

Regional Transit Authority  
June 9, 1995

## Board Workshop Minutes

### Call to Order

The workshop was called to order at 12:21 a.m. in the Auditorium of the Tacoma Public Utilities Building, Tacoma by Chairman Laing. The Board Administrator called the roll and the following members were present:

#### Chair:

Bruce Laing, King County Councilmember

#### Vice Chair

Dave Earling, Edmonds Councilmember

Paul Miller, Tacoma Councilmember

#### King County:

Don Davidson, Bellevue Mayor

Jim White, Kent Mayor

#### Pierce County:

Ken Madsen, Pierce County Councilmember

#### Snohomish County:

Bob Drewel, Snohomish County Executive

#### Washington State Department of Transportation:

Sid Morrison, Secretary

The following Board members arrived after roll call:

#### King County:

Jane Hague, King County Councilmember

Greg Nickels, King County Councilmember

#### Pierce County:

Sharon Boekelman, Bonney Lake Councilmember

Doug Sutherland, Pierce County Executive

Mr. Laing:

We are expecting more Board members to join us during today's workshop. I would like to welcome everyone and thank all parties in the audience, in particular those invited legislators

and representatives of organizations who have shown interest in the RTA in the past. This is the first step in revising the proposal to take to the public next year. The purpose of inviting today's participants is to allow them to see the types of information we are starting with and to be able to join with us in other workshops and have in effect a baseline for the information the Board will be working with between now and the adoption of a revised Phase I option.

I would particularly like to acknowledge the presence of Representative Ruth Fisher..... (Marcia - did you catch all of these names?)

With that, I will ask Mr. Matoff to set a more specific background for today's presentations. You have already noted this workshop is being held in a facility that does not lend itself to an interactive workshop. We thought that since the Board meeting was scheduled here and the nature of this presentation is to refocus the Board on the framework in which we are operating and updating information, this facility would serve adequately.

Mr. Matoff:

The workshop today is designed to put on the table for the Board and the community all the materials necessary to begin and carry out the dialogue to redefine the Phase I proposal to go to the voters. In order to do that, we have organized the materials and presentations in the following order:

- 1) set the stage by describing the overall state legislative mandate to the region and the general state rules that govern the overall development of plans on a multi-modal basis for transportation services. To assist with that, we will have Mr. Metcalf give a presentation.
- 2) We would like to focus on the region and we are grateful to have Ms. Mary McCumber, Executive Director of the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), which is the agency to do a multi-modal transportation planning for a four-county region. She will be assisted by Mr. King Cushman. This presentation will take into account transit and the highway side as well.
- 3) Ms. Renee Montgelas, Director of the Washington State Department of Transportation's (WSDOT) Office of Urban Mobility will explain the DOT's role in assisting with the preservation and enhancement of mobility options pursuant to the MTP development under the PSRC.
- 4) We would then move to the regional transit piece of the overall equation. We will be moving from a broader to the transit focus in transportation planning.

(Board member Hague arrived at this time.)

Some members of the staff will be called on to present to you some tools I think will be useful to the Board and public in developing new options.

- 4) Finally, we will have discussion of a revised ballot and election time frame.

To begin, I would like to call on Mr. Metcall to present a discussion of the revised state legislation.

Mr. Laing:

You have had concern about the screen being difficult for Board members to see. I understand there will be hard copies of all materials being presented today so that Board members may refer to them later.

Mr. Metcalf provided a presentation on the revised state legislation.

Mr. Davidson:

What is our position with regard to vetos of the budget bill?

Mr. Laing:

There is a letter in today's packet (copy on file), that has been authorized, by the Rules Committee, for my signature.

I would like to acknowledge the arrival of Jack Cairns.

Ms. McCumber provided a presentation on the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (handouts on file).

(Board member Nickels arrived at this time.)

Mr. King Cushman gave a presentation on \_\_\_\_\_ (handouts on file):

(Board member Boekelman arrived at this time.)

(Board member Sutherland arrived at this time.)

Mr. Laing:

I would like to recognize the arrival of Frank Chop. Would it be possible for the display boards used by Mr. Cushman to be displayed at the back of the room?

Mr. Cushman:

Certainly. If that would like to deal with them in detail, these diagrams are contained in the back of the appendix.

Ms. Renee Montgelas gave a presentation regarding HOV lanes and direct access ramps (handouts on file).

Mr. Morrison:

After what we have heard from the PSRC and the Office of Urban Mobility, I believe a point should be made: We have done a superb job of establishing structure regionally and planning and coordination. What we haven't done is to pay for anything. Then the RTA comes out with a package and is criticized because we have a band of the packaged called the HCT because we didn't look at the big picture. I hope as we look to the future, including those in opposition, there is a realization that the plan selected for the RTA to work in is a part of the overall regional planning that has been filled done. I hope we will given tools to answer what hte public wants. They want projects but we don't have the au thority over the big picture.

I am frustrated that 40% raise we are paying in support of transporation infrstructure than we did 25 years ago. Weare not doing the job but we not paying for it.

Mr. Davidson:

I agre e on the obs ervations that we have done a good job of planning and identifying needs. Since the time we went to hte taxpayers we went with a rail system and they wanted many things other things that weren't being addressed. Maybe now we can get an organized plaj to addresss it.

Ms. Montgelas:

That is our challenge. The ifnormation is ther and the pains lare there. The challenge is to show all of these in contenxt of each other. It is our challenge to show the public hwo they fit together. Understanding that is partly what the trnasportation summit is about.

Mr. Matoff:

Having looked at the big picture, we would like to turn to hte regional trnasit part of hte picture and ask senior staf to present the second ballot system plan. Originally we intended to review the starting point the three study options of last summer. Rather than doign so, we have made available the viodeotape that summarizes that quite clearly. More importantly now to put into the hands the tools you need and the public gcan use to develo proposals for a second ballot. The intent today is primarily to epxlain the tools to you. They do contains options but constraints. Perhaps at a future workshop Board members may wish to take in and apprise those tools.

Ms. Hendrickson, Mr. Venturato and Mr. Freeman explained the second ballot system planning kit (handouts on file).

Mr. Laing:

Will this document be made available to the public?

Ms. Hendrickson:

Yes. We could get copies to people who do not receive them today if they submit their name and address.

Mr. Laing:

With regard to operating figures, should they assume the blue number is a maximum?

Mr. Venturato:

The base way to make it simple would be if there was less emphasis on light rail, you could probably start to downplay that number a little bit. This assume it would be less than half, about \$1.5 billion for the \$3.5 billion going to light rail. You could say we only through 3/4 of a billion it could be half that number.

Mr. Miller:

The financing kit indicates a maximum federal funding of \$50 million per year. I was not clear in the language put forward whether we are restricted to the six year assumptions or could we say \$50 million per year over the full 10 years.

Ms. Hendrickson:

This reflects our interpretation of that language.

Mr. Metcalf:

Our interpretation of the message which is subject to argument is that means if current six year authorization of ISTEA contains \$300 million for our projects, we can assume that level for the next two authorization periods. We are assuming it will not decrease.

Mr. Laing:

I assume it would be best for Board members to take several copies of the worksheet. It is an iterative process and we might want to change assumptions.

Ms. Hendrickson:

We didn't go to the last reference sheet. You will be interested to know we included the issue of ridership from a 1992 atlas in support of the JRPC.

Mr. Laing:

The packet is intended to stand by itself. Would it be possible for a citizen to use the packet, as distributed, or would the RTA provide more information if needed.

Ms. Hendrickson:

That is correct.

Mr. Matsuoka reviewed the schedule for the next ballot election.

Mr. Sutherland:

Is there any data available, of a firm nature, that would represent the costs that are associated with the suggestion of people who felt we didn't look at the other kinds of approaches. Do we have numbers we could use if we considered those other kinds of ideas?

Mr. Freeman:

I am sure that for any component, there are numbers that could be applied. If you submitted a recommendation to staff, we will try to find cost estimates from the appropriate agency.

Mr. Miller:

In the schedule you identify a September date for the proposals to be made to the Board. Is that including proposals from the outside groups as anticipated by the state in consulting for alternative proposals?

Mr. Matsuoka:

It was not staff's intention to suggest that all citizen-based planning and that by the LTC would be concluded by Labor Day. Suggestion is if you look at the election dates and then back-up the schedule, the earlier we know the proposals the better and the more time the Board will have to deliberate.

Mr. Miller:

I agree with you it would be beneficial to communicate this time line for those interested in making input or for some mutual understanding of the decision time.

Mr. Matoff:

That concludes the presentations to be made by staff and other agencies today. We look forward to working with the Board on development of alternatives at another workshop.

Mr. Laing:

It is my intention to suggest, during today's business meeting, that we utilize the majority of the next meeting date for continuation of the workshop and to get it more specific. I will suggest that the business meeting occur from 1:00 to 1:30 and then the workshop continue from 1:30 to 4:30 p.m. on June 23.

I want to thank everyone who accepted our invitation to attend today's workshop. I hope the information will be useful in devising revisions to the proposals the RTA intends to take to the voters in the future.

The workshop was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

dam