

TRANSPORTATION FUTURES

Task Force Summary Notes

Meeting #4: Wednesday May 27, 2015, 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

PSRC 5th Floor Conference Room • 1011 Western Avenue • Seattle, WA

Members Present:

Dow Constantine, King County
Norm Dicks, Former U.S. Congressman (ph)
Hilary Franz, Futurewise
Slade Gorton, Former U.S. Senator
Jean Hernandez, Edmonds Community College (ph)

Troy McClelland, Economic Alliance Snohomish County (ph)
Clare Petrich, Port of Tacoma
Shefali Ranganathan, Transportation Choices
Mike Sotelo, Consolidar LLC
Rich Stolz, OneAmerica
Marilyn Strickland, City of Tacoma

Members Not Present:

Ed Murray, City of Seattle
Jeff Johnson, Washington State Labor Council
Leonard Forsman, The Suquamish Tribe

Kimberly Harris, Puget Sound Energy (phone)
Arthur Rubinfeld, Starbucks
Matt Yerbic, Aviation Technical Services

Technical Presenters:

Chris Mefford, Community Attributes

Charlie Howard, PSRC

The meeting was recorded. Click [here](#) to listen to a sound recording of the meeting.

- 1. Welcome and Meeting Overview.** Facilitator Brian Scott, BDS Planning & Urban Design, called the meeting to order at 4:13 p.m. and welcomed the Task Force. Topics and purpose for the meeting were reviewed.
- 2. Follow up: Current Funding Proposal.** Charlie Howard, Director of Planning at PSRC presented. Charlie distributed a one page summary of estimated revenues proposed under the House transportation funding package, as compared to identified needs in Transportation 2040, and updated the Task Force on the current transportation funding package in the Legislature. This information will help the Task Force to shape later recommendations. Task Force comments were recorded on a wall graphic (Appendix A: Figure 1) and included:
 - Need clarity on revenue timing
 - Define “existing authority”
- 3. Equity Dimensions of Transportation Funding.** Chris Mefford, President & CEO, Community Attributes, gave a presentation about aspects of equity in transportation planning and funding, and went deeper into the equity definition and examples. After discussion, the Task Force agreed to the following issues in equity in transportation. Recorded on a wall graphic (Appendix A: Figure 1) and included:
 - Washington’s maintenance plan nearly eliminates generational cost issues, with the exception of potential debt left for future generations. There is a duty for this generation to make investments in transportation, just as past generations provided the infrastructure that has supported the region’s success
 - Socio-economic aspects of equity are, in theory, the highest priority. However, concerns with geographic equity are a reality that will have to be addressed
 - Equity is more than income and ethnicity, equity = ability to access transportation
 - Differences in the regional economy need to be considered as the Task Force thinks about how to incorporate equity into any proposal – i.e. Seattle vs. Tacoma unemployment rates imply different access to jobs, ability to pay, etc.

- Location of jobs, housing, childcare, health, and social and ethnic community choices affect transportation system use and costs
- Solving the issue of equity will be politically charged

4. Applying Funding Principles.

Brian Scott presented Draft Funding Principles to the Task Force. After a discussion about the draft principles (recorded on a wall graphic, Appendix A: Figure 1), the Task Force agreed to the proposal by Brian for the technical consultant team to align the discussion with the draft principals and re-visit the principles at the June meeting.

5. Round Table. Task Force members discussed topics and information for future meetings that will help them make a recommendation by the end of this process. Recorded on a wall graphic (Appendix A: Figure 1) and included:

- Need a recommendation on how to pay for the transportation system and how we address regressive funding
- An approach to get to what changes are needed to make a realistic recommendation

6. Public Comment. Members of the public had an opportunity to submit comments to the Task Force. The following individuals made comment:

- Sonny Putter (written testimony attached)
- Will Knedlik
- Don Padelford (written testimony attached)

7. Adjourn. There were no further announcements. The meeting concluded at 5:47 p.m.

Next Meeting. The next Task Force meeting is **June 24, 2015, 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. at PSRC.** The topics will be: Funding Source Evaluation

Questions: Please contact Ben Bakkenta, PSRC (206) 971-3286, BBakkenta@psrc.org
--

TRANSPORTATION FUTURES

ATTACHMENT A: Graphic Recording Transcription of Meeting #4

TRANSPORTATION FUTURES TASK FORCE	Meeting #4: EQUITY	May 27, 2015
TRANSPORTATION PACKAGE <i>comments</i>	Revenue timing – 2030 or 2040? Existing authority	
EQUITY DIMENSIONS <i>comments</i>		
<p>Generational: Term of bond vs. life of facility (generational should be “legacy”) Maintenance decreases future cost Equity = ability to access Telecommuting? <i>Population is outpacing</i> <i>What does modeling show?</i> <i>Density is a factor</i></p>	<p>How are other regions dealing w/ equity? Equity is a part of economics Difference in employment options: Tacoma vs. Seattle Housing costs + type of houses: multi-generational, family Every mile between home & work contributes – growing Access to childcare User fee for traveling further Health impact – living near freeway</p>	<p>Solution complexity: work-childcare-home-cultural-health Geographic context Dynamic political discussion – voters Emergency fund / reserve for personal interpretation Track where need is v. funding Current system is inherently inequitable</p>
PRINCIPLES <i>comments</i>		
<p>There isn't enough revenue to be equitable and political Baseline tax info compared to past? Change to sales tax on construction? ADD a socially equitable principle Are we paying more for transportation? cost/mile</p>	<p>What will be most cost-effective? affects campaign Perception of rest of state? Map of taxes in the state How are other parts of the state planning?</p>	<p>Infrastructure lines are not fixed – benefit is shared Regional strategy that supports economy we want – social equity, land use – transit agencies' role Transportation is very local (how to connect regionally) Regional geography – natural resources Land use in transportation planning is a factor - sprawl</p>
ROUND TABLE <i>comments</i>		
<p>Recommendation for how to pay: Cost-effective, neighbor-friendly, define who we are trying to help</p>	<p>Platform phases: Gold: Ripping the band aide off: expose the problems & change the (funding) system over time Silver: Dress the wound: trade-offs, interim Bronze: Heal the challenges</p>	

TRANSPORTATION FUTURES

TRANSPORTATION FUTURES TASK FORCE: EQUITY MAY 27, 2015

TRANSPORTATION PACKAGE
 REVENUE TIMING
 2030 v. 2040?
 EXISTING AUTHORITY

TRACK WHERE NEED IS VS. FUNDING

CURRENT SYSTEM IS INHERENTLY INEQUITABLE

EQUITY DIMENSIONS

- GENERATIONAL: TERM OF BOND V. LIFE OF FACILITY
- MAINTENANCE DECREASES FUTURE COST
- EQUITY = ABILITY TO ACCESS
- TELECOMMUTING? ↑ POPULATION IS WHAT DOES MODELING SHOW? OUTRACING DENSITY IS A FACTOR
- HOW ARE OTHER REGIONS DEALING W/ EQUITY?
- EQUITY IS PART OF ECONOMICS
- DIFF IN EMPLOYMENT OPTIONS: TACOMA v. SEATTLE
- HOUSING COSTS + TYPE OF HOUSES (MULTI-GENERATIONAL, FAMILY)
- EVERY MILE BETWEEN HOME & WORK CONTRIBUTES → GROWING
- ACCESS TO CHILDCARE
- USER FEE FOR TRAVELING FURTHER
- HEALTH IMPACT (LIVING NEAR FREEWAY)
- SOLUTION COMPLEXITY (WORK-CHILDCARE-HOME-CARETAKER-HENRICH)
- GEOGRAPHICAL CONTENT
- DYNAMIC POLITICAL DECISION (VOTERS)
- EMERGENCY FUND/ RESERVE FOR PERSONAL INTERPRETATION

PRINCIPLES → MORE DIGESTION

- THERE ISN'T ENOUGH REVENUE TO BE EQUITABLE & POLITICAL
- BASILINE TAX INFO COMPARED TO PAST?
- CHANGE TO SALES TAX ON CONSTRUCTION?
- + SOCIALLY EQUITABLE PRINCIPLE
- ARE WE PAYING MORE FOR TRANSPORTATION? COST/MILE
- WHAT WILL BE MOST EFFECTIVE? AFFECTS COMMUTAL
- PERCEPTION OF REST OF STATE?
- MAP OF TAXES IN THE STATE
- HOW ARE OTHER PARTS OF STATE PLANNING?

INFRASTRUCTURE LINES ARE NOT FIXED BENEFIT IS SHARED

REGIONAL STRATEGY THAT SUPPORTS ECONOMY WE WANT SOCIAL EQUITY, LAND USE → TRANSIT AGENCIES

TRANSPORTATION IS VERY LOCAL (HOW TO CONNECT REGIONALLY)

REGIONAL GEOGRAPHY NATURAL RESOURCES

LAND USE IN TRANS. PLANNING IS A FACTOR SPRAWL

Figure 1: Wall graphic recorded during the meeting

RECOMMENDATION FOR HOW TO PAY
 COST-EFFECTIVE
 NEIGHBOR-FRIENDLY
 DEARIE WHO ARE WE TRYING TO HELP?

PLATFORM PHASES ← REGIONALISM

GOLD: KIPPING THE BAND-AID OFF: CHANGE THE SYSTEM OVER TIME FROM #36 → #1

SILVER: DRESS THE WOUND: TRADE OFFS, INTERIM

BRONZE: HEAL THE CHALLENGES

My name is Sonny Putter and I am a former Mayor and Councilmember of the City of Newcastle.

In previous comments, I asked that you consider the 2006 recommendations of the Rice- Stanton Commission to migrate transportation funding in this region to user fees (tolls, fares, parking charges) - to manage and reduce demand for transportation with user fees and thus the amount of construction that must be funded. I also suggested that you accept their recommendation to create a new Puget Sound Regional Transportation Commission which would be directly accountable to the people. This Commission would have taxing, tolling and borrowing authority and responsibility for planning, prioritizing and funding all modes of regional transportation for the four-county area.

Today, I ask you to consider the increased use of tolling and road usage charges for funding roads and bridges and the use of increased fares and a per employee tax on employers for funding transit.

Using more system-wide tolling and transitioning to a road usage charge would enable us to temper the projected decline in gas taxes for 18th Amendment purposes, while preserving these funding sources for roads. We must always keep in mind that most transit in the region will still travel on roads. Getting a road usage charge accepted by the public state-wide will be challenging enough; diverting road usage charges to transit may make the task impossible.

Increasing transit fares to cover at least 50% to 65% of operating costs, as is the case in major cities in Canada, would more directly tie responsibility for transit funding to the users of transit. The average King County metro rider has an annual household income of more than \$70,000 a year. This suggests that middle and upper income riders have the capacity to pay more of their share of transit operating costs than they do now. The costs of low income and transit-dependent users could be directly subsidized, as is now happening with the ORCA LIFT reduced fare program just initiated by King County Metro and also used by Kitsap Transit and Sound Transit riders.

As most transit in the region is used to get people to work during peak commute hours, a per employee charge on employers, as is used in the Portland, Oregon metropolitan area, more directly ties transit service to the generators of the transit need. Using these funding sources for transit in the future could reduce the regressive burden that current transit sales taxes impose on the least able to pay and could preserve the property tax for education and other local needs.

Thank you.

Sonny Putter, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

A Surface Transportation Future for the Metropolitan Puget Sound

There are four components to this future.* The first largely solves regional transit mobility. The second makes steps to enhance freight mobility. The third enhances personal mobility. And the fourth looks to a future technological revolution in transportation. These components are meant to be applied sequentially, with the first implemented, then the second, etc.

One. The first component largely solves regional transit mobility. It consists of repurposing the region's freeway HOV lanes into Transit Express lanes as a roadbed for Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). By Transit Express (TE) lanes we mean HOT (high occupancy / toll) lanes where "the bar" in terms of who-travels-free is raised to "vanpools or better". So officially constituted vanpools and transit buses travel free. The balance of the capacity of the TE lane is "auctioned off" with the price changing every few minutes based upon demand. The objective is to keep these lanes in free-flow, even at the height of rush hours. Thus the TE lanes, in conjunction with bus-only lanes on major arterials, provide a never-congested right of way for North American Style (freeway-based) BRT. In addition the TE lanes provide uncongested mobility for police and emergency vehicles, as well as gotta-get-to-the-emergency-room (or your daughter's violin recital) mobility for all travelers.

Two. The second component makes steps to enhance freight mobility. This consists of adding truck-only lanes to the inside (median side) of some regional freeway segments. So there would be a truck lane, then a TE lane as above, then the General Purpose (GP) lanes, and the shoulder. At this time it is envisioned that these lanes would be added to highways SR167 and I-405, connecting to I-5 at each end. These lanes would be limited to combination trucks and tolled so as to keep them in free-flow.

Three. The third component enhances personal mobility. This component envisions implementing general mobility pricing (aka congestion pricing) on all roads in the region, with some or all of the net revenues distributed to the electorate, per capita, on a periodic basis such as twice a year. Road segments that are in heavy demand, such as the TE lanes above, would have a higher price on them. Segments that are in lower demand, would have a lower price (which could be zero). The price would accrue via an on-board computer in the vehicle. At the end of the period, the net revenue from all accruals would be distributed, per capita. Thus if one uses "less than their share" of rush hours roads space, he or she would receive a credit. If one uses "more than their share", he or she would be charged for the excess usage. And if one uses "their share", he she would neither be charged nor credited. This system could be set up to be revenue neutral as above. Or a part of the net revenue could be used for road maintenance and improvement. A test of this system (set up to be revenue neutral) was run by the Puget

Sound Council of Governments, and it was found to be both technologically and sociologically feasible: ie people mostly liked it.

This third component would be implemented subsequent to, or in conjunction with, state-of-the-art traffic signal timing such as Bellevue has recently put in place. By itself traffic signal timing meaningfully enhances traffic flow. Also, it is assumed that freeway lane capacity will be selectively enhanced via additional lanes on, eg, I-405.

Four. The fourth component looks to a future technological revolution in transportation, namely self-driving vehicles. This future seems to be coming at us faster than anyone anticipated a few years ago. One aspect of a fleet of self-driving vehicles is that the capacity of the roads system is substantially enhanced, perhaps by a factor of 3X. (At this point, obviously, such a system has only been simulated.) City areas which suffer negligible rush hours congestion (as least compared to the metro Puget Sound region), such as Kansas City, have about 3 times our freeway capacity. Thus via technological development, we may attain the relatively benign congestion condition of such cities. This is particularly true if component Three above (mobility pricing) is put in place prior to deployment of the self-driving vehicle fleet. Of course such a self-driving fleet is also helpful in enhancing the objectives of components One (transit mobility) and Two (freight mobility) above. So, for instance, freight on trucks will obviously move more smoothly if all traffic moves more smoothly.

The above four components constitute a transportation future for the metropolitan Puget Sound. If all were implemented, we believe that they would largely solve all the major surface transportation challenges which currently face the region.

** Note: The above should be seen as 'in addition' to whatever passenger rail systems (light, heavy, commuter, high-speed) the region might implement. It is also 'in addition' to pedestrian and bicycle enhancements. Finally, the above is a surface transportation future, and thus does not deal with movement of people and goods via air or ship.*

Donald F Padelford
Seattle