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Agenda

• Welcome & Introductions
• Program Overview and Considerations
• SR 509 Scenario Updates and Review
• SR 167 Scenario Updates and Review
• Review Cost Estimates
• Discuss Construction Staging and Grant Opportunities
• Conclusion and Next Steps
Puget Sound Gateway Program Update

• Guiding Principles
• Review Schedule and Milestones
• Joint Executive Committee Meeting
Legislative Direction

In making budget allocations to the Puget Sound Gateway project, the department shall implement the project's construction as a single corridor investment. The department shall develop a coordinated corridor construction and implementation plan for SR 167 and SR 509 in collaboration with affected stakeholders.

Specific funding allocations must be based on where and when specific project segments are ready for construction to move forward and investments can be best optimized for timely project completion. Emphasis must be placed on avoiding gaps in fund expenditures for either project.
Puget Sound Gateway Process
Puget Sound Gateway Program Guiding Principles

1. Support regional mobility to provide efficient movement of freight and people
2. Improve local, regional, state and national economic vitality
3. Provide a high level of safety
4. Support local and regional comprehensive land use plans
5. Minimize environmental impacts and seek opportunities for meaningful improvements
6. Create solutions that are equitable, fiscally responsible, and allow for implementation over time
7. Support thoughtful community engagement and transparency
Joint Steering Committee 2016 Work Plan

December 2015

Determine Needs

Define Performance Metrics

February

We are here

June - September

Develop & Refine Scenarios

October

Stakeholder Endorsement of Scope

December

Funding & Phasing

January 2017

Recommend Const. & Imp. Plan
Scenario Refinement Process

SR 509 Process
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SR 167 Process
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Endorsed Gateway Program Scope
Puget Sound Gateway Program

Total funding is $1.87 billion; this amount assumes $310 million local match and tolling revenue.
Program Cost Estimates

Total Gateway Funding $1.87b

- 2A: $888m
- 2A: $731m

Total Connecting Washington Funding $1.57b

- 2B: $923m
- 3A: $855m
- 4A: $1.26b
- 4A: $1.03b

Total $2.29b

$0.0b $0.5b $1.0b $1.5b $2.0b
### Key Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Level</th>
<th>1. How many lanes are included on SR 167 and SR 509?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What level of tolling is considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How are managed lanes considered and included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Level</td>
<td>4. What degree of forward compatibility should be included in the design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Degree of potential impact to I-5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Where are connections most important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. How is south access to the airport accommodated? (SR 509)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. How is access to the Port of Tacoma best accommodated? (SR 167)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Key Questions

1. How many lanes are included on SR 167 and SR 509?
   • Four lanes

2. What level of tolling is considered?
   • Tolling will be part of the program for demand management and we recognize it will provide revenue.

3. How are managed lanes considered and included?
   • No freight lanes
   • No express toll lanes
   • No HOV lanes
SR 509 Completion Project
Scenario 2A

Changes from Scenario 2:
- SR 509: 4 lanes
- 188th: Half Diamond
- I-5/SR 509: 45 mph
- I-5 SB (SR 516 to SR 509): 1 auxiliary lane
- I-5 (SR 516 to SR 509): No accommodation of center to center HOV direct connector
- SB Auxiliary Lanes (South of SR 516: No auxiliary lane)
Scenario 3A

Changes from Scenario 3:

- **SR 516:**
  - Reconstruct interchange to a full diamond
  - At-grade intersection with Veterans Drive
  - Access to Veterans Drive to and from the north and south

- Includes direct access transit ramp to KDM Station from the SR 516 to SB I-5 on ramp. *(This was previously only in Scenario 4)*
Scenario 4A

Changes from Scenario 4

- SR 516:
  - Reconstruct interchange to a full diamond, at-grade intersection with Veterans Drive
  - Access to Veterans Drive to and from the north and south
  - Includes only the direct access transit ramp to KDM Station from the SR 516 to SB I-5 on ramp
  - Keeps SE loop ramp, like Scenario 4
  - Like 3, Scenario 4 included frontage road and grade separated NB onramp
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Level</th>
<th>Project Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many lanes are included on SR 509?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What level of tolling is considered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How are managed lanes considered and included?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What degree of forward compatibility should be included in the design?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Degree of potential impact to I-5?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Where are connections most important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How is south access to the airport accommodated?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SR 509 Single Roadway Prism
SR 509 Section at Undercrossing

4 LANE

6 LANE PRACTICAL DESIGN CONCEPT

6 LANE FULL STANDARD
### Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

4. What degree of forward compatibility should be included in the design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Forward Compatibility</th>
<th>Phase 1 Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR 509 structures and walls constructed to only accommodate 4 lane facility</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SR 509 structures and walls constructed to accommodate 6 lane practical design facility</td>
<td>$10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structures and walls constructed to accommodate full standard 6 lane facility</td>
<td>$15m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

4. What degree of forward compatibility should be included in the design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Buys only right of way needed for Scenario 2A</th>
<th>Buys only right of way needed for Scenario 3A</th>
<th>Buys only right of way needed for Scenario 4A</th>
<th>Buys EIS right of way footprint</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$129m</td>
<td>$150m</td>
<td>$166m</td>
<td>$173m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

5. Degree of potential impact to I-5?

• A DTA (mesoscopic) model is being developed to assess system-wide impacts to I-5 operations
• Preliminary assessment of I-5 impacts using Highway Capacity Manual tools for fatal flaw analysis
  • Peak period, peak direction assessment for year 2045
  • Performance metric is whether I-5 is harmed, or not
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

5. Degree of potential impact to I-5?

Northbound AM 2045: 2A

Northbound AM 2045: 3A

Northbound AM 2045: 4A
5. Degree of potential impact to I-5?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>NB Aux</th>
<th>NB 2 Lane CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Performance</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$97m</td>
<td>$149m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

5. Degree of potential impact to I-5?

Southbound PM 2045: 2A

Southbound PM 2045: 3A

Southbound PM 2045: 4A
### Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

#### SB I-5 Improvements needed to reach no harm to I-5 (SR 509 to SR 516)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>SB Aux</th>
<th>SB 2 Aux</th>
<th>SB 2 Lane CD</th>
<th>SB 3 Lane CD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-5 Performance</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$54m</td>
<td>$82m</td>
<td>$139m</td>
<td>$310m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Degree of potential impact to I-5?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Metric: I-5 Performance, Target: No Harm</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No SB Aux Lane SR 516 to S 272nd St</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>$0m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single lane SB Aux Lane SR 516 to S 272nd St</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>$36m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual SB Aux Lane SR 516 to S 272nd St</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>$71m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

6. Where are connections most important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Full Diamond</th>
<th>Half Diamond/Do not preclude Full Diamond</th>
<th>SPUI</th>
<th>Half SPUI/Do not preclude Full SPUI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interchange Performance</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 509 Performance</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Local and Regional Comprehensive land use planning and development</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$58m</td>
<td>$11m</td>
<td>$53m</td>
<td>$32m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Where are connections most important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S 200 ST Interchange Configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interchange Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR 509 Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Local and Regional Comprehensive land use planning and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

6. Where are connections most important?

| SR 516 to SB I-5 On Ramp KDM Station Slip ramp connection (transit only) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Options** | No Slip ramp connection to KDM | With "in" connection to KDM | With "out" connection to KDM |
| Interchange Performance | Good | Good | Good |
| Support Multimodal Choices to SeaTac Airport and KDM Link Light Rail Station | Moderate Interchange travel time slightly better than no build | Very Good 3-5 minute travel time savings | Good 2-4 minute travel time savings |
| Cost | $0m | $2m | $4m |
### Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

6. Where are connections most important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SR 516/Veterans Drive Interchange</th>
<th>Baseline with Partial Veterans</th>
<th>Parclo with Partial Veterans</th>
<th>Parclo/Frontage with Partial Veterans</th>
<th>Parclo/Frontage with Full veterans</th>
<th>Split Diamond with SE Loop</th>
<th>Split Diamond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
<td>Support Local and Regional Comprehensive land use planning and development</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Reduce pedestrian vehicle exposure</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>$130m</td>
<td>$131m</td>
<td>$136m</td>
<td>$152m</td>
<td>$135m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

6. Where are connections most important?

- Highest priority is SR 516 for the following reasons:
  - Connects two state highways – prioritizes functionality
  - Veterans Drive plays a crucial role in keeping the entire system working
- 188th, 200th, and KDM slip ramps have a lesser degree of significance to overall operations
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 509

7. How is south access to the Airport accommodated?

• Provide interim south access via 28th/24th.
• The project will accommodate a future South Access Expressway.
Additional Steering Committee Question

What are target speeds on the I-5/SR 509 Interchange ramps?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I-5/SR 509 Ramp Connection Target Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Options</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers and airport travel time and reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number ROW parcels impacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SR 509 Performance Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Essential Performance Metrics</th>
<th>Contextual Performance Metrics</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Metric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scenario Overview

- **No Build**
  - Mobility
  - Economic Vitality
  - Safety
  - Cost: $350 M

- **Scenario 2A - Limited Connectivity**
  - Mobility
  - Economic Vitality
  - Safety
  - Cost: $350 M

- **Scenario 3A - Moderate Connectivity**
  - Mobility
  - Economic Vitality
  - Safety
  - Cost: $350 M

- **Scenario 4A - Full Connectivity**
  - Mobility
  - Economic Vitality
  - Safety
  - Cost: $350 M

[Diagram showing performance metrics for each scenario]
Performance Evaluation Results – Key Takeaways

• Scenario 2A rated poor for I-5 performance, showing it doesn’t meet an essential need.

• Scenarios 3A and 4A score similarly – recommend moving these two scenarios forward for mesoscopic modeling
SR 167 Completion Project
• Range from “Closing the Gap” to “Full-Build Out +”
Scenario 2A: Limited I-5 Connectivity

Changes from Scenario 2
• ½ SPUI at I-5 replaced with ½ diamond I/C to the north
• ¾ SPUI at Meridian reduced to ½ SPUI (rebuild existing)

Other Items Total $185M
• Interurban Trail
• RRP & Wetland Mitigation
• Toll System

$888M
Scenario 2B: Full Connectivity at I-5 & Meridian

Changes from Scenario 2
- ½ SPUI at I-5 replaced with Diverging Diamond I/C
- ½ diamond at Valley Ave removed, No I/C
- ¾ SPUI at Meridian replaced with Full SPUI
- Widen NB Puyallup River bridge to 5 lanes
- N. Levee Rd to Valley connection

Other Items Total $185M
- Interurban Trail
- RRP & Wetland Mitigation
- Toll System

Total Cost $923M
Scenario 4A: Moderate Connectivity at I-5 with Full Meridian Connectivity

Changes from Scenario 4
- SB I-5 auxiliary lane replaced with NB
- Full diamond I/C at Valley removed, No I/C
- SB 167 HOV lane removed

Other Items Total $185M
- Interurban Trail
- RRP & Wetland Mitigation
- Toll System
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Level</th>
<th>1. How many lanes are included on SR 167?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. What level of tolling is considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How are managed lanes considered and included?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Level</td>
<td>4. What degree of forward compatibility should be included in the design?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Degree of potential impact to I-5?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Where are connections most important?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. How is access to the Port of Tacoma best accommodated?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What degree of forward compatibility should be included in the design?
   • Construct initial narrower project footprint
   • Plan for full build out
   • Right of way acquisition for remainder of corridor
   • Cost estimates on options to be provided at next Steering Committee Meeting
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 167

4. What degree of forward compatibility should be included in the design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forward Compatibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What degree of forward compatibility should be included in the design?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forward Compatibility as it Relates to Right of Way</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buys only what is needed for Scenario 2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buys only what is needed for Scenario 2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buys only what is needed for Scenario 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buys Refined Alignment Footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$110M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$110M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$115M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 167

5. Degree of potential impact to I-5?

• Program target is to do no harm to I-5 operations
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 167

Northbound AM 2045: 2A

Northbound AM 2045: 2B

Northbound AM 2045: 4A
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 167

Southbound PM 2045: 2A

Southbound PM 2045: 2B

Southbound PM 2045: 4A

(Pot Rd On-Ramp Off-Ramp)

54th Avenue On-Ramp Off-Ramp

SR 167/SR 509 Spur On-Ramp Off-Ramp

(Pot Rd On-Ramp Off-Ramp)

54th Avenue On-Ramp Off-Ramp

SR 167/SR 509 Spur On-Ramp Off-Ramp

(Footnotes: LOS F in No Build
All Sections LOS F in No Build
LOS Improves from No Build
LOS Similar to No Build
LOS Worse than No Build)
6. Where are connections most important?
   • Highest priority connections are SR 161, I-5, SR 509 and 54th Avenue.
Key Questions for Consideration on SR 167

8. How is access to the Port of Tacoma best accommodated?
   • The Project team needs to understand the distribution of truck traffic into, and out of, the Port of Tacoma between Taylor Way, Alexander Avenue, Port of Tacoma Road, and I-705.
   • This issue will be pursued as we gather additional truck origin & destination data.
# SR 167 Performance Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Baseline Performance Metrics</th>
<th>Contextual Performance Metrics</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Economic Vitality</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Build</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2A:</td>
<td>Limited I-5 Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2B:</td>
<td>Full Connectivity at I-5 and Meridian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4A:</td>
<td>Moderate Connectivity at I-5 w/Full Meridian Connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Date: 9/11/16

Cost: $2,003 M

Source: WSDOT
Performance Evaluation Results – Key Takeaways

Key areas where scenarios differed in performance:

- Half-diamond would be near or at capacity at day of opening
- Diverging diamond operates better than half-diamond and has ability to handle future growth
- More throughput on SR 167/SR 509 is allowed with diverging diamond
- Direct connect ramps to I-5 operate slightly better than the diverging diamond
- Northbound auxiliary lane improves I-5 operations
- Scenario 2A did not perform as well as 2B and 4A – recommend moving these two scenarios forward for mesoscopic modeling.
Program Cost Estimates

Total Gateway Funding $1.87b

Total Connecting Washington Funding $1.57b
Gateway Funding

- **Connecting WA**
- **Local Funding**
- **Toll Revenue**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Local Funding</th>
<th>Toll Revenue</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015-2017</td>
<td>$7m</td>
<td>$58m</td>
<td>$65m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>$235m</td>
<td>$20m</td>
<td>$255m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-2021</td>
<td>$70m</td>
<td>$180m</td>
<td>$250m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021-2023</td>
<td>$60m</td>
<td>$180m</td>
<td>$240m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023-2025</td>
<td>$312m</td>
<td>$288m</td>
<td>$590m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025-2027</td>
<td>$299m</td>
<td>$288m</td>
<td>$587m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027-2029</td>
<td>$319m</td>
<td>$319m</td>
<td>$638m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029-2031</td>
<td>$20m</td>
<td>$180m</td>
<td>$199m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Gateway Construction Staging

SR 167
- Stage 1
  - 70th & I-5
- Stage 2
  - SR 509 Spur
- Stage 3
  - SR 167

SR 509
- Stage 1
  - ST FWLE agreement
- Stage 2
  - I-5 to 24th/28th
- Stage 3
  - 24th/28th to 188th
FASTLane Grants

• New Federal grant program focused on freight projects
• $4.5B authorized through 2020 (about $1B/year)
• $800M awarded in 2016 to 18 Recipients (212 applications received totaling almost $10B)
  • South Lander Street Grade Separation (Seattle) - $45M of $140M
  • Strander Boulevard Extension (Tukwila) - $5M of $38M

• Key Questions for Puget Sound Gateway Program
  • Who?
  • When?
  • How Much?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Size</th>
<th>Grant Amount</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Atlantic Gateway</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$165M</td>
<td>$905M</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>Arlington Memorial Bridge</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$95M</td>
<td>$166M</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>US 69/75 Bryan County</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$62M</td>
<td>$120.6M</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>I-10 Freight CoRE</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$60M</td>
<td>$193.5M</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Interstate 10</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$54M</td>
<td>$157.5M</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>SR 11 Segment 2 &amp; SB Connectors</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$49M</td>
<td>$172.2M</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>South Lander St</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$45M</td>
<td>$140M</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Port of Savannah</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$44M</td>
<td>$126.7M</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Conley Terminal Intermodal Imp.</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$42M</td>
<td>$102.9M</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>I-39/90 Corridor</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$32M</td>
<td>$1,195.3M</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NY</td>
<td>I-390/I-490/Rt. 31 Interchange</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>$32M</td>
<td>$162.9M</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Strander Blvd Ext &amp; Grade Separation</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>$5m</td>
<td>$38M</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total for 18 FASTLANE Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$759.2M</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,612.4M</strong></td>
<td><strong>21%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not show 6 smaller projects that received grants*
Program Schedule to Construction and Implementation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>Aug</th>
<th>Sept</th>
<th>Oct</th>
<th>Nov</th>
<th>Dec</th>
<th>Jan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **SR 509 Kick-off**
- **SR 167 Kick-off**
- **SR 509 Method Review**
- **SR 167 Method Review**
- **Preliminary scenarios & evaluation results**
- **Present refined scenarios**
- **Recommend scope**
- **Funding & phasing & scope endorsement**
- **Approve Const. & Imp. Plan**

**Public Engagement**

- **Steering Committee Meeting**
- **Executive Committee Meeting**
More information:

Craig J. Stone, PE
Puget Sound Gateway Program Administrator
(206) 464-1222
stonec@wsdot.wa.gov