Total</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. King County Department of Transportation (Road Services)</strong></td>
<td><strong>King County 2017 High Friction Surface Treatment</strong>&lt;br&gt;New project adding preliminary engineering and construction phases to conduct pavement repair and install high friction surface treatments at locations with high accident rates throughout unincorporated King County.</td>
<td>$220,000 Local&lt;br&gt;$3,269,290 Federal HSIP&lt;br&gt;$3,489,290 Total</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Tacoma</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yakima Avenue Bridge Overlay</strong>&lt;br&gt;New project adding preliminary engineering and construction phases to provide a new cement concrete overlay on the bridge deck, expansion joints, and minor bridge repairs for the Yakima Avenue South Bridge.</td>
<td>$2,990,000 Federal STP(BR)&lt;br&gt;$466,950 Local&lt;br&gt;$3,456,950 Total</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. WSDOT Northwest Region</strong></td>
<td><strong>I-90/E Fork Issaquah Creek to Burlington Northern Railroad Bridge - Seismic Retrofit</strong>&lt;br&gt;New project adds preliminary engineering and construction phases to seismically retrofit I-90 bridges located within Washington's Seismic Lifeline Route.</td>
<td>$11,582,831 Local&lt;br&gt;$1,574,514 Federal NHPP&lt;br&gt;$13,157,345 Total</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Title and Work Description</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>PSRC Action Needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. WSDOT Northwest Region</td>
<td>SR 529/Northbound Steamboat Slough Bridge - Bridge Scour. New project adding preliminary engineering, right of way, and construction phases to provide scour protection for the northbound SR 529 bridge which crosses over Steamboat Slough to preserve the structural integrity of the bridge 529/20E.</td>
<td>$1,639,820 Federal NHPP $41,117 Local</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,680,937 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. WSDOT Marine Division</td>
<td>SR 305/Bainbridge Island Ferry Terminal - Pedestrian Loading Bridge Replacement. New construction phase to replace the pedestrian loading bridge at the Bainbridge Island Ferry Terminal with a new, wider structure that meets current seismic codes.</td>
<td>$7,580,000 State $2,800,000 Federal FBP $2,200,000 Federal NHPP</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,580,000 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sound Transit</td>
<td>Downtown Redmond Link Extension. New project adding preliminary engineering, right of way, and construction phases to extend light rail approximately 3.4 miles from the Redmond Technology Center Station (opening 2023), with new stations in downtown Redmond and southeast Redmond near Marymoor Park.</td>
<td>$83,695,000 Local</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$83,695,000 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sound Transit</td>
<td>Tacoma Dome Link Extension. New project adding preliminary engineering and right of way phases to extend light rail 9.7 miles from the Federal Way Transit Center to Tacoma via I-5 with four new stations in south Federal Way, Fife and east Tacoma areas, and at the Tacoma Dome Station.</td>
<td>$26,150,000 Local</td>
<td>☐ ☒ ☐ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$26,150,000 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSENT AGENDA

January 4, 2018

To: Transportation Policy Board

From: Kelly McGourty, Senior Program Manager, Transportation Planning

Subject: Recommend Authorizing a Change in Transportation 2040 Project Status for the Sound Transit Tacoma Link Extension Project

IN BRIEF

Sound Transit has submitted a request to change the status of the Tacoma Link Extension Project from “Candidate” to “Approved.” Per PSRC’s adopted procedures, requests to change a project status require Board action.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Transportation Policy Board should recommend that the Executive Board authorize a change in project status for Sound Transit’s Tacoma Link Extension project from “Candidate” to “Approved.”

DISCUSSION

The region’s long-range metropolitan transportation plan, Transportation 2040, contains policies requiring PSRC’s Executive Board to approve regionally significant transportation capacity projects before those projects begin implementation phases. Projects in Transportation 2040 are designated as Candidate, Approved, or Conditionally Approved. A Candidate designation means a project has gone through a comprehensive planning process, but that one or more of the following has not yet been completed: environmental documentation and approvals, financial plan, and/or other planning requirements. A project’s status is changed to Approved once these requirements have been met. Conditional Approval may be granted if a project has fulfilled most of the approval criteria but lacks only certain details. For example, if a project awaits only final signatures on its environmental documentation but has completed all other requirements, the Executive Board may grant Conditional Approval. Once the final details have been completed, staff has the authority to grant a project full Approval status administratively, thereby saving the project sponsor several weeks of delay.

The Tacoma Link Extension Project is a 2.4-mile light rail extension from the Theater District in downtown to the Hilltop neighborhood in Tacoma. The project extends the railway, adds six
new stations, relocates the existing Theater District station, expands the existing Operations and Maintenance Facility (OMF), and grows the fleet by five vehicles.

Table A below provides additional details of the project(s) seeking approval, including the criteria used to review the projects for the requested status change.

Table A: Project Details and Review Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Criteria</th>
<th>Sound Transit – Tacoma Link Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td>$217,346,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency with Transportation 2040 Policies</td>
<td>The project is consistent with regional policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit-Cost Analysis</td>
<td>Staff concur that the sponsor has completed their Benefit Cost Analysis requirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Documentation</td>
<td>FTA approved a NEPA documented categorical exclusion on June 25, 2015, and Sound Transit issued a SEPA Determination of Nonsignificance on July 13, 2015.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Planning Requirements</td>
<td>The City of Tacoma has passed Resolution 39255, recommending the project to be built, and Sound Transit has executed numerous agreements with Tacoma, including a Memorandum of Understanding, Term Sheet, Right of Use Agreement, and Joint Operating Agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Feasibility</td>
<td>Project funding provided by a combination of federal (FHWA, FTA, TIGER), state (Regional Mobility), Sound Transit, and City of Tacoma sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Conformity</td>
<td>Approving this project will not change the region’s air quality conformity determination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please contact Benjamin Brackett at 206-971-3280 or bbrackett@psrc.org.
CONSENT AGENDA

January 4, 2018

To: Transportation Policy Board

From: Kelly McGourty, Senior Program Manager, Transportation Planning

Subject: Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Carnation

IN BRIEF

Consistent with the Executive Board’s direction on January 26, 2017 regarding review of comprehensive plan updates for Small Cities, Carnation adopted a local resolution related to planning consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy. Staff now recommends full certification of the comprehensive plan.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Growth Management Policy Board and Transportation Policy Board should recommend that the Executive Board certify that the transportation-related provisions of the City of Carnation’s comprehensive plan updates and supporting resolution conform to the Growth Management Act and are consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan.

DISCUSSION

The 2015 comprehensive plan updates for the City of Carnation were conditionally certified last year as part of PSRC’s plan review process. Conditional certification allowed the city to qualify for PSRC-managed federal funding while working to address questions about planning for growth significantly greater than adopted targets.

The issue of growth targets for Small Cities resulted in a number of challenging policy discussions by the Growth Management Policy Board, Executive Board and the King County Growth Management Policy Council, including a GMPC/GMPB joint work session. Members reiterated that planning consistent with the Growth Management Act and VISION 2040, and regional coordination are important and need to be clearly supported in all local plans. There was also recognition that amending plans now and addressing the underlying issues related to growth targets will require ongoing work and coordination at the local and regional levels. In January, the Executive Board approved the Growth Management Policy Board’s recommendation to provide a new path for the affected Small Cities to become fully certified.
The Growth Management Policy Board noted that the affected Small Cities had provided valuable information and encouraged them to provide further clarification about how the cities are working to support the Regional Growth Strategy. Recognizing that more work to address small city targets will be needed over the course of the next planning cycle, the Growth Management Policy Board recommended and the Executive Board approved an alternative option. This option asked the cities to make a commitment to support VISION 2040 and work with regional partners, without requiring a comprehensive plan amendment at this time. This allows cities to be fully certified expeditiously, while asking the cities to:

- Acknowledge that the planned housing and employment growth anticipated in the small city's adopted comprehensive plan is greater than adopted growth targets for the city, and acknowledge the importance of managing that growth and mitigating its impacts, including on surrounding communities, rural and resource lands, and the regional transportation system.

- Continue to work collaboratively with regional and countywide planning organizations on growth allocations during the next and future target updates and commit to planning for growth in future plan updates consistent with those collaboratively set and adopted target updates.

- Identify and continue strategies cities are using to manage and mitigate the impacts of growth.

- Reinforce the city's commitment to managing its growth within current city and Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundaries, while minimizing impacts on surrounding rural and resource lands; commit to using the adopted countywide criteria for evaluating any requested UGA modifications.

- Commit to prioritize consistency with the Regional Growth Strategy when considering future land use and zoning changes and capital facilities investments.

This path does not require cities to make plan amendments now, provided they adopt a council commitment, such as a council-adopted resolution, to continue to work collaboratively on growth issues that clearly require a longer term to fully address.

**City of Carnation Resolution**

Following the Executive Board’s approval of the new path to certification, Carnation proceeded with development and adoption of a council resolution. The adopted resolution is attached and discussed below.

The City of Carnation adopted a resolution that notes how its comprehensive plan embodies policies consistent with the Growth Management Act and VISION 2040. While the city recognizes that anticipated growth exceeds the adopted targets, it states the importance of managing the growth and mitigating its impacts. The resolution commits the city to continue to work collaboratively with regional and countywide planning organizations on growth target allocations and planning for growth consistent with those target updates.

Carnation has implemented a number of best practices to manage growth, including growth monitoring, impact fees, transportation concurrency requirements, adequacy of public facilities, and environmental regulations. The resolution also notes the city’s planned 20-year growth is
fully within the city’s current city limits and no expansion of the UGA is contemplated in the comprehensive plan. Carnation’s resolution states that it has addressed the issues identified in the conditional certification and requests full certification of its comprehensive plan.

Staff have concluded that the locally adopted resolution meets the requirements set out by the Executive Board for the new path to certification.

For more information, please contact Paul Inghram at (206) 464-7549 or pinghram@psrc.org or Michael Hubner at (206) 971-3289 or MHubner@psrc.org.

Attachments:
Carnation Resolution 417
RESOLUTION NO. 417

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CARNATION, WASHINGTON, RELATED TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CERTIFICATION BY THE PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL (PSRC); DOCUMENTING THE CITY’S ACTIONS THAT SUPPORT THE PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL’S VISION 2040 AND REGIONAL GROWTH STRATEGY; AND REQUESTING FULL CERTIFICATION OF THE CARNATION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN BY THE PUGET SOUND REGIONAL COUNCIL.

WHEREAS, the City of Carnation plans under the Washington State Growth Management Act, codified at chapter 36.70A RCW (GMA); and

WHEREAS, on August 4, 2015 the City adopted its 2015 Comprehensive Plan Update pursuant to the GMA; and

WHEREAS, the update met all requirements for compliance with the Washington State Growth Management Act and State Environmental Policy Act; and

WHEREAS, the update to the Carnation Comprehensive Plan anticipates growth of and plans for the city’s planned annexation area in addition to the King County’s CPP growth targets for growth within the city; and

WHEREAS, a goal of the comprehensive plan is to continue to support integration, and implementation of the Puget Sound Regional Council’s VISION 2040 at the local level; and

WHEREAS, the comprehensive plan was reviewed by state agencies and the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC); and

WHEREAS, on January 28, 2016, Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board adopted a “Plan Review Report and Certification Recommendation” and conditionally certified
the City’s comprehensive plan with a requirement to further address consistency between housing and employment growth assumptions; and

WHEREAS, on April 5, 2016, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 403, committing to address the conditions of certification; and

WHEREAS, City staff coordinated with other cities, King County, Puget Sound Regional Council to address growth targets and growth assumptions related to the conditional certification; and

WHEREAS, on January 26, 2017, the Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board adopted a new approach to address conditional certifications related to consistency with growth targets for small cities; and

WHEREAS, the City’s comprehensive plan and development regulations demonstrate a commitment to managing growth consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy and addressing growth-related impacts, including the appropriate use of development regulations, impact fees and other tools to ensure that growth pays for growth; and

WHEREAS, the City seeks to avoid and minimize unnecessary vehicle trips through coordinated land use and transportation planning strategies; and

WHEREAS, the City coordinated with other small cities in King County to refine and adjust individual growth targets; and

WHEREAS, Carnation plans to continue the work to address transportation and capital facilities improvement programs necessary to be implemented when associated with future growth; NOW, THEREFORE

IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CARNATION AS FOLLOWS:
Section 1. The City is committed to advancing the integrity and mission of VISION 2040 and the Regional Growth Strategy through the policies and implementation strategies adopted in its comprehensive plan and regulatory standards.

Section 2. The City is working to actively manage growth and mitigate related impacts, including those on surrounding communities, rural and resource lands, and the regional transportation system.

Section 3. The City Council directs staff to continue to work collaboratively with other cities, King County, and the Puget Sound Regional Council on future growth allocations during the next housing and employment target setting process, and commits to planning for growth in future updates to the comprehensive plan consistent with those collaboratively set and adopted targets.

Section 4. The City commits to continue and, as needed, adopt measures to manage anticipated growth in a manner that mitigates potential impacts, including impacts on surrounding communities, rural and resource lands, and the regional transportation system.

Section 5. The City commits to managing its growth within the current city and UGA boundaries, while minimizing impacts on surrounding rural and resource lands, and to using the adopted countywide criteria for evaluating any potential UGA modifications.

Section 6. The City commits to working with King County to manage the development and annexation of the adjacent unincorporated urban growth area.

Section 7. The City commits to managing its growth within the current city and UGA boundaries, while minimizing impacts on surrounding rural and resource lands, and to using the adopted countywide criteria for evaluating any potential UGA modifications.

Section 8. The City commits to prioritizing consistency with the Regional Growth Strategy when considering future land use and zoning changes and capital facilities investments.

Section 9. The City Council finds that it has reasonably addressed the conditions of certification pursuant to the Puget Sound Regional Council Executive Board’s decision on January 26, 2017, and, accordingly, directs staff to submit this resolution and associated documentation to the Puget Sound Regional Council and to seek full certification of the City of Carnation’s Comprehensive Plan.

Section 10. This resolution shall be effective immediately upon passage.

ADOPTED BY THE CITY COUNCIL AT A REGULAR MEETING THEREOF ON THE 17TH DAY OF OCTOBER, 2017.

CITY OF CARNATION

MAYOR, JIM BERGER
ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:

Mary Madole
CITY CLERK, MARY MADOLE

FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK: ..... 09/19/2017
PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL: ..... 10/17/2017
RESOLUTION NO. ........................................417

Attachment: Carnation Resolution 417 (2138 : Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plan for the City of Carnation)
CONSENT AGENDA

January 4, 2018

To: Transportation Policy Board

From: Kelly McGourty, Senior Program Manager, Transportation Planning

Subject: Recommend Full Certification of the Comprehensive Plans for Arlington, Duvall, Granite Falls, and Pacific

IN BRIEF

Consistent with PSRC’s adopted plan review process, PSRC staff reviewed the 2017 comprehensive plan amendments for the cities of Arlington, Duvall, Granite Falls, and Pacific that respond to the conditions for regional certification. Staff recommends full certification of the plans.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Growth Management Policy Board and Transportation Policy Board should:

Recommend the Executive Board certify that the transportation-related provisions of the following comprehensive plans, as amended in 2017, are consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan and conform to the Growth Management requirements for transportation planning.

1) City of Arlington (certification report)
2) City of Duvall (certification report)
3) City of Granite Falls (certification report)
4) City of Pacific (certification report)

DISCUSSION

The 2015 comprehensive plan updates for the cities of Arlington, Duvall, Granite Falls, and Pacific were conditionally certified in 2016 and 2017 as part of PSRC’s plan review process. Conditional certification allowed the cities to qualify for PSRC-managed federal funding while working to address the conditions.
**Arlington**
PSRC conditionally certified the City of Arlington’s 2015 periodic update of the city’s comprehensive plan on April 28, 2016. The March 2016 certification report for the City of Arlington comprehensive plan update identified a shortfall of housing capacity within the city, as provided for in the land use element, compared with adopted targets which establish local responsibility under GMA to accommodate growth and provide the basis for land use assumptions in the transportation element.

In October 2017, the city adopted amendments to the plan that address the conditions and resubmitted the plan for further review and full certification. The amended plan demonstrates consistency with the GMA in accommodating targeted growth, providing consistency among plan elements in assumed future growth levels, planning for nonmotorized travel, and completing a multiyear financing plan.

**Duvall**
PSRC conditionally certified the City of Duvall’s 2015 periodic update of the city’s comprehensive plan on January 26, 2017. The December 2016 certification report for the City of Duvall comprehensive plan update identified as a condition for full certification the need to update transportation plan data, assumptions, and strategies to be consistent with the new 20-year planning period addressed elsewhere in the comprehensive plan.

In December 2017, the city adopted amendments to the plan, including by reference material adopted in an updated Transportation Plan, that address the conditions and resubmitted the plan for further review and full certification. The amended plan demonstrates consistency with the GMA and with VISION 2040, and includes revised inventories of existing conditions, updated project list and updated multiyear financing plan, and revised land use assumptions that are consistent with the land use element and adopted countywide growth targets.

**Granite Falls**
PSRC conditionally certified the City of Granite Falls’ 2015 periodic update of the comprehensive plan on April 28, 2016. The March 2016 certification report identified a shortfall of housing capacity of 88 units (218 people), as provided for in the land use element, compared with adopted targets which establish local responsibility under GMA to accommodate growth and provide the basis for land use assumptions in the transportation element.

Working with Snohomish County and other cities through the Snohomish County Tomorrow process, the population and housing targets for Granite Falls were adjusted through a targets reconciliation process in 2016. In November 2017, the city amended the land use element of the comprehensive plan to document the newly adjusted targets, along with a comparison with land use capacity for housing within the city.

**Pacific**
PSRC conditionally certified the City of Pacific’s 2015 periodic update of the city’s comprehensive plan on April 28, 2016. The March 2016 certification report for the City of Pacific comprehensive plan update identified a shortfall of employment capacity within the Pierce County part of the city, as provided for in the land use element. The March 2016 certification report also identified the need to provide a multiyear transportation financing plan and a nonmotorized plan.

In November 2017, the city adopted amendments to the plan that address the conditions and resubmitted the plan for further review and full certification. The amended plan demonstrates
consistency with the GMA in accommodating targeted growth, providing consistency among plan elements in assumed future growth levels, planning for nonmotorized travel, and completing a multiyear financing plan.

The amendments for the plans discussed above have been reviewed in accordance with the adopted plan review process. They were found to be consistent with the multicounty planning policies and the regional transportation plan and to conform to transportation planning requirements in the Growth Management Act. PSRC staff coordinated with city staff in the review of the amendments and the development of the certification reports.

For more information, please contact Michael Hubner at (206) 971-3289 or MHubner@psrc.org or Laura Benjamin at lbenjamin@psrc.org or (206) 464-7134.
ACTION ITEM

January 4, 2018

To: Transportation Policy Board
From: Kelly McGourty, Senior Program Manager, Transportation Planning
Subject: Recommend Approval of Funding for Projects through PSRC's 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program

IN BRIEF

PSRC recently conducted a competitive process to award funds from the Federal Highway Administration’s Transportation Alternatives Program. On November 9, 2017, the Transportation Policy Board authorized the release of the projects being recommended to receive funding for public review and comment, including a prioritized contingency list should additional funds become available, as identified in Attachment A. All comments received as of January 3, 2018, are included in Attachment B. Any additional comments received by the Executive Board meeting on January 25 will be provided at that time.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Transportation Policy Board should recommend that the Executive Board approve the projects to receive funding from the 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program as identified in Attachment A, along with the list of recommended contingency projects.

DISCUSSION

The Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) is a Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) program under the Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act that provides funding for community-based transportation improvements, such as bicycle/pedestrian facilities, historic preservation of transportation assets, environmental mitigation, and others. Metropolitan Planning Organizations such as PSRC have a role in the selection of projects to receive funding from TAP within each region.

For PSRC’s 2017 TAP project selection process, an estimated amount of $17.5 million of FFY 2017-2020 funds is being distributed. The projects recommended for funding and the prioritized contingency list of projects were released for public comment on November 9, 2017. A news release was sent to PSRC’s membership, stakeholder groups, interested parties, and news media, which includes almost 5,000 contacts. The public comment period was featured on
PSRC’s Blog, Facebook and Twitter accounts, in the At Work meeting summary, and in the email newsletter sent out by the Executive Director. Materials were also posted on PSRC’s website, which invited the public to comment by mail or email.

All public comments received as of January 3, 2018, are included in Attachment B. PSRC responds to every comment submitted, and comments regarding specific projects are also forwarded to the appropriate project sponsor for their information. Any additional comments received after January 3 will be provided to the Executive Board at their January 25 meeting when final action is scheduled.

For more information, please contact Sarah Gutschow at sgutschow@psrc.org or (206) 587-4822.

Attachments:
A - 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Funding Recommendation and Prioritized Contingency List
B - Public Comments Received for PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition (as of January 3, 2018)
### PROJECTS RECOMMENDED FOR 2017 TAP FUNDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Phase(s)</th>
<th>Phase(s) Recommended Funding</th>
<th>Phase(s) Funding Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King County Parks</td>
<td>East Lake Sammamish Trail North Extension</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,718,683</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>121st Street South Streetscape Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 151,200</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 866,125</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Bell St Protected Bike Lane</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,349,521</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Revitalizing Tacoma’s Brewery District with Complete Streets: Phase I</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 267,281</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,934,193</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Metro</td>
<td>White Center-RapidRide H Line Non-Motorized Safety Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 192,009</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 759,622</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Cowen Park Historic Bridge</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 2,409,859</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Island</td>
<td>Olympic Drive Non-Motorized Improvement Project</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 878,320</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issaquah</td>
<td>Newport Way Non-Motorized Improvement Project - SR 300 to SE 54th St</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 1,550,888</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This project will complete the 12-foot-wide East Lake Sammamish Trail in the former BNSF Rail Corridor through the SR 520/SR 202 Interchange and over Bear Creek, linking the northern terminus of the East Lake Sammamish Trail with the southern terminus of the Redmond Central Connector in Redmond.*

*This project will add wide sidewalks on both sides, install LED pedestrian scale lighting to illuminate the sidewalk, and provide signed and striped bike lanes and landscaping and planted areas to separate the sidewalks from the roadway. Parking will also be removed from this segment of roadway and a mid-block crossing will be built. Access to that new crosswalk with rapid flashing beacons will be provided by the new sidewalks that this project will build.*

*This project will build a protected bike lane (PBL) on Bell St from 5th Ave to Denny Way, and also build traffic calming features to support 2-way bicycle travel in Bell Street Park from 5th Ave to 2nd Ave.*

*This project will add bike lanes, curb ramps, pedestrian refuge islands, upgrade crossings, upgrade signals for bicycle detection/APS, improve ADA accessibility, add mid-block crossings, and bicycle amenities.*

*This project will complete missing segments of sidewalk, safety improvements to pedestrian crossings, and bicycle corridor treatments and transit-related bicycle parking in King County’s White Center designated activity center.*

*This project will retrofit the historic Cowen Park Bridge to meet current seismic standards. Based on preliminary design work, these upgrades are expected to include jacketing columns, bolstering crossbeams, and adding transverse restraints at expansion piers.*

*This project provides pedestrian and bicycle improvements on Olympic Drive SE / SR305 from Winslow Way to Harborview Drive connecting a busy intersection with commuter traffic to the Washington State Ferries (WSF) Bainbridge Island Terminal and Kitsap Transit Bus Station. The project includes sidewalk widening and accessibility improvements, bike lanes, painted bike boxes, center divider, signal modifications for pedestrian and cyclists, signage, landscaping, and other work.*

*This project will provide continuous 5’ bike facilities, a 6’ sidewalk on the south side of Newport Way NW, a 10’ multi-use trail on the north side of Newport Way NW, curb and 5’ landscaped planter strip buffer, pedestrian crossing treatments, including median refuge islands and rectangular rapid flashing beacons.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Phase(s)</th>
<th>Phase(s) Recommended Funding</th>
<th>Phase(s) Funding Year</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Pipeline Trail, Phase III Construction</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$1,936,057</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>This project will complete the 12-foot-wide East Lake Sammamish Trail in the former BNSF Rail Corridor through the SR 520/SR 202 Interchange and over Bear Creek, linking the northern terminus of the East Lake Sammamish Trail with the southern terminus of the Redmond Central Connector in Redmond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnwood</td>
<td>44th Ave W/I-5 Underpass Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$255,672</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>This project will retrofit 44th Avenue W in the vicinity of the I-5 underpass. It will provide sidewalk and crossing improvements, construction of a shared use path, lighting, and public art. Significant linkage barriers exist on both ends of the project preventing safe and efficient travel by non-motorized travelers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sultan</td>
<td>Sultan Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>This project will construct a 627-foot long, 10-foot wide pedestrian/bicycle bridge that runs parallel to and independent of the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) U.S. 2 vehicle bridge, located east of milepost 22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Transit</td>
<td>Bremerton Transportation Center ADA Improvements</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$153,412</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>This project will provide ADA improvements at the Bremerton Transportation Center, including curb ramp modifications, platform edge detectable warning modifications, accessible load/unload area modifications and landscape island pedestrian walkway modifications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** $17,522,842
## RECOMMENDED PRIORITIZED CONTINGENCY LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Contingency Funding Request</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>Markwick Trail * / **</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 153,412</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Alaskan Way Protected Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>148th Street Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 2,480,680</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonney Lake</td>
<td>Fennel Creek Trail Segment 2B</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,898,432</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Trail Along the Rail - Phase I *</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 795,800</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burien</td>
<td>4th Ave SW Sidewalk and Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 2,124,440</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellevue</td>
<td>Mountains To Sound Greenway Trail-132nd SE to 136th PI SE (Bellevue)</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>Water Flume Line Trail Phase 3A</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>Markwick Trail *</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 886,444</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Way</td>
<td>21st Ave S: S 316th Street to S 314th Street Pedestrian Connection-Grand Staircase</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnwood</td>
<td>44th Ave W/I-5 Underpass Improvements</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,814,528</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>South Fork Levee Trail *</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 869,188</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Green River Trail Connector to TUC Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 756,000</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>68th Avenue NE Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 30,000</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>Fryar Avenue Trail</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$ 1,429,352</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Transit</td>
<td>Bremerton Transportation Center ADA Improvements</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 228,988</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snoqualmie</td>
<td>Snoqualmie Valley Railroad</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 52,000</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline</td>
<td>Interurban Trail Crossing of SR-104 &amp; Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 121,151</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Downtown Kirkland to Totem Lake Greenway via Waverly Way, 18th Ave, NE 100th St, and Slater Ave NE</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 67,700</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>74th Ave Trail</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 182,400</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Contingency Funding Request</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>Gilman Trail</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 48,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 480,800</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poulsbo</td>
<td>Johnson Parkway Pedestrian and Bike Tunnel</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall City Met. Park District</td>
<td>West Side Trail</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 120,000</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>NE 120th St Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 108,325</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkland</td>
<td>Cedar Creek Culvert Replacement (100th Ave NE)</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 640,000</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenmore</td>
<td>Juanita Drive Complete Streets Project</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 58,900</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$ 814,657</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood</td>
<td>100th Street Improvements: Bridgeport Way SW to Lakewood Drive SW</td>
<td>PE/Design, Construction</td>
<td>$ 925,540</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Lake Washington Loop Trail - Phase 4</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Meet Me on Meeker Ped &amp; Bike Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 260,115</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 867,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>North Bend Tanner Trail *</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 406,501</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 150,388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnation</td>
<td>SR 203 / Tolt Avenue Central Business District</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 905,000</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Town Center ADA Compliance Plan Implementation</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>North Creek Regional Trail</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 2,500,000</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>Kitsap Way Corridor Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 228,360</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,324,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steilacoom</td>
<td>Main Street and Commercial Street Sidewalk</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 47,350</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 363,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bothell</td>
<td>Replacement of Non-Motorized Bridge over Sammamish River in the Park at Bothell Landing</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 800,000</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>Barnes Creek Trail - South Segment</td>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$ 230,000</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>Centennial Trail South (Snohomish to Woodinville)</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Contingency Funding Request</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>Collin Keck Trail</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 70,851</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 667,180</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Place</td>
<td>40th Street Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 103,800</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 536,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>160th Avenue Sidewalks</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 59,493</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 477,602</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Place</td>
<td>56th St/Cirque Corridor Phase 3</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,721,350</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish County</td>
<td>SR 527/Seattle Hill Road Vicinity Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Place</td>
<td>Chambers Creek Road/Chambers Lane Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 173,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 1,427,250</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>Railroad St. Sidewalk</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 121,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 604,000</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Roads</td>
<td>Red Brick Road Pilot Restoration Project</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 250,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>3rd/4th St Pedestrian Access and Circulation</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 403,671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 887,698</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds</td>
<td>Hwy 99 @ SR-104 Multi-Use Path Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 95,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 480,000</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington</td>
<td>188th Trail Segment</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 32,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 280,000</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Interurban Trail/Trailhead</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 106,568</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 722,829</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer Island</td>
<td>Northwood Elementary Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 300,000</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountlake Terrace</td>
<td>Interurban Trail &amp; 66th Ave W Safety Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 8,315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 140,297</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountlake Terrace</td>
<td>Interurban Trail at 216th St SW &amp; 68th Ave W Safety Improvements</td>
<td>PE/Design</td>
<td>$ 15,564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$ 236,784</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These projects are ineligible to be awarded at this time, as they are not consistent with the current regional transportation plan; once the updated plan is approved in May 2018, these projects will be eligible for funding at that time. As such, the committee recommends retaining them on the contingency list for potential future funding opportunities.

** The committee recommends this phase be moved to the first priority on the contingency list, based on geographic equity and other considerations.
ATTACHMENT B: Public Comments Received for PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition
(as of January 3, 2018)

COMMENT # 1

I am writing in support of the East Lake Sammamish Trail Extension project.

This project leverages some of King counties most valuable public assets while linking our future transit infrastructure with our rapidly expanding trail infrastructure, for all these reasons it deserves priority. Marymoor Park has more daily users than any other public park outside of Seattle Center and serves as a vital recreation hub for the Eastside. With the completion of the light rail infrastructure in 2023 it’s use will only increase. At the same time the road and freeway infrastructure in the area is not even close to keeping up with demand, and so the soon to be completed trail on the ERC and the 520 bike lanes offer a real alternative for commuters. By integrating these two projects and building them in a way that they support each other as opposed to conflicting with each other, you will create value for citizens that would be greater than the sum of both projects.

Sincerely,

Bill Finkbeiner
Kirkland resident

PSRC Response to Comment # 1

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to King County, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board for their consideration in January.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 2

Hi. I am writing on behalf of Friends of Historic Belltown. We are interested in the proposed $1.3 million bike lane project being considered for our Bell Street Park (online at https://www.psrc.org/whats-happening/blog/psrc-seeking-public-comment-transportation-alternatives-projects?platform=hootsuite).

As a designated park, we believe that any transportation project with federal funding – including bike lanes – must consider protection and improvements of Bell Street Park under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation (DOT) Act of 1966.

In addition, we believe that this project needs to be presented to the Belltown Community BEFORE IT IS DESIGNED AND FUNDED, when there is still opportunity for meaningful input from the community.
Seattle DOT recently completed the 2nd Avenue Bike lane with no opportunity for public involvement and no review under SEPA or NEPA. We remain very unhappy about this past injury and associated harms to our historic neighborhood and would like to work with PSRC to avoid similar harms to Bell Street Park.

Please let me know what the specific plans are for this project and how the community can provide meaningful input. Thank you!

FRIENDS OF HISTORIC BELLTOWN, INC  
2324 1st AVE STE 404  
SEATTLE, WA 98121-1698

Steve Hall | DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE

PSRC Response to Comment # 2

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Seattle for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Regarding your specific questions about the Bell St. Protected Bike Lane project plans, you can find all of the information we currently have available for this project at this link under “Submitted Applications”: https://www.psrc.org/our-work/funding/project-selection

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP  
Senior Transportation Planner  
Puget Sound Regional Council  
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104-1035  
Tel: (206) 587-4822  
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 3

To Whom It May Concern:

I would like to extend my personal support for the Sultan Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge Project as I believe the growth of the population in Sultan needs to be supported by infrastructure allowing more of the full-time residents in Sultan to access the business and recreational resources of the city by foot. This will allow greater number of small businesses to open doors in the areas around a major transportation corridors like the Sultan Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge. A lot of the local residents travel to nearby cities like Monroe to shop and entertain due to the higher number of businesses in the US2 corridor located in the Monroe city limits. However, this is not the case for Sultan yet due to the lack of enough businesses and services. Establishing effective city infrastructure which not only allows for quick transit through the city on the way to Stevens Pass but also allowing for guests to stay and enjoy the many local resources will create an opportunity for local economic development and growth in the city of Sultan. As an example, the newest business in Sultan opened doors very close to the proposed project site and services the local residents insurance needs. This business will highly benefit from the increased foot traffic and walk-ins customers utilizing the Sultan Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge Project.

Thank you for taking my comment into consideration.

Sincerely,  
Martin Rushkarski
PSRC Response to Comment # 3

This comment was posted on the PSRC blog. The commenter was thanked on the blog and the comment shared with the City of Sultan, but due to lack of contact information, PSRC was not able to respond directly to the commenter.

COMMENT # 4

RE: Tacoma Pipeline Trail Project

I've been promoting this project for twenty years, so I'm happy to see proposed funding

https://youtu.be/zq5iQ-SbyW0. See the video.

Bob Myrick

PSRC Response to Comment # 4

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Tacoma, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board for their consideration in January.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 5

RE: Bike lane - 44th and i-5

Hello

I see the information here on Twitter and I think it’s great you are publishing it for the community and people but I do have two questions?

1. Who pays for this?

2. How many people actually use this feature?

Thank you,

Mary Murphy
PSRC Response to Comment # 5

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Lynnwood for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Funding for the Transportation Alternatives Program is provided through the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and distributed to projects in the region through PSRC’s project selection process. The funding is used for community-based transportation improvements, such as bicycle/pedestrian facilities, historic preservation of transportation assets, environmental mitigation, and others. More detailed information about the funding process and the recommended projects, including the 44th Ave. W/I-5 Underpass Improvements project, is available at this link under “Call for Projects Background” and “Submitted Applications”: https://www.psrc.org/our-work/funding/project-selection.

Thank you,
Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 6

I wanted to offer my support of the RSRC funding recommendations for Transportation Alternatives projects. In particular, I strongly support funding for the East Lake Sammamish Trail North extension. My family and I live in Downtown Redmond and would greatly benefit from a trail connection between Redmond, Marymoor Park, and East Lake Sammamish. I can envision my children riding their bikes to meet up with their Grandma someday via such a connection (who lives in Sammamish). Having a pedestrian/bicycle connection through an area that is right now only accessible by car and bysected by freeway on/off-ramps would be a huge transformation for our community that would benefit a lot of people and make the area more friendly for the mixed-use development that the City of Redmond is trying to promote there. Thanks!

Leah Krekel-Zoppi

PSRC Response to Comment # 6

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to King County, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board for their consideration in January.

Thank you,
Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org
COMMENT # 7

Mrs. Gutschow, Puget Sound Regional Council,

I am writing to provide brief feedback on the Transportation Alternative projects selected by the PSRC for funding in Seattle.

I fully support the project to build a protected bicycle facility on Alaskan Way. Right now biking south of the Elliot Bay trail on Alaskan is a Mad Max experience dodging construction, tourists, tour buses, and ferry queuing traffic. The gigantic surface highway that will be built to replace the viaduct will cause its own problems, but every little bit helps, and this does.

I fully support the project to add protected bike lanes to Bell St. This is my primary route to access downtown and it is a critical connection in Seattle’s growing bike network. I assume that it will be a two way facility (as Bell St. is one way for most of its length). Also we need to reconsider this as a transit corridor so we can implement real traffic diversion - the woonerf between 5th and 2nd is ineffective in this regard.

I do support the Cowen Bridge replacement, but ask that the project include permanent barriers for the bike lane above (as the plastic bollards are constantly damaged or missing) and any improvements needed to the sidewalk on the bridge. The bridge is for people walking and biking too!

Yours,
Mark A Foltz

PSRC Response to Comment # 7

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Seattle for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Thank you,
Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 8

Hello,

My name is frank hammons, have lived in Sultan,WA since 2012, i ride my bicycle across the bridge from Sultan to Monroe on the highway durning the summer months twice a day. The Sultan bridge on Highway 2 is very nerve wracking especially when someone else wants to cross the bridge on foot, i have to get off my bike and hug the guardrail to let them pass and hope a vehicle does not drive by and have something sticking out to almost hit me or anybody else.

I have witnnessed wheelchairs and people with disabilities croos the bridge and its very difficult for them. I have lived in this general area all my 44 years of life and the highway 2 sultan bridge has stayed constantly dangerous for people as long as i have seen it.
I hope this bridge gets built the community od Sultan needs its thanks
frank hammons

PSRC Response to Comment # 8

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Sultan for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 9

Hello
My name is Sarah Taylor. I have been resident of Sultan since 2004. I have always had the fear that if the current traffic bridge goes out our community will be isolated. We have alot of pedestrian traffic across the bridge. I feel a pedestrian bridge would be a great asset to our community.

Thank you for your consideration in this.

Sincerely
Sarah Taylor

PSRC Response to Comment # 9

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Sultan for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 10

This email is regarding the Sultan Pedestrian and Bicycle Bridge project.
As residents of Sultan my family and I would use this new pedestrian bridge! We currently do not frequent this area of Sultan as it is not safe for me to take my two young children. With the construction of this bridge as a parent and community member I would feel much safer taking my family on walks and fun outside adventures in this area.

This project would be also be helpful to the many anglers who love to fish in the river. Also a safe way for pedestrians to walk over the river for our big Sultan Shindig festival in summer!

Thank you, The Loudenslager family.

**PSRC Response to Comment # 10**

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Sultan for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

**COMMENT # 11**

Please review the comments I sent several years ago concerning this matter (below). Not much has changed: the city continues to mislead in the real purpose of the bridge and facts relating to it. That is increasing pressure and proposals for housing developments require larger sewer lines and thus a bigger bridge to support the larger sewer line. Also recently it was learned that the land where the bridge footprint is to be is not even owned by the city, rather WDFW. Now the city has found another grant money possibility to fund the hopeful larger sewer line by creating a need for connecting parks and a scenic trail. Please don’t be fooled.

[Comment below dated November 10, 2013, re: Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Grant Requests--Sultan]

PRSC, Transportation Alternative Grant Administrators:

I am writing to you about a grant request from the city of Sultan for a pedestrian/bicycle bridge across the Sultan River. I have several concerns I think you should be aware of prior to granting any of the requested money. Following are my concerns:

1. I guess my first concern is the need for such a bridge has been grossly exaggerated. While the city has failed to assess the use of the existing bridge, I did. I spent several hours (on weekends, weekdays, different hours and different weather) counting the people crossing the bridge. This included people walking, riding bicycles, pushing baby strollers, and riding in scooters. The average number crossing the bridge was less than 2 persons per hour. I just don’t see multmillions of hard to get tax dollars being spent for such little use.

2. I have read through all the city’s files regarding the proposed bridge. While the city tried, it could not find any documentation regarding the many safety concerns and issues it presented in the grant requests. Letters from the former Police Chief, Community Transit, Cascade Bicycle Club,
even the Washington State Department of Transportation, and some local residents were obtained and submitted instead of documented safety issues. Most of the letters express support for the bridge and some go into great length about the safety concern of crossing the current bridge, from one side to the other, on this busy and dangerous highway. I am here to tell you that crossing the bridge from one end to the other is most likely the safest part of traveling along Highway 2. The bridge has a cement boundary along each side of the passageway while the highway has only a shoulder providing absolutely no protection from traffic. The letters would make you think the bridge crossing was the most dangerous; it is not by a long shot. You should not be hoodwinked on this matter.

3. Having been through the city’s files and reading newspaper articles about this proposed pedestrian/bicycle bridge, I am aware of the huge increase in the cost estimates for the proposed bridge. Engineering costs have increased six fold in a year and the total costs have increased from $2 million to over $6 million. I am concerned about the need for such an extravagant bridge, especially since I am aware of perfectly adequate and much cheaper pedestrian/bicycle bridges in many other places. Spending precious tax money on extravagance is a concern to me.

4. In its grant requests and accompanying documents, the city has asserted the need to be ADA compliant, this means safety and accessibility. Again, let me assure you that the safest place along this highway is on the bridge where there is protection from traffic. There is no protection otherwise, before getting to the bridge or after leaving the bridge. Contrary to the city’s assertions that the passageway is too narrow for wheelchairs, I have seen people in wheelchairs using the bridge. The safety issue has been exaggerated. In respect to accessibility, please look first at the attached picture which shows how the access to the present bridge has been maintained. It seems the city is not too concerned otherwise. This is omitted from the city’s cry for safety and accessibility. Please don’t be fooled. I have included a two other pictures. They show the elevation and distance from the highway to that where the proposed bridge would start. This alone is an extreme deterrence to the handicapped or marginally mobile traveler. Further, the lower portion floods every high water event.

5. My final major concern about this whole issue I feel merits the Pinocchio nose award. I think the need for a pedestrian/bicycle bridge came as a result of the state DOT not allowing the city’s desire to increase the size of the existing sewer and water pipes on the current bridge. Hence, the terrific need for a pedestrian/bicycle bridge, big and strong enough to carry new and bigger utility pipes, was born. The grant requests and supporting papers don’t tell anyone this fact. Read the letters in support of the proposed bridge and not one mentions that they support or even were told about the utility pipes. A bridge for utilities should be paid for by utility funds not transportation alternative funds. The way the need for the bridge is presented (for the safety of the pedestrians, bicyclists, and handicapped) when the real reason is to accommodate utilities is offensive. This concerns me a lot.

Gerry Gibson
Sultan

PSRC Response to Comment # 11

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Sultan for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
COMMENT # 12  [Note: Attachments referenced in this comment are included at the end of this document.]

Thank you for responding to the below email from me. [See Comment # 11.]

I have sent several previous emails on this matter to the city, the PSRC, and other funding sources. Please re-read the below email again as it is still relevant. [See Comment # 11.] I’d also like to add a few additional and supplemental comments:

Again, it is quite obvious that the real sole purpose of this bridge is to prevent a building moratorium for lack of utilities in growth areas. This is the only conclusion anyone can make when reading the attached Sultan River Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Legislative Request. Every funding request the city has submitted to the various funding agencies has a different emphasis on the need for the bridge. The city’s integrity, credibility, and honesty is definitely at issue when one looks at all the different requests for funding. You should ask the city to provide all the funding requests and compare for yourself.

Now that the utility need has been exposed, the funding for the utility expansion and then adding the utility pipes to the bridge (not to mention the added costs for a bigger and stronger bridge than needed just for pedestrian and bicycles) is left out in the open. There is no budget or planning for such funds, just hope, speculation, and prayer. This is true for the $ 1 million in matching funds for this grant. Where is it in the plans and where for sure is it coming from?

Again, the critically dangerous specifics, comments about safety by citizens and officials, staged photos, etc. provided by the city are completely false, overemphasized, and lack any credibility at all. This is all NOT true. The city did not provide accident information because it does not exist. The bridge has been safe for over 70 years and it has provided safe passageway all that time. There is nothing to the contrary. See attached email exchanges including page 2.

Lastly, the city also continued its lack of candor, truthful, and complete information in its many funding requests by failing to advise that it didn’t even own the land where part of the bridge would be constructed. It has now requested land be transferred from the state at another $100 K of taxpayer money.

All this certainly is a great example of government dishonesty and corruption. I urge you to re-consider any funds for this bridge. I am sure that if I requested and obtained funds under all these same conditions, I would end up in jail.

Gerry Gibson

PSRC Response to Comment # 12

Good afternoon,

Thank you for your additional comments on PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition funding. We will also provide this comment to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board, as well as forward it to the City of Sultan.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner  
Puget Sound Regional Council  
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500  
Seattle, WA 98104-1035  
Tel: (206) 587-4822  
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 13

PSRC TAP Reviewers

Please don't be misled, the City of Sultan’s grant request for construction funding of a new ped/bike bridge has little to do with public safety or recreation but with the upgrading of infrastructure. Engineering analysis of Sultan's sewer system indicated that the 8” sewer pipe hanging under the existing US Route 2 Bridge cannot be upsized because the bridge can't support the additional weight, therefore a new bridge is needed. Links to City's 2011 Comprehensive Plan, Sewer Chapters 6 and 7 provide further detail. Chapter 7, page 3, Upgrades to the Main Pump Station  


Chapter 6, page 5, Main Pump Station  


The City of Sultan's portrayal of the existing US Route 2 bridge as posing a threat to pedestrian/bicycle users is also misleading. This bridge was built with a substantial guardrail between the highway and a dedicated pedestrian/bike lane that protects users. According to the city's own records, there has not been a single documented accident on or near the bridge.

As proposed, the new bridge would be located just a few feet from the existing bridge with on/off ramps to be sited on the frequently flooded banks of the Sultan River. The usage of the dedicated pedestrian/bicycle lane on the current bridge is so minimal, averaging 2 crossings per hour, a new bridge cannot be justified.

City of Sultan is a perennially cash strapped and how the city intends to match the requested grant with a $1 million dollars is unclear. Note October 14, 2017 Council Retreat Packet, Page 10 "The max amount we could receive from the TAP grant is $2.5 million, which means we will have to come up with $1 million dollars to complete the project."

I urge the council to use public funds for worthier projects,

Thank you for your consideration,

Judy Heydrick  
Sultan, WA

PSRC Response to Comment # 13

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Sultan for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Thank you,
COMMENT # 14

PSRC TAP Board

A word of caution regarding City of Sultan's deceptively flawed request for funding of a new pedestrian bridge over the Sultan River. Board Members must understand that this is a continuation of grant requests to multiple agencies with ever changing reasons why the bridge is necessary.

After years of falsely claiming that crossing the existing Highway 2 Bridge's pedestrian/bicycle lane was unsafe, Sultan records show that there has not been a single accident or fatality on or near the bridge. The latest creative twist, ties the new bridge to an enhanced park and trail system which the Highway 2 bridge already ties into.

Don't be fooled. Sultan is desperate to hang a larger sewer and water pipe underneath a new bridge since WSDOT will not permit these pipes under the Highway 2 Bridge. Sultan's 2011 Comp Plan, Sewer Chapters 6 and 7 calls for a new bridge to address the undersized pipe problem. I strongly oppose using public funding to pay for infrastructure needed to enable development. Therefore, I urge you to reject Sultan's cleverly crafted grant request and use available funds for more essential public pedestrian/bicycle projects.

Thank you for not wasting our tax money on a totally unnecessary new bridge adjacent to a sparsely used, perfectly safe bridge across the Sultan River.

Stan Heydrick,
Sultan, WA

PSRC Response to Comment # 14

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Sultan for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org
COMMENT # 15 [Note: Attachments referenced in this comment are included at the end of this document.]

Ms. Gutschow

I urge your selection committee to reconsider the Sultan grant award because the city's submission deceptively conceals the underlying reason for requesting public funding. The attached documents obtained through a public record request make it perfectly clear that the city's new bridge is intended to support utility infrastructure to prevent a building moratorium by increasing sewer capacity. City intends to pay for the sewer/water pipes but is seeking funding for the engineered structure to hang it on.

The City's submission to the PSRC is dressed up as a safety and mobility issue, when in fact, the record indicates no accidents or fatalities associated with the bridge as confirmed by WSDOT engineer Larsen in the e-mail attachment. The existing SR2 bridge carries very light pedestrian/bicycle traffic and has served the community well for decades. Over several hours of observation, our informal survey group noted roughly 2 crossings per hour and no difficulties accessing either downtown or Sportsman's Park on the opposite side of the river. The bridge's beefy guardrail has been very effective in separating pedestrian/bicyclists from bridge traffic, contrary to the city's assertions to the contrary. A 2nd bridge proposed for the frequently flooded banks of the Sultan River cannot be justified.

I hope this additional information will be helpful as you reconsider the City of Sultan's application for a multi million dollar pedestrian/bike bridge the city wants primarily for infrastructure to support development, which is not the objective of the Transportation Alternative Program. Keep in mind Washington Post columnist Michael Gerson's words "WHEN LIES BECOME ROUTINE, CORRUPTION FOLLOWS."

Stan Heydrick
Sultan

PSRC Response to Comment # 15

Thank you for your additional comments on PSRC's 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition funding. We will also provide this comment to PSRC's Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board, as well as forward it to the City of Sultan.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 16

Dear PSRC Review Committee,

I am a Tacoma resident of 14 years and an at-home parent of three school-aged children. I also organize and lead monthly family bike rides for kids and their families (Kidical Mass Tacoma) that encourage children to learn the Rules of Road and gain confidence riding in the street.

I've reviewed the City of Tacoma's application for funding of the Pipeline Trail, Phase III Construction in Tacoma and am writing to support the application. The application accurately details why this trail development is so important to the lives of East Side residents, both now and in the future.
I became aware of the Pipeline Trail corridor several years ago and was immediately interested in its potential to link the East Side of Tacoma to the more rural parts of Pierce County. I finally had a chance to ride my bicycle in this corridor in June of 2016 and blogged about the trip. (http://tacomabikeranch.blogspot.com/2016/06/pipeline-trail-adventure.html)

I’ve since been back on the trail corridor several times, but only with adults familiar with off-road cycling. The many barriers, rough terrain, and unprotected arterial crossings have kept me from enjoying the trail corridor with my whole family. I have noticed that there and often families walking and biking on the small section of trail that was paved and completed behind First Creek Middle School. Further connectivity to the Tacoma Dome area, which is already underway, will only broaden the area in which East Side residents can walk and bike safely. I see the health advantages of the trail to local residents in the trail corridor as the number one reason to fund this project. The cost of creating such a paved trail seems minuscule compared to long-term health costs related to inactivity and a lack of active transportation options in the area.

I urge you to support the City of Tacoma’s application to construct Phase III of the Pipeline Trail.

With sincere thanks,

Matt Newport
Kidical Mass Tacoma

PSRC Response to Comment # 16

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Tacoma, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board for their consideration in January.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 17 [Note: Attachment referenced in this comment is included at the end of this document.]

Hello Sarah,

Please see the attached for a public comment from The Trust for Public Land on the Transportation Alternatives Program projects.

Thank you,

Ashley

Ashley Knapp | Northwest Public Grant Writer
The Trust for Public Land
PSRC Response to Comment # 17

Thank you for your comments related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comments to King County, the City of Tacoma, and the City of Lynnwood for their consideration. Your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org

COMMENT # 18

I am writing in support of the Sultan River Pedestrian Bridge project. As the former Public Works Director in Sultan for six and a half years, this project was my top priority. The existing US2 Highway bridge is the only current pedestrian access across the Sultan River and it has significant safety issues. The existing walkway is only 29 ½" wide and is an impediment for citizens in wheelchairs and is not ADA compliant.

The proposed pedestrian bridge will significantly improve pedestrian and bicycle safety. Key public facilities are located on the east side of the Sultan River (City Hall, library, Fire Station, Police Station, Visitors Information Center) and a number of the City’s elderly population live on the west side of the river. Additionally, the City’s sole pharmacy and laundromat are located on the west side of the Sultan River with the bulk of the City’s population located on the east side of the river.

The Sultan River Pedestrian Bridge is a critical infrastructure project that will also allow emergency vehicles to cross the Sultan River in the event the dilapidated US 2 bridge in damaged during an earthquake or severe flooding.

I urge the Puget Sound Regional Council to support this project.

Sincerely,

Mick Matheson, P.E.
Public Works Director | Public Works Engineering

PSRC Response to Comment # 18

Thank you for your comment related to the funding being recommended through PSRC’s 2017 Transportation Alternatives Program Competition. We will forward your comment to the City of Sultan for their consideration, and your comment will also be provided to PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board and Executive Board.

Thank you,

Sarah Gutschow, AICP
Senior Transportation Planner
Puget Sound Regional Council
1011 Western Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035
Tel: (206) 587-4822
Email: sgutschow@psrc.org
2017 Transportation Alternatives Program

ATTACHMENTS TO PUBLIC COMMENTS
We are emailing this request via electronic form as requested. We appreciate your time and consideration. If we can be of further assistance, please contact Mick Matheson directly at (360) 793-2262.

Tami J. Pevey
City of Sultan
Utility Clerk
EMAIL: tami.pevey@ci.sultan.wa.us
PHONE: 360-793-2231
FAX: 360-793-3344
2017 Legislative Session
Member Requested Local Community Project Information Form

Project Name: US 2 Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge

Address of Project Site: 151 Main Street, Sultan, WA 2017

Legislative Session Member Requested Local Community Project Information Form

Where is the Project Physically Located?
District: 39
Latitude: 47°51'40"N
Longitude: 121°49'11"W
http://www.mapcoordinate.net/en

Name(s): Mick Matheson, P.E.
Title: Public Works Director
Organization: City of Sultan
Organization's Website: www.ci.sultan.wa.us
Phone: 360.793.2262
E-Mail: mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us
Mailing Address: PO Box 1199, Sultan, WA 98294

Funding Requested: $3,580,000
Do not directly enter the Funding Requested amount on the line above. Instead, enter the relevant amounts under "Requested Dollar Amount" on page 2. The total Funding Requested will automatically be calculated and filled in on the line above.

Organization Information
Is the requesting organization registered with the state as a non-profit organization? Yes ☐ ☐
Is there a current or pending 501(c)(3) IRS registration? Yes ☐ ☐
If answered no to either of the above, is applicant a local government? Yes ☐ ☐

Important Notes:
This is not a formal grant program. This form provides information for House members to request a separate appropriation in the capital budget for this project. Funding any project is at the discretion of the Legislature; Successful past projects generally are ones in which the requested state funds: (1) are used for a facility providing an important public benefit; (2) are a small portion of the total project funding (25% or less); (3) result in a completed project or phase usable by the public for the intended purpose when the state funds are expended; and (4) are for a project that is ready for construction or renovation and will be completed within the biennium.

Funds are available on a reimbursement basis only and cannot be advanced.

Projects may be subject to state prevailing wage law (Chapter 39.12 RCW). Requesting organization are encouraged to consult the Industrial Statistician (David Soma: 360-902-5330 or somd235@lhi.wa.gov) at the Washington State Department of Labor Industries to determine whether prevailing wages must be paid.

High-performance building requirements (Chapter 39.35D RCW and Chapter 28A.150.510 RCW) and Executive Order 13-03 regarding life cycle and operating costs in public works projects may also apply.

NOTE: This form is prepared for the use of the Capital Budget Chair, Representative Tharinger. He may elect to submit this form for filing in the Capital Budget Committee records. In addition, if the proposed request is funded in the enacted capital budget bill, the form may be filed with the state agency that distributes funding for the project. If so filed, this form will become a legislative record subject to public disclosure and will be archived consistent with Chapter 40.14 RCW.
Project Information (attach separate page with additional details if available):
Please Note: Questions 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 require narrative responses and provide a limited amount of space for the answers. Please be as brief as possible, but if you should need additional space for any answers, please continue your responses in a separate attachment, with the question number or numbers clearly identified.

(1) Describe the entire project and the phase of the overall project for which funds are requested:
The City of Sultan is requesting $3.53 million for construction funds to construct a stand-alone ADA accessible bicycle and pedestrian bridge across the Sultan River. The bridge will support a new sewer force main to add system capacity to avoid a building moratorium, and a new water main to improve fire flow to the western area of the City. The funding is requested for the transportation element of the bridge only. Sewer and water improvements will be City-funded. Design is fully funded and is 95 percent complete.

(2) What is the primary objective of this project? – Check only one.

- Economic Development
- Social Services
- Education
- Infrastructure
- Health Care
- Historic Facilities
- Parks & Recreation
- Arts & Culture
- Environment
- Housing
- Other (describe)

(3) Start and Completion Dates: May 2017 to October 2018

(4) Eligible Project Type or Phase (Check all that apply to this funding request and insert requested amount).

Requested Dollar Amount

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition and Site Preparation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td>$ 3,530,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (describe)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce Administrative Fee (3%, up to $50,000 maximum)</td>
<td>$ 50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This is a mandatory fee.

Total Request

$ 3,580,000

Attachments: (Please enclose any materials that further describe the project and its financing.)

NOTE: This form is prepared for the use of the Capital Budget Chair, Representative Tharinger. He may elect to submit this form for filing in the Capital Budget Committee records. In addition, if the proposed request is funded in the enacted capital budget bill, the form may be filed with the state agency that distributes funding for the project. If so filed, this form will become a legislative record subject to public disclosure and will be archived consistent with Chapter 40.14 RCW.
6.a.b

(5) Public benefits of the project:
The new bridge corrects a safety and ADA compliance issue as the existing walkway on the US 2 bridge is only 29-1/2" inches wide. The City is facing a building moratorium because the existing sewer force main attached to the US 2 bridge has reached its capacity and a larger force main must be built. The residents and businesses west of the Sultan River will also benefit from improved fire flow with the construction of a larger water main.

(6) How does this project help the State meet its greenhouse gas emission reduction goals in Chapter 70.235 RCW?
The construction of a pedestrian/bicycle bridge will encourage residents who would normally drive to cross the Sultan River (due to a dangerous and non-ADA compliant walkway) to either walk, bicycle, or use a wheelchair to cross the Sultan River thus reducing vehicle trips.

(7) Will this project have a revenue-generating component that would have community and state economic benefit? Please describe and quantify.
Yes. The construction of the new pedestrian/bicycle bridge with a new sanitary sewer force main will significantly increase the available sanitary sewer capacity and allow for the construction of hundreds of new homes and additional businesses on the east side of the Sultan River where growth is anticipated and planned.

(8) Please quantify any short- and long-term job creation that will result from this project.
Short term job creation will likely be created by the need for the contractor to hire laborers to construct the bridge and related appurtenances. Long term job creation will likely be created by increasing sanitary sewer capacity, thus creating the need for planners, engineers, surveyors, and landscape architects to plan and design new housing and commercial developments. Jobs will likely be created to construct the infrastructure improvements needed to support the new development, and to construct the homes and businesses that otherwise would not be built due to a pending building moratorium.

(9) Is this a joint project?
If yes, has a joint operating agreement been signed?

(10) Is the site [ ] owned, [ ] optioned for purchase or [ ] under a lease?

(11) Has the applicant initiated a capital fundraising campaign?
If yes, what percent of matching funds have been secured? ________ %

(12) What other sources of matching funds are being pursued?
The City has applied for WSDOT grants the last several years.

NOTE: This form is prepared for the use of the Capital Budget Chair, Representative Tharinger. He may elect to submit this form for filing in the Capital Budget Committee records. In addition, if the proposed request is funded in the enacted capital budget bill, the form may be filed with the state agency that distributes funding for the project. If so filed, this form will become a legislative record subject to public disclosure and will be archived consistent with Chapter 40.14 RCW.
(13) Please list all past and current efforts to obtain state funding for this project, including year, state agency, specific fund source, and whether or not funding was obtained.

A $100,000 legislative proviso was obtained through the Washington State Legislature in 2011.

(14) If the project will not be completed after the requested state funding and matching funds are used, describe: (1) what the project will be at the completion of the portion funded by this request and how it will benefit the public; and (2) the phases and schedule for completion of the project.

The project will be completed if the requested funding is obtained.

(15) What source(s) of non-state funds exist for completion of the project and its ongoing maintenance and operation?

There are no non-state funds that exist for completion of the project. The City of Sultan will pay for ongoing maintenance and operation of the bridge and associated utility appurtenances.

(16) Are there any community concerns about this project (i.e. conflict with land use, neighborhood concerns, other) that would prevent it from moving forward?

No.

Legislative Sponsor
(Signature) ___________________________ Date ____________

NOTE: This form is prepared for the use of the Capital Budget Chair, Representative Tharinger. He may elect to submit this form for filing in the Capital Budget Committee records. In addition, if the proposed request is funded in the enacted capital budget bill, the form may be filed with the state agency that distributes funding for the project. If so filed, this form will become a legislative record subject to public disclosure and will be archived consistent with Chapter 40.14 RCW.
All, not sure I understand the comments as the third sentence in states; “This project will complete a gap in providing a safe, ADA compliant pedestrian and bike system that connects the existing sidewalk along US 2 on the west side of the river, to the Great Northern trail and the sidewalks of Main Street and US 2 on the east side of the river”. Also the application says nothing about water and sewer being part of the project application. The Water and sewer work along with telephone and cable is being paid for by other funds. These funds cannot be used to match the federal funds. Sam

Sam Richard | Sr. Transportation Consultant
WHPacific, Inc. | 12100 NE 195th St, Ste 300, Bothell, WA 98011
Direct 425.951.4860 | Mobile 206.963.3265 | Fax 425.951.4808 | srichard@whpacific.com

---

I talked with Charlotte regarding the ped/bike ranking for this project. The main thing that is causing it to rank low is the utility work. She said it would rank higher if you come to the table with different funds to pay for that work. She also said that emphasizing how this bridge will complete the missing link between new sidewalk proposed on SR 2 and the trail would improve the ranking. The main thing is the utility piece, which we pretty much already knew.

Renae Larsen
Assistant Local Programs Engineer
NWR Local Programs
206-440-4733
From: Claybrooke, Charlotte  
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:49 AM  
To: Larsen, Renae L. <LarsenR@wsdot.wa.gov>  
Subject: RE: Sultan  

Not necessarily. The program emphasis is on both mobility and safety. In addition, collision history is just one part of how project need based on safety is considered.

Charlotte

From: Larsen, Renae L.  
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:38 AM  
To: Claybrooke, Charlotte <ClaybrC@wsdot.wa.gov>  
Subject: Sultan  

One more thing... even if they found money elsewhere to fund the utility portion and completed the sidewalk connection, does the fact that there is no death or accidents at this location reduce the ranking?

Renae Larsen  
Assistant Local Programs Engineer  
NWR Local Programs  
206-440-4733
From: tami.pevey@ci.sultan.wa.us
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 2:40 PM
To: Brenda.Glenn@leg.wa.gov
Cc: mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us; ken.walker@ci.sultan.wa.us; armstrong.associates@yahoo.com
Subject: Sultan River Pedestrian/Bicycle Bridge Legislative Request
Attachments: Sultan River Pedestrian Bicycle Bridge Legislative Request.pdf

We are emailing this request via electronic form as requested. We appreciate your time and consideration. If we can be of further assistance, please contact Mick Matheson directly at (360) 793-2262.

Tami J. Pevey
City of Sultan
Utility Clerk
EMAIL: tami.pevey@ci.sultan.wa.us
PHONE: 360-793-2231
FAX: 360-793-3344
2017 Legislative Session
Member Requested Local Community Project Information Form

Project Name: US 2 Bicycle/Pedestrian Bridge

Address of Project Site: 151 Main Street, Sultan, WA

Project Contact:
Name(s): Mick Matheson, P.E.
Title: Public Works Director
Organization: City of Sultan
Organization's Website: www.ci.sultan.wa.us
Phone: 360.793.2262
E-Mail: mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us
Mailing Address: PO Box 1199, Sultan, WA 98294

Where is the Project Physically Located?
District: 39
Latitude: 47°51'40"N
Longitude: 121°49'11"W
http://www.mapcoordinates.net/en

Legislative Sponsor(s):
John Koster

Funding Requested: $3,580,000
Do not directly enter the Funding Requested amount on the line above. Instead, enter the relevant amounts under "Requested Dollar Amount" on page 2. The total Funding Requested will automatically be calculated and filled in on the line above.

Organization Information
Is the requesting organization registered with the state as a non-profit organization?
Yes ☐ No ☐

Is there a current or pending 501(c)(3) IRS registration?
Yes ☐ No ☐

If answered no to either of the above, is applicant a local government?
Yes ☐ No ☐

Important Notes:
This is not a formal grant program. This form provides information for House members to request a separate appropriation in the capital budget for this project. Funding any project is at the discretion of the Legislature. Successful past projects generally are ones in which the requested state funds: (1) are used for a facility providing an important public benefit; (2) are a small portion of the total project funding (25% or less); (3) result in a completed project or phase usable by the public for the intended purpose when the state funds are expended; and (4) are for a project that is ready for construction or renovation and will be completed within the biennium.

Funds are available on a reimbursement basis only and cannot be advanced.

Projects may be subject to state prevailing wage law (Chapter 39.12 RCW). Requesting organization are encouraged to consult the Industrial Statistician (David Soma: 360-902-5330 or somd235@lan.wa.gov) at the Washington State Department of Labor Industries to determine whether prevailing wages must be paid.

High-performance building requirements (Chapter 39.35D RCW and Chapter 28A.150.510 RCW) and Executive Order 13-03 regarding life cycle and operating costs in public works projects may also apply.

NOTE: This form is prepared for the use of the Capital Budget Chair, Representative Tharinger. He may elect to submit this form for filing in the Capital Budget Committee records. In addition, if the proposed request is funded in the enacted capital budget bill, the form may be filed with the state agency that distributes funding for the project. If so filed, this form will become a legislative record subject to public disclosure and will be archived consistent with Chapter 40.14 RCW.
Project Information (attach separate page with additional details if available):

Please Note: Questions 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 require narrative responses and provide a limited amount of space for the answers. Please be as brief as possible, but if you should need additional space for any answers, please continue your responses in a separate attachment, with the question number or numbers clearly identified.

(1) Describe the entire project and the phase of the overall project for which funds are requested:

The City of Sultan is requesting $3.53 million for construction funds to construct a stand-alone ADA accessible bicycle and pedestrian bridge across the Sultan River. The bridge will support a new sewer force main to add system capacity to avoid a building moratorium, and a new water main to improve fire flow to the western area of the City. The funding is requested for the transportation element of the bridge only. Sewer and water improvements will be City-funded. Design is fully funded and is 95 percent complete.

(2) What is the primary objective of this project? – Check only one.

- Economic Development
- Social Services
- Education
- Infrastructure
- Health Care
- Historic Facilities
- Parks & Recreation
- Arts & Culture
- Environment
- Housing
- Other (describe)

(3) Start and Completion Dates: May 2017 to October 2018

(4) Eligible Project Type or Phase (Check all that apply to this funding request and insert requested amount).

- Land Acquisition
- Demolition and Site Preparation
- Design
- New Construction $3,530,000
- Renovation
- Other (describe) 
- Commerce Administrative Fee (3%, up to $50,000 maximum) $50,000

Requested Dollar Amount

Total Request $3,580,000

Attachments: (Please enclose any materials that further describe the project and its financing.)

NOTE: This form is prepared for the use of the Capital Budget Chair, Representative Tharinger. He may elect to submit this form for filing in the Capital Budget Committee records. In addition, if the proposed request is funded in the enacted capital budget bill, the form may be filed with the state agency that distributes funding for the project. If so filed, this form will become a legislative record subject to public disclosure and will be archived consistent with Chapter 40.14 RCW.
(5) Public benefits of the project:
The new bridge corrects a safety and ADA compliance issue as the existing walkway on the US 2 bridge is only 29-1/2" inches wide. The City is facing a building moratorium because the existing sewer force main attached to the US 2 bridge has reached its capacity and a larger force main must be built. The residents and businesses west of the Sultan River will also benefit from improved fire flow with the construction of a larger water main.

(6) How does this project help the State meet its greenhouse gas emission reduction goals in Chapter 70.235 RCW?
The construction of a pedestrian/bicycle bridge will encourage residents who would normally drive to cross the Sultan River (due to a dangerous and non-ADA compliant walkway) to either walk, bicycle, or use a wheelchair to cross the Sultan River thus reducing vehicle trips.

(7) Will this project have a revenue-generating component that would have community and state economic benefit? Please describe and quantify.
Yes. The construction of the new pedestrian/bicycle bridge with a new sanitary sewer force main will significantly increase the available sanitary sewer capacity and allow for the construction of hundreds of new homes and additional businesses on the east side of the Sultan River where growth is anticipated and planned.

(8) Please quantify any short- and long-term job creation that will result from this project.
Short term job creation will likely be created by the need for the contractor to hire laborers to construct the bridge and related appurtenances. Long term job creation will likely be created by increasing sanitary sewer capacity, thus creating the need for planners, engineers, surveyors, and landscape architects to plan and design new housing and commercial developments. Jobs will likely be created to construct the infrastructure improvements needed to support the new development, and to construct the homes and businesses that otherwise would not be built due to a pending building moratorium.

(9) Is this a joint project?
If yes, has a joint operating agreement been signed?

(10) Is the site ☐ owned, ☐ optioned for purchase or ☐ under a lease?

Does the applicant understand and agree that any and all real property owned, optioned for purchase, or under a lease, that is acquired, constructed, or otherwise improved using state funds approved by the Legislature must be held and used for the purposes stated in this application for at least ten years from the date of the final payment made for the project?

(11) Has the applicant initiated a capital fundraising campaign?
If yes, what percent of matching funds have been secured? %

(12) What other sources of matching funds are being pursued?
The City has applied for WSDOT grants the last several years.

NOTE: This form is prepared for the use of the Capital Budget Chair, Representative Tharinger. He may elect to submit this form for filing in the Capital Budget Committee records. In addition, if the proposed request is funded in the enacted capital budget bill, the form may be filed with the state agency that distributes funding for the project. If so filed, this form will become a legislative record subject to public disclosure and will be archived consistent with Chapter 40.14 RCW.
(13) Please list all past and current efforts to obtain state funding for this project, including year, state agency, specific fund source, and whether or not funding was obtained.

A $100,000 legislative proviso was obtained through the Washington State Legislature in 2011.

(14) If the project will not be completed after the requested state funding and matching funds are used, describe: (1) what the project will be at the completion of the portion funded by this request and how it will benefit the public; and (2) the phases and schedule for completion of the project.

The project will be completed if the requested funding is obtained.

(15) What source(s) of non-state funds exist for completion of the project and its ongoing maintenance and operation?

There are no non-state funds that exist for completion of the project. The City of Sultan will pay for ongoing maintenance and operation of the bridge and associated utility appurtenances.

(16) Are there any community concerns about this project (i.e. conflict with land use, neighborhood concerns, other) that would prevent it from moving forward?

No.

Legislative Sponsor
(Signature) ___________________________ Date ______________

NOTE: This form is prepared for the use of the Capital Budget Chair, Representative Tharinger. He may elect to submit this form for filing in the Capital Budget Committee records. In addition, if the proposed request is funded in the enacted capital budget bill, the form may be filed with the state agency that distributes funding for the project. If so filed, this form will become a legislative record subject to public disclosure and will be archived consistent with Chapter 40.14 RCW.
mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us

From: Sam Richard <SRichard@whpacific.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 31, 2017 8:28 AM
To: Larsen, Renae L.; mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us
Cc: Moini, Mehrdad
Subject: RE: Sultan

All, not sure I understand the comments as the third sentence in states; “This project will complete a gap in providing a safe, ADA compliant pedestrian and bike system that connects the existing sidewalk along US 2 on the west side of the river, to the Great Northern trail and the sidewalks of Main Street and US 2 on the east side of the river”. Also the application says nothing about water and sewer being part of the project application. The Water and sewer work along with telephone and cable is being paid for by other funds. These funds cannot be used to match the federal funds. Sam

Sam Richard | Sr. Transportation Consultant
WHPacific, Inc. | 12100 NE 195th St, Ste 300, Bothell, WA 98011
Direct 425.951.4860 | Mobile 206.963.3265 | Fax 425.951.4808 | srichard@whpacific.com

From: Larsen, Renae L. [mailto:LarsenR@wsdot.wa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 4:40 PM
To: mick.matheson@ci.sultan.wa.us
Cc: Sam Richard <SRichard@whpacific.com>; Moini, Mehrdad <MoiniM@wsdot.wa.gov>
Subject: FW: Sultan

Mick, Sam,

I talked with Charlotte regarding the ped/bike ranking for this project. The main thing that is causing it to rank low is the utility work. She said it would rank higher if you come to the table with different funds to pay for that work. She also said that emphasizing how this bridge will complete the missing link between the new sidewalk proposed on SR 2 and the trail would improve the ranking. The main thing is the utility piece, which we pretty much already knew.

Renae Larsen
Assistant Local Programs Engineer
NWR Local Programs
206-440-4733
From: Claybrooke, Charlotte  
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:49 AM  
To: Larsen, Renae L. <LarsenR@wsdot.wa.gov>  
Subject: RE: Sultan  

Not necessarily. The program emphasis is on both mobility and safety. In addition, collision history is just one part of how project need based on safety is considered.

Charlotte  

From: Larsen, Renae L.  
Sent: Wednesday, January 25, 2017 11:38 AM  
To: Claybrooke, Charlotte <ClaybrC@wsdot.wa.gov>  
Subject: Sultan  

One more thing... even if they found money elsewhere to fund the utility portion and completed the sidewalk connection, does the fact that there is no death or accidents at this location reduce the ranking?

Renae Larsen  
Assistant Local Programs Engineer  
NWR Local Programs  
206-440-4733
January 3, 2018

Puget Sound Regional Council
Attn: Sarah Gutschow
1011 Western Ave., Ste. 500
Seattle, WA 98104-1035

Dear Ms. Gutschow,

The Trust for Public Land would like to extend our support for three projects on the Puget Sound Regional Council’s recommended list of projects to receive funding from the Transportation Alternatives Program. While all listed projects will increase our region’s livability, these three will directly benefit our work to increase public access to parks.

King County’s East Lake Sammamish Trail North Extension will amplify the benefit of the Eastside Rail Corridor within the local and regional trail system. As co-leads of the Eastside Greenway Alliance, we are working with King County and other owners and stakeholders to promote the development of the Eastside Rail Corridor into a multi-use, active transportation network. This project is a significant step forward toward our collective vision.

The City of Tacoma’s Phase III Pipeline Trail Construction project is vital to connect the surrounding low-income community to regional transit. Leveraging the project’s education component, we are partnering with the City to activate the trail with health-focused amenities to ensure the trail becomes not just a well-used transportation route but a cherished community asset.

The City of Lynnwood’s 44th Ave W/I-5 Underpass Improvements will remove linkage barriers that could increase access to South Lynnwood Park, a nearby, run-down park we are renovating in partnership with the City and the surrounding diverse community. The Interurban Trail runs through the park, meaning improvements in the city’s bicycle and pedestrian network increases the number of people able to walk or bike to the park.

We appreciate PSRC’s ongoing support for expanding Puget Sound’s pedestrian and bicycle transportation network. Thank you very much for your time and consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

David Patton
Northwest Area Director
The Trust for Public Land
ACTION ITEM January 4, 2018

To: Transportation Policy Board

From: Kelly McGourty, Senior Program Manager, Transportation Planning

Subject: Recommend Approval of Policies and Procedures for the 2018 Project Selection Process for PSRC Funds

IN BRIEF

PSRC is required under federal legislation to have a documented process that provides the policies and guidance for how PSRC will approve, manage and administer projects to be selected to receive PSRC’s federal funds. PSRC has project selection authority for several sources of funds from both the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA). Prior to each funding cycle, the policies and procedures for the project selection process are reviewed and updated to reflect current regional priorities and requirements, and are documented in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Transportation Policy Board should recommend Executive Board approval of the policies and procedures for the 2018 project selection process (Attachment A). These policies and procedures will be documented in the 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds.

DISCUSSION

A competitive project selection process is conducted every two to three years for the distribution of PSRC’s federal funds. The next process will be conducted in 2018 for PSRC’s 2021-2022 FHWA and FTA funds. Prior to each process a Policy Framework is adopted, outlining the policy guidance for the distribution of funds and other details on how the process will be conducted. Volunteers were solicited from PSRC’s four boards – Transportation Policy, Growth Management Policy, Economic Development, and Executive – to serve on a Project Selection Task Force charged with reviewing the policies and procedures for the 2018 project selection process. The Task Force, composed of 27 volunteer board members and alternates, met a total of four times between September and December 2017 and prepared the recommendations for the 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds contained in Attachment A.
These recommendations encompass the policies and procedures for conducting the competitive processes for both PSRC’s FHWA and FTA funding sources, and include the following:

- appropriate estimates to be used to program federal fiscal year (FFY) 2021-2022 funds
- policy focus of support for centers and the corridors that serve them
- set-asides for bicycle and pedestrian investments, preservation, the Rural Town Centers and Corridors Program, and PSRC’s work program
- the split of funds between the regional and countywide processes for PSRC’s FHWA funds
- the split of funds between the regional and earned share processes for PSRC’s FTA funds
- other details of each competitive process, including refinements to the project evaluation criteria and information on the four countywide processes

Once the Executive Board approves the policies and procedures for the 2018 project selection process, which will be documented in the 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, a Call for Projects will be released.¹ A draft schedule for the 2018 process follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 2018</td>
<td>Policy Framework adopted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2018</td>
<td>Call for Projects issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>Staff committee project recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2018</td>
<td>Board review of recommended projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>Air quality conformity analysis and preparation of the new 2019-2022 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>Public comment period on new TIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2018</td>
<td>Board adoption of new TIP; submittal to WSDOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2019</td>
<td>State and Federal approval of new TIP; funds available to projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information, please contact Kelly McGourty at 206-971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.

Attachments:
A - 2018 Project Selection Task Force Recommendations
B - Estimated FFY 2021-2022 FHWA Funds
C - Estimated FFY 2021-2022 FTA Funds
D - Draft Countywide Process Summaries

¹ Per past practice, the Policy Framework will provide details on the requirement that local jurisdictions must have the transportation elements of their comprehensive plans certified by PSRC to be eligible to compete for PSRC’s federal funds.
Attachment A

2018 Project Selection Task Force Recommendations

The Project Selection Task Force recommendations on the policies and procedures for the 2018 project selection process for PSRC’s federal funds are summarized below, encompassing both PSRC’s Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funding processes. Full details on the 2018 project selection process will be documented in the final 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, which is anticipated to be released as part of the Call for Projects in February of 2018.

Administrative Details

1. Funding years to program = FFY 2021 and 2022
2. Funding estimates will be based on 2017 final allocations, per consultation with FHWA, FTA and the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT). Refer to Attachments B and C for further details on the funding breakdown.
3. A four-part selection process will be conducted:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FHWA Funds</th>
<th>FTA Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Competition</td>
<td>Regional Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Competitions</td>
<td>Earned Share Distribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PSRC’s FHWA funds will be split between a regional competition and competitions conducted by each of the four countywide forums. The distribution is 50/50% after the set-asides have been applied to the total available funding. A limit of 36 applications is set for the regional FHWA competition; each countywide forum sets their own procedures for the countywide competitions.

PSRC’s FTA funds will be split between a regional competition and earned share distributions to the region’s transit operators. There are three Urbanized Areas (UZAs) in the region – Marysville, Bremerton and Seattle-Tacoma-Everett – and FTA funds come to the region based on both regional attributes and the individual operating characteristics of each transit agency. Per policy, this latter portion of the funds is distributed to each transit agency based on their earnings, called the “earned share” distribution. Within the Marysville and Bremerton UZAs there is only one transit operator; therefore only an earned share distribution is conducted within those areas. Within the Seattle-Tacoma-Everett UZA approximately 86% of the FTA funds received is based on the service and operating characteristics of the nine transit operators within the UZA, and is distributed via the earned share distribution. The remaining 14% is based on regional attributes and is distributed via a regional competition. There are no limits to the number of applications for the FTA regional competition.

Prioritized contingency lists of projects will continue to be created as part of each competitive process, should additional funds become available prior to the next process.
Set-Asides

1. The bicycle/pedestrian set-aside is retained at 10% of the total estimated FHWA funds and will be allocated by population among the four countywide forums, to be distributed via a competitive process.

2. The preservation set-aside for PSRC’s FHWA funds is retained at 20% of the total estimated Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STP) funds, with retention of the provision in 2016 to add 5% to the countywide processes. The preservation set-aside for PSRC’s FTA funds is retained at 45% of the regional competitive FTA funds.

3. The Rural Town Centers and Corridors Program is increased from $3 million to $5 million of FHWA STP funds from the regional competitive portion of funds. This program was created in 2003 to assist rural communities in implementing town center and corridor improvements, in coordination with state highway corridor interests. This program is above and beyond the minimum amount of STP funds required to be spent in the federally designated rural area. Normally, this program is conducted one year later than the main project selection process; staff is reviewing options for whether to conduct this process in 2018 or 2019.

4. The methodology to allocate funds for the Kitsap countywide competition by applying their population share to the total estimated STP funds, rather than after other set-asides have been applied as is done for the other counties, is retained. Kitsap County jurisdictions are ineligible to utilize the other PSRC FHWA funding source - Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement (CMAQ) Program funds – and this methodology provides a modest increase to the amount that would otherwise be available for the Kitsap countywide competition.

5. The minimum floor set-aside, which provides an adjustment for those transit operators earning less than 1% of the total earned share FTA funding within the Seattle-Tacoma-Everett Urbanized Area, is retained, and remains capped at FFY2015 levels. In addition, staff is directed to consider the full range of transit operations and ownership of assets when conducting the calculation.

6. The amount of funds from both FHWA and FTA for PSRC’s work program is retained at $1 million per year of FHWA funds and $1.25 million per year of FTA funds.

Policy Details

1. The policy focus of support for centers and the corridors that serve them is retained. For the regional FHWA competition centers are defined as regionally designated growth and manufacturing/industrial centers; for all other competitions centers are broadened to include locally identified centers. The provision to include military bases as locally defined centers for the countywide processes is retained.

2. The project evaluation criteria address elements such as supporting centers, safety, mobility, populations served, accessibility, emissions, project readiness and other elements. The Task Force recommended the following improvements for the 2018 process:

---

1 In 2016, the preservation set-aside for FHWA funds was reduced from 25% to 20%, with the 5% delta distributed to the countywide processes.
• the elements of safety and equity are included in the criteria, but should be made more explicit and be called out individually

• the improvements adopted in 2016 to strengthen the CMAQ program were retained: setting a higher amount of CMAQ funds in the regional process; setting a higher weighting for the air quality score for CMAQ projects; and utilizing cost-effectiveness in the air quality score for CMAQ projects

• the provision of transit projects being coordinated and integrated with the local system should be strengthened by ensuring consistency with state, local and transit agency plans

• given the advanced programming to FFY 2021-2022, and given that a set amount of funds, by source, is available to be utilized in any given year, the project readiness criterion is modified in the following ways: 1) evaluation will be based on a risk / feasibility assessment of delivery by the expected timeline, rather than seeking projects that are “ready to go” at point of application; and 2) points are reduced from ten to five points. The remaining five points will be moved to the Policy section of the criteria.

3. Information was provided to the Task Force on the process to distribute PSRC’s FTA funds for special needs populations (specifically, seniors and people with disabilities). This process is conducted separately from the main project selection process, the details of which have not historically been included in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds. PSRC’s competition has been conducted in concert with the state’s coordinated grant process, and staff has been working with WSDOT and PSRC’s Special Needs Transportation Committee to discuss opportunities to streamline the overall process, which would result in a greater role by WSDOT and more coordination and strategic planning on the part of PSRC. These discussions are ongoing, with more details to be determined; staff will present additional information to the Board in the future as these proposals unfold.

New for 2018

1. Both FHWA and FTA funding awards must now be balanced by year, and the amount of funds able to be utilized in a given year is limited by the annual estimated allocation amount by funding source. This has been standard practice for PSRC’s FTA funds for many years, but is new to PSRC’s FHWA funds and is a result of the region “catching up” on the use of older, previously awarded funds. Since only a certain amount of funding may be used each year, and to ensure the region continues to meet its annual FHWA delivery targets, the amount that may be requested in the FHWA regional competition is limited to 50% of each year’s available funding, by source. There is no limit to the FTA regional competition, as there are fewer applicants and the process has been conducted in this manner since 2004.

For more information, please contact Kelly McGourty at (206) 971-3601 or kmcgourty@psrc.org.
## Surface Transportation Program (STP) Funding
- $103.46

## Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) Funding
- $51.80

**Total** $155.26

### Set-Asides
- 10% for bicycle/pedestrian set-aside (STP & CMAQ) $15.53
- 6.5% for Kitsap County adjustment (per 2017 OFM population estimate) (STP) $6.72
- 20% of STP for preservation set-aside $20.69
- 5% from previous preservation set-aside to countywide forums $5.17
- PSRC Work Program (STP) - $1m per year $2.00

**Total** $50.12

### Amount Remaining for Regional and Countywide $105.14

### Regional/Countywide 50-50% Split

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regional Competitions</th>
<th>Countywide Competitions</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Competitions</td>
<td>$52.57</td>
<td>$52.57</td>
<td>$105.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countywide Competitions</td>
<td>$52.57</td>
<td>$52.57</td>
<td>$105.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Regional Competition

- Rural Town Centers and Corridors Program $5.00
- Regional FHWA Competition $47.57
- **Total Regional Funding** $52.57

### Countywide Competitions

- 50% to Countywides $52.57
- 10% for bicycle/pedestrian set-aside $15.53
- 6.5% for Kitsap County adjustment (per 2017 OFM population estimate) $6.72
- 20% of STP for preservation set-aside $20.69
- 5% from previous preservation set-aside to countywide forums $5.17
- **Total Countywide Funding** $100.69

### County Population Share & Amounts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County Population Share &amp; Amounts</th>
<th>Share</th>
<th>Non Motorized</th>
<th>Preservation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King - 52.96 %</td>
<td>$32.52</td>
<td>$ 8.22</td>
<td>$10.96</td>
<td>$51.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap - 6.5 %</td>
<td>$7.06</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce 21.13 %</td>
<td>$12.97</td>
<td>$ 3.28</td>
<td>$4.37</td>
<td>$20.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish -19.41%</td>
<td>$11.92</td>
<td>$ 3.01</td>
<td>$4.02</td>
<td>$18.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $100.69
## FTA Funding Estimates for PSRC's 2018 Project Selection Process

### Estimated 2021-22 FTA Funds (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Funds by UZA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton UZA</td>
<td>$7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marysville UZA</td>
<td>$4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle-Tacoma-Everett UZA</td>
<td>$356.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$368.94</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Funds Taken Off the Top

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSRC Work Program - Bremerton UZA</th>
<th>$0.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Work Program - Marysville UZA</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSRC Work Program - STE UZA</td>
<td>$2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2.50</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remaining Estimated Funds by UZA Available for Programming

| Bremerton UZA                  | $7.71 |
| Marysville UZA                 | $4.45 |
| Seattle-Tacoma-Everett UZA     | $354.28 |
| **Total**                      | **$366.44** |

### STE UZA Estimated Earned Share and Regional Processes

| 86% Earned Share Process        | $304.68 |
| 14% Regional Process           | $49.60 |
| **Total**                      | **$354.28** |

### STE UZA Estimated Earned Share Amounts by Transit Agency*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transit Agency</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Transit</td>
<td>$17.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Transit</td>
<td>$1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Ferry District</td>
<td>$3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Metro</td>
<td>$141.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Ferry System</td>
<td>$1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Transit</td>
<td>$11.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Transit</td>
<td>$94.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Ferries</td>
<td>$23.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Transit*</td>
<td>$0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit Transit*</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Transit*</td>
<td>$5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$304.68</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STE UZA Regional Process

| 14%                               | $49.60 |
| **Amount for Minimum Floor Adjustment ** | **$4.21** |
| 45% to State of Good Repair (distributed via Earned Share percentages) | **$22.32** |
| **Remaining for Regional Competition** | **$23.07** |

### STE UZA Estimated Earned Share Amounts, including State of Good Repair

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of Good Repair</th>
<th>Earned Share</th>
<th>Min. Floor</th>
<th>Subtotals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Transit</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$17.81</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett Transit</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$1.70</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Ferry District</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
<td>$3.65</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County Metro</td>
<td>$11.37</td>
<td>$141.47</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seattle</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>$1.61</td>
<td>$1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Ferry System</td>
<td>$0.15</td>
<td>$1.62</td>
<td>$1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce Transit</td>
<td>$1.01</td>
<td>$11.82</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Transit</td>
<td>$6.13</td>
<td>$94.39</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Ferries</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
<td>$23.87</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Transit</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.89</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit Transit</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.68</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercity Transit</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5.16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22.32</strong></td>
<td><strong>$304.68</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4.21</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These agencies are “external” transit agencies that earn FTA funds by providing service to this UZA. Per adopted policy, these agencies will receive what they earn from this service, but are not eligible to participate in the regional competition, the minimum floor adjustment or vote on Committee actions.

** This amount is based on the minimum floor methodology used in PSRC’s 2016 Project Selection Process.
Attachment D
2018 Project Selection Process for PSRC Funds:
DRAFT COUNTYWIDE PROCESS SUMMARIES

The overarching parameters for PSRC’s funding project selection process include the following:

- **Transparency** – conduct an open and transparent process and clearly communicate to prospective sponsors, elected officials and the public;
- **Fairness** – conduct a process that is fair to all eligible sponsors;
- **Meet regional policy** – ensure that regional policies are being followed, such as project tracking and the adopted policy focus of support for centers and the corridors that serve them;
- **Meet federal requirements** – ensure all federal requirements are met, including project delivery, full funding of a phase, and that projects are competitively awarded.

The following are brief summaries of the countywide processes for the 2018 project selection process. Each countywide process is based on the policies and procedures as adopted in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, with additions and tailoring as necessary to meet their local needs. Please note that the countywide forums are still finalizing their procedures, and there may be revisions to some of the items below; the final processes will be incorporated into the 2018 Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds prior to the Call for Projects being released.

**King Countywide Process**

The King Countywide forum conducts competitions for six separate categories of projects, due to the large number of eligible jurisdictions. The King Countywide process is based on the regional criteria and application process, with some customization for a few of the project categories. Volunteer subcommittees of the King County Project Evaluation Committee (KCPEC) score and rank projects within each of the six categories, and the full committee then prepares a funding recommendation. Additional considerations beyond the scores are taken into account when making the recommendation, particularly geographic equity between the three King County subareas. Prioritized lists of contingency projects within each funding category are prepared. The final KCPEC recommendation is then forwarded to the King County members of PSRC’s Transportation Policy Board for their final recommendation to PSRC.

The funding distributions and procedures for each are described below:

- **Bicycle/Pedestrian set-aside**: The amount to be distributed is pre-determined in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds at 10% of the total estimated FHWA funds available and distributed per each county’s population share. The evaluation criteria incorporate additional elements per PSRC’s adopted Active Transportation Plan.

- **Preservation set-aside**: The amount to be distributed is pre-determined in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds at 20% of the total estimated Surface Transportation Program (STP) funds available and distributed per each county’s population share. There is a limit of three applications per agency and a maximum request of $1.5 million per project is allowed. The evaluation criteria is based on the regional parameters for the preservation set-aside as adopted in 2012.

- **Rural program**: PSRC is required to program a minimum amount of STP funds within the rural area, and per policy distributes this amount among the four counties based on the average between rural population and rural center lane miles.
• All others program: Eligible sponsors include transit, the port, tribes and other non-local jurisdiction agencies. Funding for this program is set at 15% of the total FHWA funds available for the core King Countywide process, with the remaining funds distributed by population share to the small and large jurisdiction funding program.

• Small jurisdiction program: Eligible sponsors are agencies less than 15,000 in population, and the funding amount is described above. In addition, these agencies may also submit projects to the Large jurisdiction program, to address larger project needs than may be funded in the Small jurisdiction program.

• Large jurisdiction program: Eligible sponsors are agencies over 15,000 in population, and the funding amount is described above.

Kitsap Countywide Process

The Kitsap Countywide forum conducts competitions for three categories of projects: the bicycle/pedestrian and preservation set-asides as identified in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, and a general competition for the core countywide funding program that encompasses capacity, safety and environmental projects. The distribution of the required minimum rural amount is also distributed, and eligible projects may be identified within each of the three categories.

The Kitsap Countywide process is based on the regional criteria and required elements, but is customized to reflect the local context and priorities. High, Medium and Low rankings are applied for each criterion. Similar to the KCPEC process, the bicycle/pedestrian criteria incorporate additional elements per PSRC’s adopted Active Transportation Plan, and the preservation criteria are based on the regional parameters for the preservation set-aside as adopted in 2012. Prioritized lists of contingency projects within each funding category are prepared.

The Transportation Technical Advisory Committee evaluates and ranks project submittals and makes recommendations to the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council’s (KRCC) Transportation Policy Committee; the Policy Committee makes recommendations to the full KRCC Board, who in turn makes final recommendations to PSRC.

Pierce Countywide Process

The Pierce Countywide forum conducts competitions for six categories of projects: the bicycle/pedestrian and preservation set-asides as identified in the Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds, and the required minimum rural amount, as well as specific categories for roadway, transit, and all other projects. The Pierce Countywide process is based on the regional criteria and required elements, but is customized to reflect the local context and priorities. Similar to the other counties, the bicycle/pedestrian criteria incorporate additional elements per PSRC’s adopted Active Transportation Plan, and the preservation criteria are based on the regional parameters for the preservation set-aside as adopted in 2012.

Each agency may submit a maximum of six applications. A target is established for small cities at 10% of the total available amount, for cities with a combined population and employment of less than 9,000, and a cap is established for transit projects at 18% of the total amount available.

A subcommittee of the Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) scores and ranks projects from each category, and the full committee then prepares a funding recommendation. A prioritized contingency list of projects is also recommended. Additional considerations beyond the scores are taken into account when making
the recommendation, particularly geographic equity. The TCC makes recommendations to the Pierce County Regional Council, who in turn makes recommendations to PSRC.

**Snohomish Countywide Process**

The Snohomish Countywide forum conducts their competitive project selection process by having sponsors select one of three project categories: projects located within a center, projects connecting to a center (both of which are similar to the regional competition) and preservation projects either within or connecting to a center. Similar to the other counties, the Snohomish Countywide process is based on the regional criteria and required elements, but is customized to reflect the local context and priorities. The preservation category is based on the preservation set-aside as identified in the *Policy Framework for PSRC’s Federal Funds*, and the criteria is based on the regional parameters for the preservation set-aside as adopted in 2012. The distribution of the required minimum rural amount and the bicycle/pedestrian set-aside occurs through eligible projects identified within each of the three categories. As described for the other counties, the bicycle/pedestrian criteria incorporate additional elements per PSRC’s adopted Active Transportation Plan.

A subcommittee of the Infrastructure Coordinating Committee (ICC) reviews and scores all projects and makes recommendations to the full committee. Additional considerations beyond the scores are taken into account when making the recommendation, particularly geographic equity. A prioritized contingency list of projects is also recommended. ICC makes funding recommendations to Snohomish County Tomorrow, who in turn makes final recommendations to PSRC.
ACTION ITEM

To: Transportation Policy Board
From: Kelly McGourty, Senior Program Manager, Transportation Planning
Subject: Recommend Adoption of Regional Safety Performance Management Targets

IN BRIEF

PSRC has developed 2018 regional Safety Performance Management targets to comply with a federal rule requiring action by February 27, 2018.

RECOMMENDED ACTION

The Transportation Policy Board should recommend that the Executive Board adopt the 2018 regional Safety Performance Management targets identified in Table 1.

DISCUSSION

In March 2016, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), in accordance with performance provisions established by the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21st Century Act (MAP-21) and The Fixing America’s Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, published the Safety Performance Management Measures (Safety PM) Final Rules. State Departments of Transportation (DOTs) were required to report statewide targets to FHWA by August 31, 2017. Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) have until February 27, 2018, to establish quantifiable targets specific to their Metropolitan Planning Area.

The Safety PM Final Rule establishes five performance measures based on the five-year rolling averages on all public roads, including:

- Number of fatalities
- Rate of fatalities per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
- Number of serious injuries
- Rate of serious injuries per 100 million vehicle miles traveled
- Number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) developed targets for these measures based on the State’s Strategic Highway Safety Plan, Target Zero, using a straight-line
projection beginning in 2016 that achieves zero fatalities and serious injuries by 2030. PSRC participated in WSDOT's MAP-21 Target Setting Working Group, which included WSDOT and MPO staff from across the state.

Based on the inputs received via this process, the MAP-21 Target Setting Working Group recommends that all MPOs in Washington State apply a similar methodology and adopt regional targets (based on regional share of statewide totals) that align with the statewide targets. During the November 2017 Transportation Policy Board meeting, staff briefed the Board on the target setting process, the draft state and regional targets for the above performance measures, and the evaluation process for the targets. At the January 11 meeting, staff will present the proposed final targets (shown in Table 1 below) and ask the Board to recommend their adoption.

**Table 1: 2018 PSRC Regional Safety Performance Management Targets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>2018 Target (5-Year Rolling Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Fatalities</td>
<td>172.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatality Rate Per 100 Million VMT</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Serious Injuries</td>
<td>898.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Injury Rate Per 100 Million VMT</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Bike/Ped Fatalities &amp; Serious Injuries</td>
<td>264.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other federally required performance targets\(^1\) are in the process of being developed and will be presented to the Board later in 2018.

For more information, please contact Gary Simonson, Associate Planner, at 206-971-3276 or gsimonson@psrc.org.

\(^1\) Additional sets of performance targets include: Freight Movement, Pavement & Bridge Condition, System Performance, and Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ Emissions).