SR 167 Stakeholder Committee Meeting
Thursday, August 25, 2011
9am to 12pm

Port of Tacoma Fabulich Center
3600 Port of Tacoma Road
Tacoma, WA 98424

Attendees

Committee Members

George Walk, Pierce County (Chair)
Kevin Dayton, WSDOT Olympic Region
Dean Moberg, Federal Highway Administration
Ken Gill for Russ Blount, City of Fife
Sean Ardussi, PSRC
Karen Schmidt, FMSIB
Tom Pierson, Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber
Gary Nomensen, South Sound Chambers of Commerce Leg. Coalition
Dennis Dowdy, City of Auburn
Chad Wright, Marine View Ventures/Puyallup Tribe
Jay Bennett, City of Pacific
Sanjeev Tandle, City of Puyallup
Chris Larson, City of Tacoma
Sheri Call for Larry Pursley, Washington Trucking Association (WTA)
Sean Eagan for Brian Mannelly, Port of Tacoma

Legislators

Rep. Hans Zieger, 25th Legislative District
Senator Randi Becker, 2nd Legislative District
Kimberlie Lelli for Senator Steve Conway, 29th Legislative District
Rep. Mark Hargrove, 47th Legislative District
Caitlin Lopez for Rep. Christopher Hurst, 31st Legislative District
Rep. Laurie Jinkins, 27th Legislative District

Alternates/Interested Parties

Carl Durham, City of Fife
David Schroedel, Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber
Dale Tabat, Milgard
Dan Handa, City of Puyallup
Tara Mattina, Port of Tacoma
Evette Mason, Port of Tacoma

WSDOT

Stacy Trussler, Director- Urban Planning Office
Shuming Yan, Urban Planning Office
Steve Fuchs, SR167 Project Office
JoAnn Schueler, Olympic Region Project Development
Lisa Copeland, Olympic Region Communications

Charles Prestrud, Urban Planning Office
Annie Johnson, Toll Division
David Pope, Toll Division
Steve Kim, Olympic Region Traffic

Agenda

Meeting called to order at 9:05am.

1. **Action: Confirmation of committee chair**
   Kevin Dayton identified George Walk from Pierce County as the committee chair.

2. **Introduction and meeting purpose**
   Kevin Dayton reviewed the purpose of meeting.
   - To review toll decision-making process
   - To review previous options and the findings from the 2010 Toll Feasibility Study
   - To endorse phasing and tolling options for further study
   - To endorse evaluation criteria, performance measures and methodology to be used in this study
   - To discuss public outreach strategies

3. **Information: Notebook provided for your convenience**
   Shuming Yan walked the group through the notebook provided to attendees.

   Please keep the notebooks, new materials will be provided for insert into the notebook for future meetings. If you do not wish to hold on to your books, you can give them to WSDOT to store and return to the next meeting for you.

4. **Discussion: Overview of the toll decision-making process**
   Kevin Dayton conducted an overview of the toll decision-making process using PowerPoint presentation.

   Shuming Yan discussed different types of tolling studies, using a PowerPoint presentation: 1) Toll Feasibility Study; 2) Comprehensive Study; and 3) Investment Grade Toll Study

   Sean Egan asked if all three studies are necessary.
   Answer provided by WSDOT staff: Yes, all three studies are necessary, however after the comprehensive study, there would be enough information to provide to the legislature in order to get funding authorized for of the investment grade study, purchase the remaining right of way and to begin the design.

   Dean Moberg asked if tolling is projected to start prior to the construction of SR167 to help pay for this project.
   Kevin responded that this discussion will help us define that and other options, hopefully defining how we are going to move forward.

   Chad Wright asked if there is a dollar assumption related to the data being provided.

Shuming Yan responded that the executive summary of the SR167 Toll Feasibility Study that is located in the notebook provided does have this information in it. There is a full version of the study that we can send to you. Steve Fuchs also reminded the attendees that tolls cannot cover the entire cost of construction.
Kevin Dayton added that the PowerPoint presentation that we are watching will be emailed to everyone.

5. Information: Review the 2010 Toll Feasibility findings

Steve Fuchs outlined some SR167 extension potential phasing options, 19 in total, that are listed on a spreadsheet that was handed out to all of the attendees. Steve explained the differences in the options and displayed them via maps on the overhead. A brief summary of each option is as follows:

1. Full Build; contains 2 lanes in each direction, plus HOV lanes; all interchanges
2. Two lanes each direction; no HOV; all interchanges
3. Two lanes each direction; no HOV; half an interchange at SR 161
4. Two lanes each direction; no HOV; no interchange at 54th
5. Two lanes each direction; no HOV; no interchange at Valley
6. Two lanes from SR161 to I-5; no HOV; all interchanges
7. Two lanes from SR161 to I-5; no HOV; half an interchange at SR161
8. Two lanes from SR161 to I-5; no HOV; no interchange at Valley
9. One lane each direction; no HOV; all interchanges
10. One lane each direction; no HOV; half an interchange at SR161
11. One lane each direction; no HOV; on interchange at 54th
12. One lane each direction; no HOV; no interchange at Valley
13. One lane each direction; no HOV; all interchanges
14. One lane each direction; no HOV; half an interchange at SR161
15. One lane each direction; no HOV; no interchange at Valley
16. Two lanes each direction from SR509 to I-5; no HOV; all interchanges
17. Two lanes each direction from SR509 to I-5; no HOV; no interchange at 54th
18. One lane each direction from SR509 to I-5, no HOV; all interchanges
19. One lane each direction from SR509 to I-5; no HOV; no interchange at 54th

Dennis Dowdy suggested that we do not support anything that does not allow the project to eventually go to a full build. Steve Fuchs added that none of the listed options would prevent a future full build or two-lane option; excluding the updated interchanges when going from a one lane option to the full build or two lane option.

Steve Fuchs explained that not all of the information in the spreadsheet is filled out because we are looking to explore different options and are looking for endorsement from the group on 2-3 options to carry forward. The *Funding Needs* column is the estimated amount needed to fund design, construction, and right of way acquisitions. The *Tolling Funding Contribution* column includes an estimated 30-year net toll funding range.

Dennis Dowdy asked if there is an option to have two lanes where we can gain access straight to the Port and then straight to I-5 as that is where most of the traffic is see coming through the city.

Steve Fuchs reminded the group that there could be additional options that are not listed on the spreadsheet.

6. Action: Endorsing phasing/tolling options for further study

Sean Ardussi asked what is the cost difference between options 16 and 17.

Steve Fuchs responded that it is primarily dirt work, however all cost estimating is not detailed and is given as an order of magnitude. Steve reminded the attendees that our goal is to get down to 3 or less options to look at for the next study.

Sean Eagan stated that he would prefer options 1 or 2, however if we cannot get all of that he supports at least options 16 or 17. He also stated that he is not in support of doing just one side or the other of I-5. A 509 connection is required. He could get around the Valley interchange by getting on highway 18.

Chris Larson stated that he feels that it is important to have option 9 with all of the interchanges, even if it is one lane in each direction, to include the extra pieces of option 16. He stated that this would be the City of Tacoma's minimum desire.

Dennis Dowdy asked if we are going to be using the toll road west of I-5 to assist in paying for the remaining project. WSDOT answered no.

Senator Becker stated that her concern is the cost of right of way.

By consensus and after a brief discussion it was determined that the group was not going to support anything that did not go the length of the project; therefore, they dropped options 6-8 and 13-19 as possibilities.

Karen Schmidt stated that if you added two lanes to option 9, from 54th to I-5, that would be ideal.

Senator Becker suggested that we give legislators different levels and options but still show the need for future additions leading up to the full build. She again noted that she was concerned about the ability to purchase the remaining the right of way in the future.

Dean Moberg added that the demand will show when you go to two lanes. He suggested that we let WSDOT do their work, so that we can see what the best option is.

Chad Wright stated that you need to look at who is using a particular stretch of road. When you are merging on and off I-5 it takes longer for a slow moving tractor trailer to merge onto a single lane road than normal vehicles.

David Schroedel suggested that whichever package we do chose, we should ensure that all of the right of way costs, $170 million, are included in the package to finish purchasing the necessary properties for the full build.

Ken Gill stated that the Valley interchange is smack dead in Fife, and it is crucial to get the trucks in and out of Fife. Carl Durham added that the City will not support any proposal that increases street traffic within the City.

After some discussion, the Committee reached a consensus that any options short of building at least one lane each direction all the way presents a fatal flaw. George Walk pointed out that the only current viable options on the table are options 1, 2 or 9. Karen Schmidt suggested to modify option 9 by including an extra lane between 54th and I-5 to accommodate high truck volume on this segment. This option is labeled option 9A. Steve Fuchs added that there are no fatal flaws with these options besides a little throw away work to redo some ramps when the project is expanded to the full build.

The committee then focused the discussion on options 1 and 2. Shuming Yan explained that analyzing both options in this first go around is not necessary since analyzing one will provided needed information to access the other. For example, if the analysis indicated that option 2 provides enough capacity, building option 1 that includes all project components in one phase will not be necessary.

Karen Schmidt asked for further clarification on the breakdown of components. She wanted to ensure that the legislative staff would be given all of the options with component break outs so that they could then determine what options they were going to include. This was confirmed by WSDOT Staff.

Tom Pierson suggested that we forget about option 9 and only go with 9A with the extra lane. After consensus this was then adopted.

George Walk reminded everyone that we want to keep the full build in front of everyone, as this is our preferred option.

The discussion continued around offering up some smaller projects or a phased in option 9a. Representative Laurie Jinkins stated that she is worried that if the legislature sees us studying these other options they will assume that they are acceptable. Senator Randi Becker agreed and suggested that we offer option 1 but compromise on option 9A. Senator Becker suggested that when WSDOT provides numbers, they show some comparisons between this project and the 520 project and other related projects. Senator Becker explained that we need to be able to sell this project and its importance. Dean Moberg added that we should also include the cost to our communities if we don't proceed with construction.

Representative Hans Zieger acknowledged that with political dynamics, getting this done does require us to scale down the project, however, we have to watch how much we scale down as we do not want to eliminate the enthusiasm of any one particular stake holder.

Representative Laurie Jinkins stated that we also need to include why are we doing SR 167 Extension at all? By identifying this we do not negotiate ourselves down. She pointed out that if

you had to choose only some but not all of the interchanges vs. not having the full length of the build what would you chose?

Ken Gill from the City of Fife responded that we have to pay the bills, therefore, we are needing the interchanges. David Schroedel added that the total cost of each interchange is a fraction of the cost of not having the interchange to our communities.

George Walk then looked for clarification, asking if we are going to advise WSDOT to go forward with options 1, 2 and 9A. A consensus was reached.

7. **Break:**

8. **Action: Endorsing project evaluation criteria and methodology**
   Charles Prestrud presented the spreadsheet entitled SR 167 Project Evaluation Criteria-Draft. There are four elements to the spreadsheet.
   a) Consistency with Plans and Standards
   b) Benefit to Cost Ratio
   c) Toll Revenue and Funding Gap
   d) Nonmonetizable or Qualitative

   Additional information was passed out from Senator Kastama regarding the support of economic development, this information had not been previously been reviewed b y WSDOT.

   Sean Eagan asked if safety should be included as a criteria, stating that accidents are 20% higher on city streets vs. highways. Shuming responded that in the past it was WSDOT's priority to focus on areas that had the highest accident rates.

   Charles Prestrud added that the items on the spreadsheet that are shaded are not unimportant. They are more difficult to quantify and will be revisited later. Shuming added that once we are moving forward and have additional funding, the shaded items will be studied for environmental permits later down the road.

   Representative Laurie Jinkins added that we need to watch our air quality or we risk losing federal funding.

   Chad Wright expressed that we should also be evaluating the flood control considering most of this area is in a flood plain. We could use it as a backup plan and consider this a safety measure. Charles responded that we don't have an answer to that at this time; all of these alternatives are in the same place.

   Sean Eagan asked what is the difference between this exercise and the EIS? Charles responded that it is to compare the alternatives that are being studied in this process, such as a comparing 9A and the full build. Shuming added that it also justifies funding the project.

   David Schroedel asked about the weight scores for the different categories shown at the bottom of the criteria matrix. Shuming responded that we are looking for the benefits for continuing with this project. These are the weightings that were recommended by the SR 509 committee. We may have things that come back as a higher priority, but right now they are place holders.

George Walk then added that we would continue this discussion in the next meeting, and then asked the group if we are comfortable with this until the next meeting. There was no objection from the group.

9. **Info/Discussion: Public outreach strategies**
   Charles Prestrud shared a PowerPoint presentation regarding outreach efforts, including information received from a phone survey.

   Jay Bennett asked how the project was explained to the callers. Charles responded that there was no explanation. He continued to explain that the survey was done as a baseline, where we can then identify what other areas we would be looking at. You cannot bank on the amount of people who would divert per their answers.

   Sean Eagan asked if this survey work is consistent with other surveys that have been done for other projects. Annie responded that it is similar and is based off of the same types of questions.

   Lisa Copeland then indicated that they are currently working on putting a communication plan together for this project. She handed out a summary of the public involvement plan. The main element of the plan is to inform decision makers and to engage the public.

   George Walk then asked for suggestions as to how we are going to help Lisa get this information out to the public. Gary Nomensen volunteered to be the link between all of the chambers. Senator Randi Becker volunteered to be the link between the different business associates, and Sheri volunteered to assist with the trucking industry.

10. **Other Information: Meeting Summary and Next Meeting**
    Sean Eagan stated that it would be great to have presentations at natural points in time at board meetings and council meetings. Lisa Copeland agreed that it would be ideal to schedule them around different milestones, however, it isn't always possible due to meeting dates and times. She will be available to meet during other times as well. These meeting times and schedules should be sent to Lisa so that she can get on their schedules.

    Next meeting September 27th, 2011 at the same time and place. It will be another full agenda.

11. **Adjourn at 12:05pm**