

Regional Transit Authority  
December 10, 1993

Members Present:

Bruce Laing, Chair; King County Councilmember  
Bill Brubaker, Vice Chair; Snohomish County Councilmember  
Bill Stoner, Vice Chair; Pierce County Councilmember

King County:

Martha Choe, Seattle Councilmember  
Don Davidson, Bellevue Councilmember  
Mary Gates, Federal Way Councilmember  
Greg Nickels, King County Councilmember  
Norm Rice, Seattle Mayor  
Cynthia Sullivan, King County Councilmember

Pierce County:

Ken Madsen, Pierce County Councilmember  
Paul Miller, Tacoma Councilmember

Snohomish County:

Dave Earling, Edmonds Councilmember  
Pete Kinch, Everett Mayor

Washington State Department of Transportation:  
Sid Morrison, Secretary

The meeting was called to order at 12:19 p.m. by Chairman Laing in the Bellevue Conference Center, 505 - 106th Avenue N. E., Bellevue, Washington.

Recognize Official Clerk for this Meeting

It was moved by Mr. Morrison, seconded by Ms. Choe and carried by the unanimous vote of all Regional Transit Authority (RTA) Board members present that Ms. Debi Milham be appointed the official Clerk for today's meeting.

Report of the Chair

Mr. Laing said due to the length of today's meeting, I will forego a report from the Chair.

Approval of Minutes

It was moved by Ms. Choe and seconded by Mr. Miller that the minutes of the November 12, 1993 RTA Board meeting be approved as presented.

Mr. Earling asked that his attendance be reflected in the minutes of the November 12, 1993 RTA meeting.

The motion to approve the November 12, 1993 RTA Board meeting minutes, as corrected to list Mr. Earling in attendance, was carried by the unanimous vote of all RTA Board members present.

#### Public Comment

Mr. Laing said Board members have received a letter from Mr. Mike Ferro of the Cascade Bicycle Club regarding the use of least cost transportation planning. Copies of this letter are available, he noted. In addition, he continued, the RTA has received a FAX from Mr. Donald F. Padelford. Mr. Padelford's letter urges the RTA Board to "consider least cost planning as a primary evaluation tool for the RTA", he stated.

Mr. Richard Tait, Bellevue, made the following remarks:

I am speaking today as a private resident and taxpayer. I wanted to make comments about the excellent presentation on the system plan provided one week ago by Mr. David Kalberer.

I would like to draw attention to the three alternatives Mr. Kalberer showed that could be accomplished with .9%, .7% and .5% sales tax equivalent local tax option. I would like the RTA to consider the possibility of a .6% local tax option and the reason is this: Mr. Kalberer showed that given his assumption of 30% federal support, a .5% tax option would accomplish a minimum new rail element from approximately Roosevelt to Boeing Field. I hope Mr. Kalberer is wrong when he said that if that is all we could build, we would not build anything. This is a short segment but it does address the two major congestion problems addressed by Mr. Aubrey Davis: the Ship Canal and the bus capacity problem in the Seattle central business district (CBD). If we were able to accomplish this with a .5% local sales tax option with 30% federal funding, I think it is reasonable to think that a .6% local sales tax would accomplish that work without any federal funding at all.

Furthermore, we know from Mr. Kalberer's previous work that given 30% federal funding, .6% local sales tax would allow us to extend the system north to Mountlake Terrace and south to SeaTac, which the Federal Transportation Administration (FTA) regards as a very important system. The assumption of 30% federal funding derives from the fact that the total system upon which that assumption was made does include substantial outlying elements for which federal support is not likely at all. If the only system we are offering is from Mountlake Terrace to SeaTac, it is reasonable to think federal support might be at a higher level, particularly from the Seattle CBD to Mountlake Terrace, which could be financed at 80%. So the overall system

contribution might be 50%. Adding a .6% local tax option would permit us to accomplish the system Mr. Kalberer showed us that would be possible with a .7% sales tax. This would include an extension to the Eastside, if you decide you want to do so.

I would suggest that as you go to the public in November, you should seek a local sales tax option of .6%, which is two-thirds of that discussed previously. If that is approved, maybe at their next winter session the Legislature might consider some approach as that proposed by the Governor a year ago where the state would finance the capital cost of building the railway. If we are going to the public in November 1994, everything hangs on getting a positive vote. I would like to suggest that when we do that we use an approach other than the one which seems inherent in the JRPC plan. The message in that plan, to those people not served by the rail segment from Mountlake Terrace to SeaTac, was that eventually they will have the opportunity to utilize the rail line. I submit that the only thing I have heard from the public when they are told there will be much more bus service is "like what?" That question was never adequately answered. You must show the public that in addition to the rail, a regional express bus service, described in as much detail as was the rail system that you developed, will be provided.

In addition, if you decide to allocate 25% or some other amount to local authorities to develop local bus systems compatible with the regional plan, it is not inappropriate to ask them to let you have their plans for using that money so you can include that information in the transmission to the general public. This way the public will know in detail what it is you are offering. Those who will not be served by the rail system initially are being told their concerns are being addressed by a well defined bus system, both express and local. It is not unreasonable to tell the local authorities that if they cannot decide how they would spend the money, there is some question as to whether or not they should receive the funds.

Mr. Russell Cook, Bellevue, made the following statements:

My concerns and remarks are appropriately addressed to the Staffing Task Force, and Mr. Brubaker specifically.

I have concerns regarding the current process being used to identify the candidates for the Executive Director and Clerk positions.

First, I would like to know the competitive process used in selecting the source currently being used to identify applicants for those two positions.

Secondly, I am concerned about the media and other sources being used to access qualified applicants for those two positions. To what extent do you intend to deviate from the current media sources being used and to make use of those media sources used more commonly by the African-American community? I have not seen these two positions advertised in the Medium, the Facts, or other community newspapers.

Third, how will future staff needs be met? How will the staff for the RTA Board be selected if, in fact, the current firm, T. M. Campbell, has the perpetual contract to provide that staffing service?

Mr. Brubaker said a request for proposals (RFP) process was used to select the T. M. Campbell firm; I would defer questions about this firm to their representative. Regarding future staff needs, he continued, the Campbell firm was hired to assist in the hiring of the Clerk and Executive Director only. Future staff selection will be assisted by the Staffing Task Force, he said. Once an Executive Director has been hired, he concluded, there will be some leeway to allow him/her to select staff.

Mr. Cook asked if, regarding future staff needs, there will be a bit more public involvement in that process. Mr. Brubaker said we fully intend to use a public process, but we have shortened that process in the interest of time for these two positions. There is no intention that it not be a full process, he concluded.

Ms. Sullivan said it was a very critical issue for the Staffing Task Force that the Campbell Company come back with a representative of the broad community in the group of final applicants to be considered. They are advertising in the Black Public Administrator's Monthly newsletter to attract people of color who are qualified and available for this position, she stated. This was a critical issue for the Staffing Task Force, she said, and it was something the Campbell firm was very interested in as well, and they will tap sources nationwide to be sure people highly qualified and of color are notified of this opening.

Mr. Miller said that as a current member of the Staffing Task Force, it is our intention to limit the number of actual RTA employees. The majority of staffing needs, currently and in the future, will be met with contracts with transit agencies and existing employees. It is prudent to watch the selection within Metro, Pierce Transit and Community Transit because the majority of staffing needs will be met through contracts with those agencies, he stated.

#### Legislative Program

Mr. Madsen made the following statements:

The Legislative Task Force met and has developed a set of recommendations. Included in the material distributed today (copy on file) is a memo dated December 8,

1993, which provides the Legislative Task Force's recommendations for securing federal and state legislative representation.

Our goal is to acquire legislative representation at the federal and state levels. I will discuss the proposal for federal representation first. I would like to indicate that the Task Force has provided recommendations for both long and short term representation.

With regard to long term legislative representation, there was much discussion and a mutual feeling that the Executive Director needs to be part of the process for acquiring legislative support in Washington, D.C. He or she should be comfortable with this representation. For the long term, the Task Force is suggesting that it develop a scope of work and then initiate a Request for Proposals or similar process where qualified firms can submit proposals. The Task Force would review these proposals and recommend a single firm to the Board. We would work towards a goal of March 1, 1994 for recommending a firm.

For short term federal representation only, there is also before you today (copy on file) a letter for Mr. Laing's signature addressed to Mr. Sid Morrison suggesting that for the interim period between now and March 1, 1994, the RTA use the services of the Department of Transportation contract with their lobbyist in Washington, D. C. We do not know how much work will be required between now and March 1. The Secretary will be suggesting some issues today which would mean we would have to move quickly.

Regarding state representation for the long term, the question is do we need a contract lobbyist to represent the RTA in the long term and/or do we need a governmental relations full time equivalent (FTE) on staff? I believe it was the position of the Task Force that this is something we need to discuss with the Executive Director and determine his/her comfort level.

Given the immediacy of the 1994 legislative session, the Task force recommends that short term legislative representation be secured by contract. The Task force recommends that it be authorized to conduct a very short phased solicitation of resumes and interview process, followed by a recommendation to the Rules Committee and then a contract. I want to stress that we expect to receive many resumes. I would invite any member of the RTA Board who wishes to be a part of the evaluation process to contact me or Mr. Gunter. After reviewing resumes, interviews will be undertaken; all RTA members are invited to participate in the process. The Legislative Task Force is asking that it be authorized to enter into a contract with the top ranked firm, with the concurrence of the Rules Committee. We hope to have someone on board by the first of the year.

We have some legislative issues that will come to the Board for review and consent. In some areas there may be a need to protect legislation we already have. These are strategy issues.

It was moved by Mr. Nickels and seconded by Mr. Madsen that the RTA Board endorse the strategy outlined in the Legislative Task Force's December 8, 1993 memorandum for securing long and short term legislative representation for the RTA Board and authorize the Rules Committee to enter into a contract for assistance in the 1994 state legislative session.

Ms. Sullivan said I will be voting against the motion. The Board will be bound by the legislative package and the individual firm chosen to represent the Board, she said. It is critical that all Board members participate in making this final decision, she stated. I have great respect for the Rules Committee, she continued, but I do not understand why the recommendation would not come back to the full Board for final approval. For that reason, she concluded, I will vote against the motion.

Mr. Laing said Ms. Sullivan could move to amend the motion so that final approval by the full RTA Board would be required to enter into a contract for 1994 state legislative representation.

It was moved by Ms. Sullivan and seconded by Mr. Davidson that Mr. Nickels' motion be amended to indicate the full RTA Board (rather than the Rules Committee) would approve a contract for assistance in the 1994 state legislative session.

Mr. Davidson said I have seconded Ms. Sullivan's motion mainly because I would like to hear staff's response to it. I presume there is a timing issue involved, he noted.

Mr. Madsen said there is a timing issue. We have to move quickly to get someone on board who is competent and who is not already filled up with clients, he stated.

Ms. Sullivan asked what does "quickly" mean? Mr. Madsen said we hope to have someone on board by around the first of the year, which is 20 days from now.

Ms. Sullivan said the board will meet once or twice more before the first of the year. Is there a Board meeting on December 17?, she asked. Mr. Laing said no; there will be a RTA Board meeting on January 7, 1994 to interview candidates for the Executive Director position. This would not preclude the Board from scheduling an additional meeting if it so desires, he said. The Board might schedule a meeting to discuss the appointment of a legislative representative, he said, and then take action in a regular meeting.

Mr. Brubaker said bypassing the Rules Committee and going directly to the full RTA Board would not add a step to the process. Maybe that is critical to the timing issue, he said, but the Board has been flexible to get together and address the tasks at hand.

Ms. Sullivan said there has not been a situation where the Board has shrunk from making decisions in a timely fashion; I do not believe that would be the case in this situation either. I think it is important that all RTA Board members understand where we are going legislatively, she stressed, and that we have an opportunity to cast a vote on this subject.

Mr. Miller made the following statements:

I think we are in agreement about the importance of legislative representation. More from a philosophical standpoint, I think we need a discussion of what portions of our work can be done at the level of the Rules Committee versus bringing topics back to this Board. There is an urgency to everything before us. I think we will do ourselves a disservice without distinguishing those issues that need to come back to the Board as a whole and those we can delegate to the Rules Committee to approve on our behalf. This would help speed the process along.

Mr. Kinch asked if, with passage of the proposed amendment, an additional RTA Board meeting would be necessary in December. Mr. Laing said I would ask the Chair of the Legislative Task Force to determine whether the January 7 meeting is adequate or if another meeting in December would be necessary.

Mr. Madsen said the answer to that question goes to the comments made by Mr. Brubaker. The Legislative Task Force is suggesting a process, he said; if the Board chooses to bring this before the full Board, it is my hope we would make that decision before the end of December or the first of January. Delaying the decision by one week, to January 7, is not a long delay, he said, but it does not allow much time to bring someone up to speed on the learning curve. I have faith in elected representatives to make decisions, he said, but I struggle with the timing issue.

Ms. Sullivan said in fact there are only four business days between the first of the year and January 7, due to the weekend and holidays. There is a lot of concern among the public that there is a railroad running here, she stated. The more the full Board can be involved in making those decision so there is broad involvement, the better off we will be in discussing this with the public, she stated. A Rules Committee is not the most open of processes, she said, and I think there is generally some concern about that. I would argue we should bring this issue back to the full Board on January 7, she concluded.

Mr. Davidson said I will support the proposed amendment. I do not think the Board is yet of one mind, he said, and I agree we should determine which issues the Rules Committee

may deal with without full Board action. Representation before the state legislature is very important, he said, and I would support bringing this back to the full RTA Board.

Ms. Gates said I will support the amendment but I would be more supportive if the full Board could reconvene before the end of December. This would allow more time to bring someone up to speed, she said. How many people would be able to commit to a meeting before January 7?, she asked. Mr. Laing asked for a show of hands.

Mr. Nickels said I would like some clarification. The recommendation is not to have the Legislative Task Force and Rules Committee adopt the legislative program, he explained; the legislative program would come back for discussion by the full Board. The selection of a legislative representative has to do with "who will carry the water, to the extent we want water carried" in Olympia, he stated. I am comfortable that the Rules Committee is balanced enough and capable enough to look at the recommendations from the Legislative Task Force without the kind of debate we are having on this amendment, he concluded.

Mr. Kinch said in voting for this amendment, it is assumed a majority of Board members would come back and meet before the end of the year in order to keep this schedule on track. Mr. Laing said the showing of hands indicated people were willing to meet during the week prior to January 1, 1994.

Mr. Laing said the motion before the Board is to amend Mr. Nickels' motion which would have delegated authority for selection of a state legislative representative to the Rules Committee and place that authority with the full RTA Board.

The motion to amend Mr. Nickels' motion failed by a vote of eight to five. (Those in favor of the motion were Ms. Sullivan, Mr. Earling, Mr. Brubaker, Ms. Gates and Mr. Davidson; those opposed were Mr. Stoner, Mr. Madsen, Mr. Nickels, Mr. Laing, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Miller, Mr. Kinch and Ms. Choe.)

The main motion, which would endorse the strategy outlined by the Legislative Task Force for securing long and short term legislative representation for the RTA Board and authorize the Rules Committee to take the steps necessary to carry out the recommended strategy, was carried by a vote of twelve in favor and one opposed. (Those in favor of the motion were Mr. Earling, Mr. Brubaker, Ms. Gates, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Stoner, Mr. Madsen, Mr. Nickels, Mr. Laing, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Miller, Mr. Kinch and Ms. Choe; Ms. Sullivan was opposed.)

Ms. Choe said I am not sure this is the appropriate time to raise this issue, but there have been requests to record RTA members' votes by name. I would offer this as a procedure the Board could adopt, she said, which would help clarify and make public the position of each



Board member. Mr. Laing asked that the Clerk indicate each member's position on this vote, and that this should be a standard procedure.

Ms. Sullivan said members' votes on both amendments and main motions should be reflected in the minutes.

### Commuter Rail

#### Planning Update

Mr. Bob White said a handout entitled "Commuter Rail Status Report" has been distributed today (copy on file). He gave the following report:

My status report comes in three parts: 1) background information; 2) some discussion of the schedule we are currently working on for the four elements of the project; and 3) identification of some issues on which the Board will need to give staff direction in the relatively near future.

Page one of the handout provides an excerpt from state law defining under what conditions commuter rail can be operated by the RTA. This is, in fact, the feasibility test we have talked about in terms of commuter rail. The origin of this test is, perhaps, important to understand. It was originally proposed by Senator Thorsness to be sure adequate attention was given to emerging technologies such as entrained buses, trolleys or personal rapid transit systems. In all cases, the evaluation has always boiled down to a comparison of the comparable bus alternatives. We have spent a lot of time on that with the Expert Review Panel (ERP).

This test is unique. No other element of the transit project authorized by state law has to meet any particular numeric value. This test has been applied only to commuter rail. It is not a numeric test in other areas. It exists only in state law.

The next couple of sections of background material lay out what is actually stated about commuter rail in the JRPC system plan, subject to your confirmation or revision when you adopt the final plan. This sets an aggressive schedule for implementation of commuter rail; it states that commuter rail service between Tacoma, Seattle, Everett and Renton will be implemented within two years of locally committed funding. To those of you who see track in place, it does not always appear that providing commuter rail within two years of local funding is aggressive, but acquiring vehicles and building stations often takes 18 months to two years.

In Paragraph C there are specific actions that the plan suggests that staff and the Board take. I would like to emphasize at this point that we can put a check mark on each of those.

Paragraph D describes the relationship of commuter rail to at least one other project, the Pacific Northwest Rail Corridor, which the WSDOT is pursuing. The two projects are generally compatible. There are some technical issues as to location and infrastructure, but the projects are compatible in the \$40 million of capital investment between Everett and Tacoma that would be necessary for both projects. It is a question of who goes first in some of those investments.

Paragraph E lists the proposed public scoping meetings. In order to meet the two year schedule, we are in project planning between Tacoma and Seattle. We have scheduled scoping meetings for the environmental analysis related to the station siting. This meeting schedule is on page two of the handout. Staff will be contacting RTA Board members and asking their interest in participating in some of these meetings.

Page three provides the schedule we are operating under for each of the major elements of the program. There are four major elements:

- 1) Project level planning/environmental assessment of stations in Tacoma versus Tacoma/Seattle, starting in January. We expect to complete the technical work by the end of 1994 and expect a final statement of non-significance in early 1995.
- 2) Procurement. There are two things we need to make commuter rail work: track and an operator. We would be restarting this process early in 1994. We started the process last year.
- 3) Feasibility studies. We have two feasibility studies currently underway and authorized by both Tacoma and Seattle. The feasibility study or reasonableness test is required by the state legislature. We will be completing that work so it can be reviewed by the ERP. We are doing the work according to their rules, with completion anticipated by the end of February.
- 4) As part of that, we will be evaluating other scenarios for commuter rail projects in terms of their impact on growth management activities and intermodal terminals in cities in Snohomish County. We are doing similar work on the Lakewood/Tacoma segment. You may have noticed that the earlier system plan describes that segment somewhat differently in terms of asking us to evaluate rapid rail and commuter rail extensions in that area. We are starting that evaluation by doing the reasonableness tests on commuter rail.

The last thing I would say about the schedule and implementation is that in some respects, commuter rail is in a unique circumstance. The Board is evaluating the place of commuter rail in the overall system plan, but it has asked staff to take an aggressive approach in terms of implementation. We are trying to do both, even though it is not always easy to make them compatible. There are many people carrying out your work program, although not all of them work full time on the project. I would like to introduce some of them. These are people who are doing real work; they are not solely engaged in doing policy analysis or watching each other do other work. They are:

John Hubbard (Pierce Transit) for the Tacoma, Sumner, Puyallup areas; Val Batey for Auburn/Kent; Barbara Gilliland for Tukwila/Renton; Johnathan Jackson for Seattle King Street; Paul Kaftanski (Everett Transit) and Charles Prestrud (Community Transit) for the Snohomish area; David Beal, Teri Fina and Bob Harvey working on Travel Forecasting; Mike Wold, Environmental; Julie Rodwell, Procurement; and Ron Kuchenruether and Dick Seelye, Engineering.

There are highly skilled people supporting this project. I think it is a very good team. They are not all working full time on the project.

Page four of the handout outlines certain policy issues the Board will be asked to deal with in the next few months. The first has to do with the need to deal with commuter rail and where it fits into the system plan. We must make a determination of the feasibility of commuter rail.

The second issue has to do with implementation strategy. These may not necessarily be areas the whole board needs to be involved with in the early stages. Staff needs assistance from elected officials. There are difficult policy decisions. How do we package the procurement? We have an option to do the procurement with a single railroad and operator as the service provider, separately from track rights and a second operator. The second issue is also difficult and not subject to numeric analysis. It has to do with balancing public benefits and public investments between public agencies and between public agencies and private railroads. The ports would all benefit from the infrastructure. Maybe it doesn't make much difference because it comes from the same pocket, but we need to consider this. If WSDOT makes investments between Tacoma and Seattle, their cost would not be considered in the feasibility study. This points out the arbitrariness of the reasonableness test. In February and March I would estimate we need a minimum of four to six hours of the Board's time in order to get your judgments in terms of how to proceed with that procurement. Given that these are legal issues, much of that discussion may require executive sessions. You may want to think about that.

The last issue is funding. We must obtain funding for project level planning for the Everett-Seattle and Tacoma-Lakewood segments. I believe we have account funds for that purpose; we will be asked to reapply for those funds.

The last item is something that is the next discussion item on today's agenda. It is a method to be sure federal funds currently allocated and available to us remain that way.

Mr. Laing said the Board raised a question at a previous meeting as to whether or not it should appoint a Commuter Rail Oversight Committee. The JRPC had such a committee that followed the commuter rail work done by staff and was a policy sounding board, he said. Such a committee would bring issues back to the full body for decisions, he said; the Board considered this possibility and said the full Board was going to work the commuter rail issue. I am suggesting we do a reality check as we move along, he stated; I heard Mr. White suggest the Board would be asked to spend six hours in February or March dealing with the commuter rail issue.

Mr. White said the four to six hour figure is a guesstimate. This assumes the staff and consultants will do a better than usual job of making decisions easy for the Board to work through, he said. This is a low estimate, he noted.

Mr. Laing said the board has until February or March to instruct the staff as to whom it should approach with this information. Mr. White said that on the first of February, staff would be prepared to start coming before either the full Board or a subcommittee to deal with procurement issues.

Mr. Laing said I just wanted to highlight this situation so that as the board looks at its work program in January, it might ask whether or not an additional committee is necessary.

#### Proposal

Mr. Morrison made the following presentation:

I have asked that copies of a proposed resolution be distributed today (copy on file). I think Mr. White has done an excellent job of "building the platform and the depot." Maybe we can step forward more aggressively and get the train on track. I want to assure you my interest in this issue is the result of the Congressional experience I bring to this Board. I have never seen the momentum building faster for our losing money that has been authorized and appropriated but not obligated. That is the driving force behind the proposed resolution. You can change this resolution but I would like to see the RTA step forward and not lose money we have had for the last several years. This appropriation was originally \$25 million for the Seattle/Tacoma

commuter run. The actual appropriation came through at \$20.2 million; only \$1.8 million has been obligated for some of the work mentioned by Mr. White. To receive these funds through the FTA, a 20% match is required. Before you proceed, you must have a plan and a funding mechanism in place; unfortunately, we have neither, except the work done by the JRPC. My proposal is to reach out and ask a team of people that already exists to explore the feasibility of utilizing these funds for rail infrastructure.

When I originally announced this proposal last Friday, I think some of you and staff knew I had a list of projects in mind. I have backed away from that position and I am not proposing any specific projects. There is no reference in the resolution to the CTC. I am finding that it would be better to have a team work out those details because doing otherwise might prejudice either Burlington Northern or the Union Pacific Railroad. It is good to keep a competitive format between those two railroads.

This is to be an RTA project. I don't see it in conflict with any of the things Mr. White has presented to us. It has value also to intercity passenger service and freight service. I think we can sell this as an investment that is worthwhile because it is in the interest of all parties. Mr. White mentioned balance in implementation strategy. Some of you were members of the JRPC. Ms. Ruth Fisher opposed this initially but now recognizes we should probably take this step. Her fears were we would end up separating commuter rail from the total rail project. This admittedly is taking a step forward with money we think we can get and investing it in commuter rail and would be away from the phase to be presented to the voters. This is only \$18.5 million out of a potential \$200 million investment with north and south runs. This figures does not include operational costs.

I would like to run through the proposed resolution. There are five "whereas" paragraphs that were initially thought of as "threats." They spell out the pressures on the RTA and the fact that the RTA must "use it or lose it." The second "whereas" addresses the issue of funds that are appropriated but not obligated. The third paragraph talks about the "Reinventing Government" report by Vice President Gore. The next paragraph is where I think it is appropriate to explore the feasibility of committing the remaining \$18.5 million for rail infrastructure between Tacoma and Seattle.

In the "resolved" language the resolution indicates we are asking an existing team to sit down and seek support of any proposed alternative approach for utilization of the federal funds. The resolution asks the Legislative Task Force to identify sources of funds to provide the 20% required local match. There are players who would be willing to participate; the state is a \$40.2 million participant along some part of the

total corridor. The Legislative Task Force is also directed to refine the list of infrastructure improvements that could be undertaken to maximize expenditures throughout the region; they would be asked to report back in 30 days on the specific issues identified and to include a recommendation on the feasibility of implementing a proposal. I fear that without this action, we may lose these funds.

Mr. Brubaker asked if the 30 day period is critical. Mr. Morrison said we believe so because there are four congressional level packages moving that could carry the modest changes needed. We could stretch it out, he said, but we might lose one of those options. I think staff is comfortable with the 30 day requirement, he said, as they proposed this language.

Ms. Choe said inherent in this proposal is an understanding that commuter rail would continue to be under the full jurisdiction of the RTA. There has been some rumor and discussion, she said, and the subject of the RTA keeping full jurisdiction over the commuter rail project should be placed on the table for discussion. Mr. Morrison said this could be seen as a power grab by the DOT. I have heard those rumors myself, he stated; if the RTA asked the DOT to take on the commuter rail project, it might consider doing so. We want to see this done, he continued, but we do not want to do it ourselves. We would undertake the project if it came down to that, he noted. This resolution says there is funding on the table and let's not risk losing it, he concluded.

Ms. Choe said it makes sense to balance the opportunity of available funding and, at the same time, assure that commuter rail will be part of the program. Whatever improvements identified would advance what we are trying to do on the regional plan, she stated. In as much as we can identify those projects that would benefit the program, she stated, that is what we should do. We have not made final decisions, she said. There seems to be a consensus on parts of the plan, she continued, but I think we have an obligation to pursue those funds in a way that makes sense.

Mr. Laing said I have a question for staff. The question is whether, considering where the RTA is in the sequence of events in meeting the requirements of the enabling legislation, the RTA is in the position to expend funds on construction. We are in a planning mode to complete the system plan and the financing plan, he said; we must then obtain approval by the voters to receive authorization to proceed with construction. This resolution seems to approve a construction project, he said. I am not trying to create a problem, he said, but how do we explain to the public why we are in a construction mode without first going to the voters? If the perception is that the RTA would be acting as a funding pipeline for another entity who is in a construction mode, he stated, I could understand. Mr. Gunter said state law gives the RTA independent authority to operate or contract commuter rail where it is a reasonable alternative. That is separate from the planning process you are involved with generally, he explained. It is separate legislation which gives you authority to contract, he

said. This means the RTA could expend funds, assuming it had funds, he said, to go ahead and plan and operate a commuter rail system. Commuter rail was part of the JRPC plan, he said, which is your current plan, so you have a planning process and a separate enabling legislation to advance this. When the RTA approves the entire system plan, he said, I assume this would be folded into it.

Mr. Morrison suggested staff be directed to obtain the full answer to the question about the 30 day period. Frankly, he said, if we cannot get into some of these more active parts of a regional transit system, we might as well kiss the \$25 million and the \$300 million good bye.

Mr. Madsen said I would underscore Mr. Morrison's comments. We are way behind schedule, he said, and if we do not make some moves to capture the funding that has been authorized for us, I believe we will lose it. I commend Mr. Morrison for his efforts, he stated. There has been discussion of what will we do with these funds, he said; Mr. Morrison has a proposal and I think it is appropriate to move as quickly as we can or we will have no prospects for funding in a year.

Mr. Nickels commented as follows:

I would also like to commend Mr. Morrison. At the workshop last week, we utilized small group sessions. In my group, I was trying to raise questions to see if people were thinking along the same lines. I was told by staff that the RTA members were not there to answer questions, but to raise questions. I think we need to answer some questions. We need to find ways to move ahead where there is agreement and be working hard to come to agreement where it does not currently exist. This portion of the planning has been accepted well by the public and elected officials.

I believe Mr. Morrison has a personal agenda. I was with him when he testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee last spring while he was still the Secretary-designate. He was chewed out because the funds that had been appropriated had not yet been committed or spent. I do not think he wants to go back again and face this same situation. I do not think any of us wants to be in that position again or in that position with the public.

Mr. Miller made the following statements:

I strongly support the proposed motion. We need to get moving forward where we can agree.

There are instances where membership on the Finance Committee and the Legislative Task Force overlaps. I want to be sure we define the roles of our committees in supporting and cooperating among each other. Mr. Madsen indicated last week that

any efforts on the RTA's behalf in the Legislature should be reported to the Legislative Task Force so there is coordination. As the Finance Committee identifies needs for funds, we should have one clearinghouse so we know where we are committing ourselves. I am sure that is intended.

Mr. Morrison said in this case, funds are in hand but if we do not clear some legislative hurdles, those funds will disappear.

Mr. Miller said I was referring to the 20% matching funds.

It was moved by Mr. Kinch that the resolution presented by Mr. Morrison be approved as presented.

Ms. Sullivan said this is something I wholeheartedly support and endorse. At this point, she said, I wonder if RTA members will personally be out paving road beds. We have no Public Works Department, she said; the RTA may be the conduit of funds to contract with the WSDOT or some other agency to actually do the work or leave the option for the WSDOT to take this back over to perform the construction necessary to operate the system. She said Mr. Morrison eluded to being amenable to that possibility in the future. Mr. Morrison said that would be a discussion item for this group after some time has gone by. Generally, he said, WSDOT is standing by as the RTA's humble servant.

The motion to approve the resolution presented by Mr. Morrison was seconded by Mr. Brubaker.

Mr. Laing asked is this action appropriately taken by passage of a motion or a resolution? Mr. Gunter said this can be done with either a motion or a resolution as it does contain items of a general nature.

Mr. Brubaker said I assume we are assigning numbers to resolutions adopted by the RTA. It seems this would be appropriate, he noted. Ms. Dougherty said the resolution being discussed will be numbered either eight or nine.

Mr. Brubaker said I support this resolution. In terms of federal rules and regulations for our relationship with the FTA or other governmental agencies notwithstanding, he said, they look at how aggressively we are moving ahead. I think this action is appropriate, and sends a message for future endeavors.

Ms. Gates said the suburban cities of King County have always been supportive of commuter rail as long as this is not the only element of the system. I would support this action, she said, because it serves our cities well. It is an integral component of the system plan, she stated.



The motion was carried by a vote of 12 to 0. (Those voting in favor were Mr. Davidson, Mr. Stoner, Mr. Gates, Mr. Brubaker, Mr. Nickels, Mr. Laing, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Miller, Mr. Earling, Mr. Kinch, Ms. Choe and Ms. Sullivan.)

Mr. Morrison thanked the board for its consideration of this matter.

#### Least Cost Planning

Mr. Laing introduced Mr. Richard Watson, Northwest Power Planning Council, and previous Director of the Washington State Energy Office. He said Mr. Watson is here to address the RTA on the proposition of least cost transportation planning. This issue is one that has been brought up from a variety of sources in recent comments to the board, he said, including a letter referred to earlier in today's meeting. He thanked Mr. Watson for being here today.

Mr. Watson gave the following presentation, utilizing slides and a handout (copy on file):

Thank you for the opportunity to be here today. I would like to explain what this presentation is not intended to do: This is not an attempt by the Northwest Power Planning Council to become involved in transportation planning. We have our hands full.

The origin of the paper distributed today and the presentation to be given is the result of our being approached last summer by the Bullitt Foundation, asking us to look at our experience in planning the region's electrical systems and to examine whether or not there were any parallels between what we experienced and the problems facing transportation. This was a labor of love; many nights and weekends were utilized in this work. These are the personal opinions of myself and Mr. Edward Sheets, and not those of the Northwest Power Planning Council.

#### Objectives:

- 1) The first objective is to describe the key elements of electricity least cost planning done by the Northwest Power Planning Council and the public utilities.
- 2) The second objective is to examine parallels with/application to transportation planning.
- 3) The third objective is not to draw conclusions about the appropriate transportation mix for the Puget Sound region. This will be the result of the least cost planning process.

What is least cost planning? It is a planning framework that facilitates evaluation of alternative strategies for meeting a goal. It integrates consideration of different kinds

of resources: supply side and demand side. The experience we have had in the area of electricity has had a significant effect on the debate that has gone on. It has shifted the debate from choice of resources on to the quality of information an analysis and important policy issues. Because people understand how decisions will be made, a lot of the controversy is removed.

Elements of least cost planning:

- . Define the goal;
- . Deal explicitly with uncertainty;
- . Evaluate all measures--supply and demand;
- . Consider total costs;
- . Identify least cost strategy;
- . Create action plan;
- . Involve the public at all stages; and
- . Use good policy judgment.

What is the goal? The goal is to meet service needs at the lowest total cost to the society. There is no intrinsic demand for electricity, but there is a demand for the service it can provide. What services do we need and what is the least cost way to apply them? What is the comparable idea for transportation that is broad enough to encompass the full spectrum of alternatives? Are we meeting the access needs at the lowest total cost? Are we carrying out transfers of information? Is there an intrinsic need for transportation? There is an intrinsic need for the transfer of information. Transportation will be the major part of all of this, but defining the goal is intended to leave the spectrum open for all kinds of options.

Measurement: Measuring access is difficult. It is probably important to say we have an appropriate degree of humiliation. We think it is harder to perform this planning for transportation than for electricity. It comes down to the appropriate measures. For electricity we measure the total kilowatt hours; in transportation this measure could be trips and trip miles. We have not had to deal with the "peak" situation for electricity, but in transportation that is how the problem is viewed. We are starting to deal with it in electricity planning. Location of facilities is typically dealt with at a regional level; utilities worry about that. Corridor planning is central to the transportation issue. The most important difference is we rely on physics and economics; transportation relies more on human behavior, which is a more difficult proposition.

Dealing with Uncertainty: The basic premise here, as Mr. Madsen will recall, is the Washington Public Power Supply System (WPPSS) experience. That premise is that the future is uncertain and almost any single forecast made for demand is likely to be wrong and expensive. The lesson that has come out through the least cost planning

framework is that the best plans should be flexible enough to perform well over a wide range of possible futures. Demand has been a primary uncertainty. There is also uncertainty about resource performance, fuel costs and environmental regulation. The idea is to bind them and deal with them in an explicit way. In transportation, the same list of uncertainties is probably applicable. It is probably harder to forecast demand, but there are large opportunity costs associated with guessing wrong. I think it is important to deal with the uncertainties.

**Evaluate All Measures:** We try to be as comprehensive as possible in looking at measures that can help build a strategy to meet your goal. Supply and demand side measures are evaluated. We compare the performance and cost on an equivalent basis and create "supply curves" to guide selection of strategies. An important point here is you have to deal with the achievable potential and not theoretical potential. If everyone in Bellevue were to install compact fluorescent lights in their homes, demand would go down; this is a theoretical potential. Is it achievable? No. The same concept applies to transportation.

**Chart:** There are a number of different kinds of measures the Council considers in putting together a strategy. Included are everything from improvements in efficiency of transmission systems to more efficient water heaters to nuclear power plants, solar panels and wind farms. The chart on page five lays out how much energy savings we can achieve from these measures and the cost of doing so.

**Comparison of Alternatives:** In electrical supply we are talking about building power plants. The electrical supply can be met with coal-fired power plants, gas turbines, wind farms and building-scale photovoltaics. The transportation supply is met with freeways, rail systems, buses and bikeways. What we do to maximize efficiencies of the through part on that system is the system management activities you do in transportation. These include traffic light synchronization, ramp metering and smart highways.

**Demand Management:** We are interested in moving demand off the periods when generation capacity is limited or when transmission and distribution system capacity is limited. The time of day rates send a signal that is appropriate. Direct control of appliances is another possibility. The parallel for transportation would be congestion pricing, parking charges/elimination of parking subsidies and flex time.

**Efficiency:** In terms of electricity, efficiency is increasing the useful output per unit of energy (conservation). This is done in two categories: technology and policy. It goes beyond the technology but also the policies that will be necessary in order to have those technologies adopted. In transportation, having more persons per vehicle trip is the definition of efficiency. You have to have technology, such as HOV lanes,

but you also have to have the policy measures that make utilization of those technologies efficient.

**Demand Substitution:** Some electrical utilities do not like to think about it, but perhaps we should be substituting the use of natural gas for electricity. Perhaps in transportation, substitution of access to telecommunications proximity can be utilized. There is a policy determination. There is software and hardware, and you have to consider both; one won't work without the other.

**Total Costs:** In electricity we deal with the direct cost to build a plant. There are also costs to install conservation measures and indirect costs to the environment. We try to take all of these into account. In our circumstance and in transportation, we do not look at each measure on a stand alone basis. We have to look at a system as a whole. Transportation has the same set of category of costs. The difficulty transportation faces and we do not face is the question of personal values. What is the value of time and the value of having access to your own vehicle?

This chart (page eight) is an attempt to look at categories of costs. Time cost is one of the major costs you will deal with and we do not. There is also a cost that transportation cost planners are used to dealing with: personal values have to be dealt with in some way.

**Development of Resource Portfolio:** We look at the existing system and bring in forecasts of demand. There is a range of possible demands. We bring in information about cost and the available supply of alternatives, other key planning uncertainties and analyzing the portfolio of resources we bring together to see which provide what we need at the lowest cost. The results is a resource portfolio that will meet our needs in the future with the least total cost. Equally important is the action plan needed to bring that into being.

**Portfolio of Resources:** It is not one thing that does the job; it is a mix of resources that meets the total need at the lowest cost and has the flexibility to do so in a wide range of futures. In electricity we found diversity has some real value to deal with uncertainty. We also came up with ideas we call "options" as a way of dealing with risk.

**Options Concept:** We chose a profile of expenditures in building a small hydroelectric facility. There is six year lead time from inception to completion. In the old days we were talking about coal and nuclear power plants with 10 to 12 years lead time. When you have to commit large dollars a long time in advance of the actual need, there is a lot of risk. We observed that preconstruction costs account for half of the lead time and one-tenth the cost of a construction project. If you can

"option" the resources through this preconstruction activity, then when you are closer to actual need you can make a decision whether to hold the project for later development, continue or fold entirely because something better has come along.

**Action Plan:** The plan is to identify barriers to the strategies you have defined. What is it? Who has to do what for the plan to be successful? I think the Northwest Power Planning Council finds itself in a situation very similar to many of you; the direct authority to make some of the things happen is not there. There is a problem of securing cooperation of relevant policy makers. We have had to deal with county councils, city councils and state legislatures to implement building standards, etc. Transportation faces the same kinds of challenges.

**Public Involvement:** We utilize public involvement early, often and continuously. We think it builds understanding and support for the kinds of measures we are proposing. Advisory committees with input on the data information analysis that goes into the plan are utilized. Issue papers are circulated widely to gather input. A draft plan goes out for review before we arrive at the final plan. What we have found is that public participation is facilitated by a least cost planning foundation.

**Other Considerations:** The planning process is a continuous process because change is continuous. Is a process of adaptive management. There is no substitute for good policy judgment; this is not a mechanical process that has no heart to it. It is probably hard to make low income weatherization make sense from a least cost planning standpoint unless you bring in values when we have to deal with low income people. There are probably similarities in dealing with provision of transit services to low income people.

**Lessons Learned:** The value of flexibility in adapting to an uncertain future, such as smaller scale, shorter lead times, "optioned" development, is important. Conservation makes up about half of the resources for the Northwest; this did not exist before the least cost planning approach was brought into being. The value of an agreed upon planning framework has been important in developing the constituency for action.

**Conclusion:** Electricity and transportation planning face similar problems: high capital costs, capital constraints; uncertainty; and conflicting interests. Transportation planning is more difficult, but it is not impossible. Least cost planning is not a panacea either for electricity or transportation, but it has lead to action on a broader range of alternatives. It can point to some significant benefits to the economy and the environment.

(Mr. Rice arrived at this time.)

Mr. Laing said Mr. Paul Matsuoka of staff has a short presentation related to the level of transportation planning activities within our region where least cost planning might be applied.

Mr. Matsuoka made the following statements:

I would like to thank Mr. Watson for taking the time to come here from Portland to explain the least cost planning foundation used successfully in energy planning.

Least cost planning has been successful in the energy field. They should be congratulated for their work in this area. Staff believes least cost planning sounds like a good idea. Who can be against achieving specific objectives with the least cost? I want to convey some major points we think you should think about in how this applies to transportation.

- 1) Staff would like to state its support for demand side measures.
- 2) We would like to state our concern that we do not think least cost planning can be rigorously done, as it was in the area of energy planning, in the time frame before the ballot measure.
- 3) Even if the region agreed least cost planning should be undertaken in a major way, there is some question whether the RTA is the appropriate institution to take on the work.
- 4) There are lessons that have been learned in energy that we can benefit from.
- 5) We would like to explore how we might pursue this further in subsequent RTA meetings.

First, I would like to address the planning done thus far. Proponents say we focus too much on the supply side; I think they are probably right. We have focused on the supply side because transit agencies have little or no authority over the demand side, such as land use management, parking policies, etc. Our methods include forecasting demand, evaluating alternatives to meet demand, and implementing the preferred alternative. We focus on supply options but we are supportive of the demand side in a policy sense. Typically our forecasts do not boost ridership, assuming we will be successful in some of the TDM. Last week Mr. Aubrey Davis talked about the process where the FTA only allows us to take into account policies that are "on the books." This region has done a lot of planning, but because these policies are not yet "on the books", their impact cannot be included in the forecasts.

Because the forecasts do not reflect the TDM increases in ridership, they give the misperception that we do not care about TDM. The JRPC cared a lot and the existing plan devotes a chapter to the subject. A key point here is that some elements of transportation act similarly to energy conservation because some things reduce the

entire demand for trips, like telecommunicating, but most TDM results in more demand for investments like the Regional Transit Project. That is why we have supported TDM measures.

We have discussed this with least cost planners and came to the following conclusions. The energy application was complicated and took over a decade; they continue to make refinements. I do not think the energy methods are directly transferrable to transportation because of the human behavior issues mentioned. I think the transportation application will be much harder; it will require a great deal of staff time and it will be data intensive.

This leads staff to the conclusion there it would not be possible to develop realistic models prior to the ballot measure. In addition, if the region were to agree that least cost planning should be done, is the RTA the right institution to undertake such planning? The Northwest Power Council did least cost planning and the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) implemented the results of the work. In past meetings, the Board had a discussion of its role within a larger transportation arena. Should the RTA, or some other institution, be responsible for least cost planning? Is the RTA an analogy to the Power Council or more of a BPA?

If least cost planning cannot be emulated within a short period of time, what policies ideas might be gleaned from it? One of the key lessons learned by the energy industry was the importance of demand side resources and conservation. I think the TDM can benefit from that level of recognition because it will help solve transportation problems and fill up the seats we provide in our project. This goes back to linking software and hardware. The RTA could go back and look at the strength of TDM in the System Plan.

The second conclusion is the need for flexibility to adapt to uncertain futures. In energy, this has meant reliance on smaller, more incrementally developed, investments. The RTA might decide to link plan and rail implementation so that we link implementation of the project with some land use supportive actions.

How should the RTA follow up? Staff would return to the Board in January or February to address some further information regarding the "what" and the "who" of least cost planning. In response to the "what" question, staff would come back with all the transportation measures that might be considered. What is in the plan? What programs should be supported more in the plan? What are the barriers to implementation?

"Who?" Who is doing much of the transportation and TDM planning and who is responsible for implementing these measures? What role does the RTA see itself playing among those who need to take action to implement demand management?

In looking at your work program early next year, does the plan need strengthening on the demand side? Do you think phasing of the plan and rail elements might be tied more explicitly to TDM actions? I hope you will get into discussion of issues you want to address in the next few months. Is least cost planning something you wish to pursue?

Mr. Laing said the presentations and observations of staff are intended to be fodder for the Board's discussion.

Mr. Davidson asked is least cost planning a philosophy or something you broke in and did? I presume you named it after you did it by designing something that seemed to work, he said. Mr. Watson responded:

We named it two different things: least cost planning and integrated resources planning. It is not a specific set of models. It is an overall framework for dealing with the input and output from models, as well as the policy judgments you have to make. When the Northwest Power Planning Council began its work in 1981, it had from Congress a two year period in which to develop the region's first plan. If not, the whole concept of a regional planning body appointed by the Governor would be out the door. We completed a plan in two years; it was clearly not at the level of sophistication and analytical precision that we might bring today, but the basic framework was one you would recognize. It lead us to basically the same general place.

Ms. Choe said I would like to extend my appreciation to Mr. Watson for attending today's meeting. There is a lot of food for thought and further discussion that may go beyond staff's initial observations, she noted. One of the things I found missing in your analogy is the expectation that certain kinds of transportation planning can be used to leverage economic development, she said. Can you address how something like economic development or land use would fit into your model?, she asked. How might this be analyzed in terms of least cost planning analysis?, she asked.

Mr. Watson asked is Ms. Choe speaking of the secondary benefits of economic development associated with least cost planning? Ms. Choe said yes.

Mr. Watson said I do not see why this couldn't be brought into the least cost planning framework. Our approach starts from a need for energy services, he said; we then try to find the least cost way of reaching the goal. In the modeling sense, he said, we do think



about the secondary economic benefits that might be associated a proposal, he said. Economic development and activity interests are clearly there, he said; they don't fall out of the model per se, but they are part of the judgment.

Ms. Choe said the term "least cost" can be misleading; as Mr. Watson mentioned, the least cost alternative may not be the most preferred because of personal values. Mr. Watson said it will always be necessary to make policy judgments on things that don't fall neatly into a cost/benefit framework. You can, he said, with some risk, assign dollar values to some things, such as time. Very rarely do we put to ourselves as decisionmakers those kinds of trade-offs, he said. An alternative may have a certain cost, he said, but it may also impede a person's access to their single occupancy vehicle. How much is that trade-off worth to you?, he asked.

Mr. Morrison said the State Senator from this district has said people want to return to nature, but they do not want to return to nature on foot. How much least cost planning was built into the JRPC process?, he asked. Mr. Matsuoka said there is an entire chapter in the plan devoted to support of demand side resources. The issues are to support the idea of looking at the possibility of congestion pricing, support of parking policies, support of land-use planning in the region, he said. Those are things people recognize would only strengthen ridership forecasts, he stated. There was a very crude estimate of how much additional ridership might be achieved, he continued, but as Mr. Davis pointed out last Friday, we were unable to use those enhanced ridership figures with the ERP or the FTA because they are not policies on the books. There is a policy sense of supporting the TDM, he concluded, but we do not have the ridership to back it up.

Mr. Morrison asked if brown-outs were occurring from 6:00 to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 to 7:00 p.m., would you build Grand Coulee Dam? Mr. Watson said not necessarily. Mr. Morrison is providing this as the only option, he said; are there other options and what are their relative costs? Let's look at broader options, he said, and choose a solution that gets us there at the least possible cost. It may be Grand Coulee Dam, he said, or it could be something different.

Ms. Sullivan said the King County Council was very insistent on including least cost planning as part of its resolution in joining the RTA. I would like to thank Mr. Watson for attending today's meeting, she said, and I want to follow-up on Mr. Matsuoka's comment regarding the timeline. We have a lot of analysis that has gone on to date in developing information for the JRPC, etc, she stated. I would like your opinion whether least cost planning, if used as a framework for the analysis of that data, must slow down the process dramatically or could we integrate it fairly swiftly?, she asked. Mr. Watson said I cannot say precisely how much time this would add to the process. I can only make a guess, he said; a lot of the bits and pieces of information are there. It is a question of organizing the information in this kind of framework, he said. Whether or not it can be done in this

framework is something I don't know, he added. What is perfection?, he asked. Our first plan was a lot cruder than our subsequent plans, he stated. Applying the framework with the kinds of information we had at that time was valuable to us, he said, and we had time constraints as well. I cannot judge the staff's job, he said; they are more familiar with transportation planning than am I.

Ms. Sullivan asked is the critical part of the least cost planning the collection of data? Or is it the time it takes to conduct the analysis? Should we look at phasing this?, she asked. Should we look at a demonstration project? Could we decide today to undertake least cost planning?, she asked. Mr. Watson asked do you mean a demonstration project of least cost planning? Ms. Sullivan said yes.

Mr. Watson said I am not qualified to answer this question. My "gut" tells me we could use information we have and put it in a least cost planning framework that may lead to some insights for the Board. Will it be perfection?, he asked; the answer is no. Will it give you some better insights?, he asked; the answer is maybe.

Mr. Rice said I have two concerns about Mr. Watson's model. When you take least cost planning from electricity to transportation, he said, you are assuming the measures you took are things we should be measuring. I am sure the debate over what elements make up least cost planning will be very difficult for us, he said. The example I am focusing on is the sense of conservation and its relationship from electricity to transit. If you ask me, he continued, I could say it is dealing with rubber tires and not rail and concentrating resources in certain ways. What is conservation as you define it in transportation?, he asked. Mr. Watson said it is the most efficient use of the system which means more people miles per vehicle mile. With electricity, he said, we are talking about more BTUs of heat or lumens of light per unit of electricity. That part of the comparison is the one I am most comfortable with, he stated, and I think there is a clear analogy between electricity and transportation.

Mr. Rice asked do you think it covers all modes? One of the difficulties is the multi-modal operation, he said; this would not be a system made up of rail only. Mr. Watson said I cannot tell you I have this all thought out. There are some difficult conceptual things, he said; this is not an either/or proposition. It is reaching an appropriate mix for the appropriate parts of the region that will make sense, he noted.

Mr. Davidson said along the same lines I was thinking about the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) who has some of the broad authority. They could do the least cost planning because they have this ability. We may think in those terms also, he said, but maybe the PSRC would think in the terms of the tradeoffs.

Mr. Laing made the following statements:

I think Mr. Davidson is right. The PSRC has distributed their proposed work program for preparing a metropolitan transportation plan. It seems it is the ideal regional place to talk about least cost planning, in that it does not apply to the level of planning for the particular implementing measures we do. I think it is reasonable to ask staff to put on the agenda a briefing or a presentation on the Regional Council's transportation planning work program related to least cost planning. With that would be a proposed aggressive application of least cost planning to our own effort, allowing us to see the relationship to each other. It seems you can take the concept of least cost planning and apply it to any segment of the types of systems we are talking about. You could take it as a way of determining phasing of the elements in the system plan. It seems that is an appropriate application of it. We have talked about the need to discuss phasing options. It seems least cost planning is one approach. Staff was asking for direction. I am suggesting one way to do that would be to tell them we want to see the least cost planning in the context of the regional planning effort underway and an aggressive analysis of least cost planning applied to our work. From that we could have the basis of our own decision on its application.

Mr. Madsen made the following comments:

I do not disagree with Mr. Laing. I don't know if least cost planning applies to our job. I am familiar with the work done by Mr. Watson. I suggest it is a strategic framework within which you evaluate things. As it applies to electricity it may not apply to transportation, but it is a framework within which we can look at things. I would request that if we are going to take this approach, we look at how we set up that strategic framework and how we drive this board to the policy decision we have to make today and a week from now and a month from now. Mr. Watson has laid out a framework within which we can do this. If we are going to do this, we should look at how to strategically lay this out. Least cost planning may be a way to aid us, but we are not comfortable that it is the answer.

Mr. Laing commented as follows:

I agree that least cost planning is a tool. Mr. Madsen's comments are a perfect lead in to the next agenda item, which is the completion of the workshop which began last Friday, in which we are asking ourselves certain questions, the answers to which are the basis for completing a work program. What decisions are we expecting ourselves to make in the next week or month leading up to March? Until we complete the work program, we have not set our marching orders. I look at least cost planning as a tool for carrying out the work program and evaluating the decisions.

Mr. Rice made the following statements:

Until we understand what the full system is, it is hard to make an evaluation of its elements. I think until we say we want a plan and these are the modes, I think it is easier to look at least cost planning and see if those elements are right or wrong. Trying to do this incrementally before we have that framework seems difficult to me. You could probably apply least cost planning to each of those alternatives and get better data but we have to determine if these are the elements that make sense and then do that evaluation instead of building the system through least cost planning.

Mr. Laing said I think we are thinking upon the same line. It seems to me that by looking at the regional transportation plan framework we can see where our planning effort fits with other planning efforts that include least cost planning technology, such as commuter trip reduction.

Mr. Madsen said it may be worthwhile to allow Mr. Watson to leave today's meeting so he can catch his plane back to Portland.

Mr. Laing asked are there other questions before Mr. Watson leaves? I would like to thank Mr. Watson for attending today's meeting, he stated.

Mr. Kinch said whether or not we ultimately adopt the least cost planning proposal, I feel it is critical to deal with the public's perception that this entity is utilizing "most cost" planning. This is something we should be conscious of as we move ahead, he said. Whether we adopt the least cost planning proposal as it was presented today, he said, that perception should be put out to the public. We need to tell the public that this regional transit concept is being dealt with with costs in mind, he said, and it is not just an open checkbook.

Mr. Nickels made the following remarks:

This was an interesting discussion. I think it would be useful to sort out the role today versus the role of the RTA once the plan is submitted and approved. It seems it would be useful to go through what the JRPC did and the list of elements. While the JRPC didn't call it least cost planning, many of those things took place and those evaluations were made. If some were missed, fine. It seems we have a more focused job in front of us, which is to take a plan given to us, refine it and put it before the voters so we can move ahead. There will be many decisions made and we need to build in flexibility for the future RTA that is in fact constructing the systems so that when they go through what we called alternatives analysis, they employ some of the techniques of least cost planning. I would hate for us to get off on a rethinking and

reengineering of the planning process. We need to be comfortable with the plan and not redo it.

Mr. Laing said describing how least cost planning is a factor in phasing is part of our discussion.

Mr. Morrison said in the interest of public involvement, there are people with an interest in this issue. We might ask them how they would apply these concepts, he said, knowing the work schedule we have in front of us and the time limitations involved.

Mr. Bruce Kendall and Mr. Dick Nelson said they would be happy to respond to this presentation.

Mr. Miller said I appreciate the presentations made today. I think least cost planning is an essential step for us to take, not only in insuring the work done by the JRPC, but in evaluating each of the elements and how they are intermixed in the system plan. One statement made today stood out in my mind, he said, and that is the influence of personal values and cost in the intermix. Least cost planning is one element in making our decision, he said; the influence of personal values on that decision has to be weighed. This plan will go to the public, he stated, and they must feel they are getting the best value for their dollar and that the plan meets their personal needs. Least cost planning is not the only overriding issue, he stated.

Mr. Laing said there has been a request that we conclude today's business meeting prior to breaking into small groups to continue our workshop. Mr. Nickels said this makes sense.

### Task Force Reports

#### Rules Committee

Mr. Laing said I would like to remind Board members there is a mission statement being circulated. I have received some responses, he said, and others have indicated they are working on their suggestions. The Rules Committee will take this up upon receiving input from the Board members, he noted.

#### Finance Committee

Mr. Nickels gave the following report:

The RTA has no funds. I met with staff and confirmed that this is true.

The first task for the Finance Committee will be to designate a treasurer. This will

be a public agency who will handle the RTA's accounts. Three agencies, the City of Seattle, the City of Tacoma and King County, have indicated a willingness to provide this service. We have asked staff to prepare a matrix showing the costs and other issues that should be considered. I do not think this responsibility is anything these agencies are thirsting after, but they are willing to provide this service.

Staff is also going through the funding available for HCT planning. We hope to have a decision on the treasurer prepared for authorization in early January. There are HCT funds available from the state; they have appropriated \$4.8 million for HCT planning primarily to Metro, but also Community Transit. The RTA has asked staff to look at those funds and what has been programmed for work underway. I think we should take funds not yet programmed and put them into the RTA account. This requires a 20% match and we have no money. We have to identify mechanisms for providing this local match. Agreements with Metro and other counties to advance funds to the RTA which would be reimbursable upon public approval and upon receiving operating funds from some unidentified source are necessary. We will be coming back with the issues in January. In the end of January/first of February we will be considering a budget and making some direction where those dollars should be spent.

Mr. Laing said the resolution adopted today allowing 30 days to develop a proposal for state legislative support has the potential of involving funds from the federal government and matching funds being needed. We could ask the Finance Chair to understand what is going on in the Legislative Task Force as it involves passing funds to/from the organization, he stated.

Mr. Davidson asked if the Finance Committee has held a meeting. Mr. Laing said Mr. Nickels is explaining work that has been done prior to the first meeting of the Finance Committee. Mr. Nickels said the Committee will be called together soon, but we have been trying to determine what tasks need to be done prior to the first meeting.

#### Staffing Task Force

Mr. Brubaker said there are many people who are interested in working for the RTA. The Staffing Task Force has not held a meeting since the last RTA meeting, he said, but it will meet this Friday at 10:00 a.m. in the Puget Sound Regional Council's conference room. We will begin evaluating the applicants for the Executive Director position, he said; we have received over 70 applications for the Clerk position.

Public Involvement Task Force

Mr. Earling gave the following report:

The Public Involvement Task Force's next meeting will be a workshop on public involvement. It will be held January 5. Task Force members should put that date on their calendar. We will be sending invitations to organizations asking for a delegate to participate in the workshop, and inviting feedback on the goals, objectives and techniques the Board approved last Friday. We will seek specific ideas for public involvement in the RTA's development of the final system plan. All Board members are invited to attend. The time and place will be announced.

I would like to remind you that last week you approved, in principal, a short range plan, acknowledging that the Task Force might have to come back for adjustments. We are today presenting the first adjustment. We have looked at the schedule to implement the research side of what we want to do with the survey and we determined that in order to meet the timelines that the Board will expect to meet by March, we must implement that portion of our research by the first of January. We have come up with cost estimates for this research between \$46,000 and \$63,000. The maximum cost would be \$33,000 for King County, and \$15,000 each for Snohomish and Pierce Counties. These costs reflect a percentage of the voters in each county. I have asked staff to inquire if there are monies available from Metro, Pierce and Snohomish Counties. There appears to be money available to move forward if the Board chooses to do so. All agencies are willing to participate financially and with staff support subject to final approval within each agency.

The recommended action is that: 1. We request that Metro, SNO-TRAN and Pierce Transit obtain the necessary services to conduct this research using existing budgets. 2. Assuming approval by the three agencies to this approach, request the staff of these agencies cooperate in the development of the questionnaire under the policy guidance of the Public Involvement Task Force.

Page two of the handout provides a description of what we would try to assess from the research we would undertake. We would attempt to complete telephone interviews with approximately 1,500 voters regionwide. The recommendation is that we try to move forward on this.

Ms. Gates said the financing percentages referred to county versus RTA boundaries. Would the survey sample be adjusted to boundaries we have agreed upon?, she asked. Mr. Earling said yes.

Mr. Miller said it would be helpful to include the number of solicitations and the number of responses so Board members can identify the scope of the responses and have some scale.

It was moved by Mr. Davidson, seconded by Mr. Kinch and carried by a vote of 13 in favor and 0 opposed that the RTA request that Metro, SNO-TRAN and Pierce Transit obtain the necessary services to conduct this research using existing budgets, and, assuming approval by the three agencies to this approach, request the staff of these agencies to cooperate in the development of the questionnaire under the policy guidance of the Public Involvement Task Force. (Those voting in the majority were Mr. Laing, Mr. Brubaker, Ms. Choe, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Earling, Ms. Gates, Mr. Kinch, Mr. Madsen, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morrison, Mr. Nickels, Mr. Rice and Ms. Sullivan.)

#### Legislative Task Force

Mr. Madsen said the Legislative Task Force has a lot of work to do in the next 90 days; all members are asked to check their FAX machines occasionally as they will be receiving documents.

#### Other Business

Mr. Laing asked for any other business at this time. As there was none, the meeting was adjourned at 2:54 p.m. to allow the RTA Board members to resume the workshop that began last Friday, December 3, 1993.

---

Bruce Laing  
Chair, RTA Board

ATTEST:

---

Debi Milham  
Interim Clerk of the Board