

## SUMMARY NOTES

Pierce County  
Transportation Advisory Commission (TAC)  
Thursday, September 28, 2017  
9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

**Call to Order: 9:02 a.m.**

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

**Voting Members present:** Deryl McCarty, Paul Lubbesmeyer, Jeremiah LaFranca, Liz Kaster for Bob Myrick, Brian Devereux, Jason Kennedy, Scott Jones, Tom Pierson. There was a quorum.

**Absent:** Voting members: Don Swensen; Non-Voting: Hugh Taylor

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

**Guest:** Don Samdahl, Kurt Wilson, Jie Chen, Gary Hendricks, Neil Quisenberry

**Staff:** Rory Grindley, Jesse Hamashima, Jinelle Casten

**Approval of Agenda:** Deryl McCarty Approved

**Approval of Meeting Notes:** Liz Kaster, Rob Allen 2nd

### Traffic Impact Fee Program

- a. Review the listing of the completed major TIF roadway projects and the concept of including them within the updated TIF (To Complete Discussion from August Meeting):

Reviewed the August 24<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting topic, "Completed Major TIF Roadway Projects and Costs". This presentation showed the larger roadway projects funded in part by TIF dollars from 2006 to 2015. The total cost of these projects shown in tabular form added up to approximately \$161M. It was shown that the current TIF program raised \$27M in TIF fees for these completed projects. Assuming that the County should have collected 38% of total project costs in TIF fees, the TIF collection should have been about \$61M. The "balance due" or unrealized amount from the TIF Program is approximately \$33M.

One option noted is that this \$33M be added to the added to the other TIF costs associated with the newly developed TIF list projects. He indicated that the advantage of including the completed projects in the TIF Program is that the County could recoup funds for roadway projects that it constructed that did not realize the full TIF fee contributions. This charging for projects that are part of the TIF program that still have excess capacity would be within the legal parameters of the Growth Management Act.

There was animated discussion on this point. One TAC member felt that it was appropriate as the "taxpayers have already fronted the money" for the projects. A number of other members expressed some level of skepticism on this concept on including these project

costs for the revised TIF Program and wanted to see additional information on the same. There was no clear consensus on this issue at this time.

16 completed TIF Roadway improvement projects (2006 – 2015); 2 of which were Developer Cost sources – 198/199 Ave E and 112<sup>th</sup> St E/Portland Ave E; Total cost of \$161, 294,000 – this reflects the actual project costs. Average TIF revenue accounts for about 17% of expenditures on completed major roadway improvements. Discussion: Questions arose regarding the Costs of TSA's and how those were determined? Who authorized the County to spend \$17M on the Wollochet projects – Bond and some TIF? Taxpayers have fronted the costs? County road fund how it is made up – New construction vs. O&M, anticipated growth – revenue. Will revisit this topic.

- b. Present the initial results of cost sharing between public and TIF funds: Breakdown of the shares of public monies and the TIF responsibilities. Reviewed Improvement Cost by Project Type w/o completed TIF projects; Completed TIF Project Cost; Proposed Roadway Improvement Cost by Project Type: completed Major TIF; Freight Mobility, Plateau Corridor, Corridor & Connectors, Concurrency. Reviewed Intersection Improvement Cost by Project Type: Signalized, Add Signal & Left Turn(s), Add Signal, Add Left Turn(s).
- c. Provide the preliminary cost estimates of new trip costs:

*Preface: It is noted that the “new growth trip cost” calculation is important as it forms the basis of the actual “TIF Fee”. The codified Traffic Impact Fee schedule is based on the specific land use multiplied times the trip rate times the cost per trip. Thus, if the cost per trip is about \$682, and the trip rate is about 10 for a house, then the effective TIF fee is about \$6820.*

Using the \$312M of “TIF Responsible” project costs, and the modeled future travel demand of the individual Transportation Service Area (TSA's) one calculations the “cost per trip” for each TSA. The average Cost per New Trip is \$648. The range is \$46.77 to \$1058. This is still unadjusted trip rate. More work needs to be done to refine these numbers and adjust them to their respective trip generation rate and trip length characteristics. Rory cited the benefit of showing the project types with associated aggregate costs should the need arise to examine the need for adjusting the new trip costs by altering the list of project categories.

Slide 18 compared the current TIF rate with the calculated TIF rate with the “what if” Pierce County had constantly applied either a cost of living adjustment or a Construction Cost Index year after year after program inception.

Updated TSA boundaries based on updated TSA structure. Three TSA's TIF cost is below \$7K – 9, 11, & 12; TSA 3, 4 and 5b ranked as the top three TSAs with the highest growth cost. Slide 18 compared the current TIF rate with the calculated TIF rate with the “what if” Pierce County had constantly applied either a cost of living adjustment or a Construction Cost Index year after year after program inception. Discussion: CPI vs. CCI rate....which index to adopt. What other jurisdictions have TIFs?

- d. Discuss the options to consolidate the Transportation System Area boundaries  
Staff had suggested earlier on that this County may want to adjust the boundaries of our Transportation Service Areas. Among the possibilities discussed has been: 1. Creating one big TSA, 2. Generally reducing the number of TSA's through combining or possibly eliminating the participation in the areas.

Don Samdahl observed that for the past ten years the movement of other TIF programs has been to have fewer TSA's. This is done for purposes of simplifying the programs and administration of the same. To that end consolidating TSA's could make sense. Toby offered that a TAC recommendation on the TIF is needed. A recommendation is needed but it must be recognized that if the proposal is not viable for political consideration and cannot be advanced we would advance other options to proceed:

- a. Change the level of service/service standards recognizing that the improvements would not be done and that we would accept higher levels of congestion
- b. Raise more money outside of the TIF realm for roadway projects
- c. Declare a moratorium on developing
- d. Go back to using SEPA to determine development impacts and accommodate through this process

He did not advocate any of the above measures but raised these as the options.

Motion made by Liz Kaster & seconded by Jason Kennedy to consolidate TSA's in the following manner:

TSA 1 & 2

TSA 5a & 5B

TSA 3, 4(urban), 10 & 11

TSA 6, 7, 8, 12 & 4(rural)

TSA 9 will be separate

**Vote was unanimous to consolidate TSA's as listed above.**

Will recalculate the numbers for the next meeting.

#### **Next Meeting Topics:**

Will discuss the revised numbers for the TSAs; look at alternatives – project list; what will be proposed to the Council.

#### **Discuss November and December TAC Meeting Dates:**

Requested that Jinelle send out a survey calendar for members to vote on the best date; Choices of dates: All on Thursdays – November 2, 9, 16, or 28<sup>th</sup>; December 7, 14, 21, 28<sup>th</sup>....there may be staff conflicts for dates as well. Depending upon date in November, will there be a meeting in December?

#### **Public Comment:**

#### **Adjourn**

Attachments: September 28th Meeting Notes