

Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Program
Advisory Committee on Tolling and Traffic Management
Meeting Summary – Dec. 8, 2011

Committee Members in Attendance

- Claudia Balducci
- Kurt Beckett
- Rick Bender
- Marcus Charles
- Bob Davidson
- Phil Fujii
- Anne Goodchild
- Tessa Greeger
- Rob Johnson
- Sharon Maeda
- Charley Royer
- Peg Staeheli
- Sung Yang

Committee Members Not In Attendance

- Maud Daudon
- Henry Yates

Agencies and Staff In Attendance

- Dave Dye, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
- Jennifer Ziegler, Governor Gregoire's office
- Linea Laird, WSDOT
- Mike McGinn, Seattle Mayor

- Tom Rasmussen, Seattle City Council
- Dan Eder, Seattle City Council central staff
- Bob Chandler, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT)
- Linda Mullen, Advisory Committee on Tolling and Traffic Management Administrator

Agenda Item #1 – Welcome, Introductions and Purpose

Advisory Committee on Tolling and Traffic Management (ACTT) Administrator Linda Mullen welcomed the members and the public to the meeting.

Seattle Mayor Mike McGinn noted that the committee will have the job of balancing the need to provide tolling revenue to the project and to minimize negative effects from diversion on city streets.

Seattle Councilmember Tom Rasmussen announced that, at his request, Charley Royer and Maud Daudon have agreed to be co-chairs of the ACTT.

Dave Dye, WSDOT Chief Operating Officer and Deputy Secretary, explained that all SR 99 tunnel tolling scenarios examined to date show diversion to I-5 and city streets, which is not acceptable. He noted that Governor Gregoire, the Legislature and the State Transportation

Commission are interested in the work of this committee and want to see this project go smoothly.

Agenda Item #2 – Committee Authorization

WSDOT Alaskan Way Viaduct (AWV) Replacement Program Administrator Linea Laird, SDOT Major Projects Division Director Bob Chandler, and Seattle City Council staff member Dan Eder explained how and why the ACTT was formed.

The expectation is that the ACTT's recommendations will go to the Federal Highway Administration, Governor, Legislature, Transportation Commission, Seattle Mayor and Seattle City Council. The first set of recommendations is needed by December 2012. The ACTT will continue to meet through the first year the tunnel is operational, which will be the end of 2016.

WSDOT and SDOT staff members who will support the committee were introduced. Linda Mullen will serve as the liaison between those teams and the ACTT.

Agenda Item #3 – AWV Program Overview

Linea Laird and Bob Chandler gave brief overviews of the projects which make up the Alaskan Way Viaduct Replacement Program.

Presentation materials are available on the AWV website at:
www.wsdot.wa.gov/Projects/Viaduct/tollingcommittee.htm.

Agenda Item #4 – Tolling 101

Dave Dye and Jennifer Ziegler, senior policy advisor for Governor Gregoire, gave an overview of tolling in Washington state.

The Legislature determines toll-eligible facilities and authorizes tolls. The State Transportation Commission sets toll rates, establishes exemptions, reviews toll collection and operation policies, and ensures that toll rates will generate sufficient revenues.

In 2008 legislation set the state's overarching tolling policy objectives. It stated that tolling should be used when a project has a funding gap, as a way to manage traffic on a system, or sometimes for both. The key is that tolls should not have significant adverse diversion effects that cannot be mitigated.

A 2010 study looked at five SR 99 tunnel tolling scenarios and found that \$400 million could be raised from tolls. All scenarios also produced diversion. Tolloed traffic analysis was included in the project's Environmental Impact Statement. The AWV program is updating its tolling analysis using current assumptions about traffic and financing. This information will be shared with the Legislature and the ACTT in early 2012.

Agenda Item #5 – Guiding Principles

Linda Mullen presented the draft ACTT guiding principles. She noted that the principles will provide the framework for evaluating ideas generated by the committee.

Comments on the guiding principles:

- Principle one – diversion to city streets and to I-5 should be looked at separately.
- Principle two – should be broken into separate guiding principles. Identification of funding for diversion impacts is separate from the state’s funding obligation to the AWW program.
- Principle six – the intent should be to improve traffic efficiency.
- Principles five and seven – language should be included that recognizes the waterfront neighborhood’s role as a connector to the industrial and maritime activity in the Duwamish, Ballard and Interbay neighborhoods.
- Principles six and seven – should account for needed movements within the downtown zone. We should be more precise on what we mean by “downtown.”
- Principles should call out the role of the AWW program in regional mobility.

Question: Does the order of the principles imply a prioritization?

Answer: Beyond the first three that came from the City-State memorandum of agreement that established the ACTT, no.

Question: Could we spend some time discussing a definition of geographic scopes?

Answer: We have that planned for a future meeting, but it could be discussed in January.

Question: If our task is to balance all of these needs, is there a guiding principle or perhaps a preamble, that alludes to that balance or guides our decisions when making trade-offs?

Answer: We will come back to these principles at the next meeting and begin an evaluation discussion.

Question: Will we use consensus or majority rule to make decisions about recommendations?

Answer: Consensus.

Comment: The committee needs to establish ground rules for the consensus process given the many diverse interests represented here.

Question: None of these principles specify emissions reductions, although that was listed as one potential policy outcome of tolling. Emissions are alluded to with “enjoyable place,” but can we call out air quality directly?

Answer: We will figure out where in this process it fits. We will also bring to the committee the environmental work that has already been completed.

Agenda Item # 6 – Work Plan Discussion

Linda Mullen led a discussion about the anticipated committee work plan. Preliminary recommendations are due in December 2012. We will hold committee meetings every 5-8 weeks.

The work plan has four phases:

- Phase 1 – Review tolling analysis done to-date, traffic conditions, and traffic and financial modeling.

- Phase 2 – Discuss, evaluate and review potential tolling scenarios and strategies to minimize diversion.
- Phase 3 – Review modeling results and begin prioritizing strategies to minimize diversion.
- Phase 4 – Complete a report with the committee’s recommendations.

Question: How can we integrate SR 520 tolling lessons into our process?

Answer: Tolling on SR 520 begins Dec. 29. We may have tolling analysis from SR 520 in three to six months. We will share this data with the committee.

Question: Who created the traffic model?

Answer: The initial model was developed by the Puget Sound Regional Council. Parsons Brinckerhoff is now developing a model for us that can analyze regional and individual car movements.

Question: What happens to this committee after 2012?

Answer: We don’t expect the time commitment to be as heavy in future years. This committee will be in place through 2016 to ensure that the recommendations made are tested after the tunnel opens, and changes can be made if necessary.

Question: Will the AWV program communications team manage communications for this committee?

Answer: While AWV program communications will support this group, communications people from partner agencies will be involved with the ACTT. All ACTT communications will be a joint message from the partner agencies.

Agenda Item #7 – Operating Charter and Meeting Ground Rules

Linda Mullen presented the meeting ground rules, noting that the rules are in draft form and can be amended by the committee if desired.

Comment: With past consensus processes, the group’s goal was to not water down recommendations that didn’t meet the primary goals simply to reach consensus. The model used in the Mercer Corridor stakeholder process is an example.

Comment: For occasions when we can’t make consensus, we can use minority versus majority reports. These allow the process to move forward while ensuring everyone has a voice. But a concern is how to prevent that tool from becoming an escape valve.

Question: Is the public going to be involved in this process. Will they have an opportunity to provide feedback on our draft recommendations? Otherwise we could spend a lot a time on recommendations that will never be used by legislative bodies.

Answer: There will be regular updates to the Seattle City Council and the State Transportation Commission. There may be opportunities to get public feedback then. We are accepting written and email comments from the public. There might be an appropriate time for public comment after the committee’s first round of recommendations.

Comment: Very few of us have staff support. Meeting materials should be available as soon as possible.

Answer: Our goal is to make materials available the Friday before each meeting. Earlier than that may not be possible, due to the coordination required between agencies and the amount of data we need to produce. If we can make them available sooner, we will.

Question: Can we clarify the word “diversion”? Does that mean people who take the same trip at a different time, or those who use the same mode via a different route? We should be more specific in the way we use that word in our guiding principles.

Answer: For us, diversion takes into account the route taken, time traveled and mode used. The concern is that people will change their route and then inundate downtown streets and I-5. To help clarify this point, we will show you models of what I-5 and Seattle city streets will look like in 2016 and 2030, for tolled and un-tolled scenarios.

Comment: This analysis should look at different times of days as well.

Question: You indicated that raising \$400 million from tolling is a legislative directive. Can we try to raise money from other sources?

Answer: Yes, the committee can make those recommendations.

Question: How did the amount of \$400 million get chosen?

Answer: At the time the funding package was put together, there was an agreement on the partner agencies' contributions. A gap of \$400 million was identified. The Legislature decided those funds should come from tolling. We anticipated that finding other revenue sources would be an interest of this group. The committee may decide to investigate other options; we recommend that this wait until after all of the background information has been presented.

Agenda Item #8 – Closing, Questions and Next Steps

Linda Mullen thanked everyone for attending and noted that the next meeting will be held on Jan. 25, 2012, at Sound Transit from 3 to 5 p.m.

Action items:

- Send committee members details regarding traffic modeling before the next meeting.
- Report on the findings of the Executive Review Panel to the ACTT.
- Provide information about work done to-date on air quality and emissions.
- Discuss the geographic scope of the committee and the project.
- Share SR 520 data and experience of tolling.