

# Summary Notes

Pierce County  
Transportation Advisory Commission (TAC)  
Thursday, June 22, 2017  
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

**Call to Order:** 9:00 a.m. – Chair Deryl McCarty called the Transportation Advisory Commission (TAC) meeting to order.

**Roll Call:** 9:03 a.m.

**Voting Members present:** Deryl McCarty, Don Swensen, Scott Jones, Brian Devereaux, Liz Kaster for Bob Myrick, Max Henkle for Jason Kennedy, and Chuck Sundsmo for Jeremiah LaFranca. There was a quorum.

**Absent:** Voting members: Paul Lubbesmeyer, Tom Pierson; Non-Voting member: Hugh Taylor

**Non-Voting Members present:** Dennis Hanberg, Rob Allen, Toby Rickman

**Guest:** Don Samdahl of Fehr & Peers

**Approval of Revised Agenda:** Deryl McCarty Approved

**Approval of Meeting Notes:** Don Swensen made a motion to approve; Liz Kaster seconded.

**Report:** June 6<sup>th</sup> Transportation Benefit District Executive Committee Discussion and Request

- Councilmembers of the TBD Executive Committee requested the Chair – Deryl McCarty and Vice Chair – Scott Jones attend the TBD Board of Governor’s meeting on Tuesday, July 18<sup>th</sup> 9:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m. Both were willing to attend and noted date.

## Developing the Revised Traffic Impact Fee Program

- a. Review additional information on the selected roadway corridor projects discussed in the last May meeting.
- All projects have been carried forward from the last review; except by consensus of the group, 176<sup>th</sup> St E extension. Group asked that we not show that project as an assumption within the TIF program due to the cost and the function is not that TIF eligible.
  - 94<sup>th</sup> Ave E (C1): Extensive discussion: Questioned the effectiveness of the TAC proposed configuration (Scenario 2) to widen to 3-5 lanes when the no build (Scenario 3) seemed to result in a similar V/S ratio and not have a \$25M price tag associated with it. The relationship of the correlating extension was included in the scenarios and was explained how they affect each other if one was built without the other.
  - 94<sup>th</sup> Ave E EXT (C2): Correlating project to 94<sup>th</sup> Ave E (C1): If this extension is not built then you get the no build configurations on both (C1 & C2). Both of these extensions are parallel to the Meridian corridor; helping alleviate the traffic off Meridian which is over capacity. The State does not build state highways to accommodate local land use; they build state highways to accommodate travel across the state. Basically, the State does not invest in building local jurisdictions with roadways.

Proposed that a 1.5 version be considered or researched to get the V/S under 1.00 along 94<sup>th</sup> Ave E.

Non-motorized projects considered as well in the packages. Presentations for active transportation would be appreciated.

Send calendar invite to Deryl and Scott for TBD BOG

- 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave E & Shaw Rd E (C-3): How confident are we with the \$39M? Cost will more likely be more – City of Puyallup will be more costly. Long term legacy project for Pierce County.

V/S is projected for 2040

- 160<sup>th</sup> St E (C4): Intersects with 94<sup>th</sup>; No topography analysis done; this is today's conditions. Look at turn pockets; 3 lanes across whole section. Consider what is the best or most effective at least cost. Re-evaluate in 5 or 10 years.

Break: Question arose about if quorum was still active because a voting member had to leave early. Yes, there is still a quorum when 5 voting members are present. "**Quorum requirement:** There is a quorum requirement. Five voting members of the Advisory Commission shall constitute a quorum at all meetings". (See Operating Guidelines).

- Military Rd E (C-5): Cost is underestimated due to topography analysis has not been performed. More accurate cost is probably \$30M. V/S would be 1.09 if added a center turn lane at \$6M. This was the compromise to building 176<sup>th</sup>. Possible Federal funding, but minimal interest from City of Orting.
- Spanaway Loop Rd S (UL-1): Overlay is currently underway, next couple of months the restripe will be done.

Porous pavement – concerns with using this for roadways because of icing and becoming very slick. Being monitored for use. Level of maintenance – needs to be swept everyday to remove fines.

Southern portion of Canyon Rd coming off the project list? Possible delay of project or built to 208<sup>th</sup>. Perhaps come off the current project list. How should it be treated for modeling purposes and remain within the TIF program? Recommendation to remove the southern portion of Canyon Rd; (M8) from the project list - TIF. Motion by Liz Kaster to remove M8; southern portion of Canyon Rd and Scott Jones seconded motion. Unanimous vote to remove. It is removed from TIF project list.

- b. Discuss what land uses are currently exempt from the Pierce County TIF Program (if time allows).

Land use exempted from current TIF program. Pierce County in comparison to other counties is pretty generous in their exemptions. Virtually all cities and counties do some kind of exemption for low income housing as well as daycares and other public facilities. Pierce County is the only county offering exemptions for Industrial/Office in Employment Center. Pierce County replenishes from the road fund for the land use exemptions. Most jurisdictions are supposed to replenish from other funds. Example of

Industrial/Office Industrial/Office Employment Center would be like Boeing. Straight warehousing does not qualify for land use exemption.

Talk at next meeting about credits. Purpose of TIF program was to supplant SEPA. Keep context in mind the purpose of the TIF.

In future meetings show results – propose offer to show some results growth cost per trip; breakdown of TIF cost per housing unit; project type; list of completed TIF projects.

Question about members being here for next month’s meeting. Brian Devereaux and Liz Kaster will not be present, but July meeting is moving forward. There is possibility of setting up a conference call.

Question arose regarding alternates voting in place of primary members. According to the TAC Operating Guidelines; “Alternates are allowed to speak and vote on behalf of their Commission member only if the Commission member they represent is absent from the meeting.”

- c. Review how the TIF roadway project costs are distributed to development within the Transportation Service Areas.
- d. Next Meetings- Topics and Schedule

**Public Comment: None**

**Adjourned: 11:03 a.m.**

Next Transportation Advisory Commission Meeting: Thursday, July 27<sup>th</sup>

Attachments: June Meeting Notes, Meeting Directions