



SR 167 Master Plan Technical Advisory Committee Meeting

Wednesday, Nov. 10, 2021

2:00 – 4:00 p.m.

Zoom

Technical Advisory Group members in attendance:

- Brianne Bannwarth, City of Renton
- Robert Barandon, Puyallup Tribe of Indians
- Jennifer Barnes, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC)
- Kim Becklund, King County Metro
- Chad Bieren, City of Kent
- Frank Boykin, Tacoma-Pierce County Chamber of Commerce
- Rob Brown, City of Kent
- Lora Butterfield, Fife Milton Edgewood Chamber of Commerce
- Sean Eagan, Northwest Seaport Alliance
- Steven Friddle, City of Fife
- Vangie Garcia, City of Renton
- Ingrid Gaub, City of Auburn
- Jimmy Griess, City of Algona
- Aaron Halbert, Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC)
- Zenovia Harris, Kent Chamber of Commerce
- Hans Hunger, City of Puyallup
- Justin Johnson, City of Renton
- Owen Kehoe, King County Metro
- David Korthals, King County Metro
- Michael Kosa, City of Sumner
- Doug Levy, City of Renton
- Liana Liu, Federal Highway Administration
- Cecile Malik, City of Auburn
- Salvador Marez, City of Algona
- Jeremy Metzler, City of Edgewood
- Jim Morgan, City of Pacific
- Geri Poor, Port of Seattle
- Bryan Roberts, City of Puyallup
- Carl See, Washington State Transportation Commission (WSTC)
- Darin Stavish, Pierce Transit
- Greg Vigoren, City of Fife
- Kendall Wals, City of Puyallup
- Christine Wolf, Northwest Seaport Alliance and Port of Tacoma

Presenters and project team members in attendance:

- Ryan Anderson, SR 167 Master Plan
- Chris Breiland, SR 167 Master Plan
- Amy Danberg, SR 167 Master Plan
- Samantha DeMars-Hanson, SR 167 Master Plan
- Rob Fellows, WSDOT
- Alex Henry, SR 167 Master Plan
- Loreana Marciante, SR 167 Master Plan
- Robin Mayhew, SR 167 Master Plan
- Jeff Storrar, SR 167 Master Plan
- Wendy Taylor, SR 167 Master Plan
- Karl Westby, SR 167 Master Plan

Meeting objectives:

- Discuss roles and responsibilities and committee structure
- Review and discuss Master Plan schedule and committee work plan
- Share key themes from listening sessions
- Gather feedback on purpose and need, proposed study area
- Introduce evaluation criteria and gather initial feedback

Introduction

Robin Mayhew, Management of Mobility Director, thanked committee members for coming and reviewed the meeting agenda. Amy Danberg, SR 167 Master Plan Communications, facilitated introductions and reviewed ground rules for the meeting.

SR 167 Master Plan background

Robin provided background information on the SR 167 Master Plan, including reviewing legislative direction, clarifying the definition of a master plan, reviewing planning and environmental linkage (PEL), and going over the schedule.

Technical Advisory Committee roles and responsibilities

Robin reviewed the roles and responsibilities of the TAC members, which include attending six additional meetings between now and June 2023, reviewing our materials and sharing them internally, and keeping their policy advisory committee members informed and prepped heading into those meetings.

Committee members noted it would be helpful to have the slide deck in advance of the meetings. Going forward, the project team will aim to send a draft slide deck before each meeting.

A committee member asked if this meeting was being recorded. Amy responded it was not being recorded since we send out a meeting summary and slide deck after each meeting but we will look into that for future meetings.

Community engagement

Amy reviewed the team's partner/community engagement plan and provided a recap of some key themes from the listening sessions the project team recently completed. Their plan includes equity focused community engagement and CBO engagement. The result of the engagement will be presented at this meeting and the policy advisory committee meetings.

Discussion:

- Christine Wolf, Northwest Seaport Alliance and Port of Tacoma, commented that it would be helpful to get high level information on what will be discussed at the policy advisory committee meetings in advance.
 - Amy clarified that those meetings are typically pared down versions of these meetings so there should be no surprises.
- Hans Hunger, City of Puyallup, asked if there are other recently completed master plans we could look at to see what a finished product looks like, or if there is existing working on SR 167 that this would be trying to update.
 - Robin answered that there is a corridor study from 2008. After the meeting, the project team sent the link to that document.



- Darin Stavish, Pierce Transit, asked if the project team would want help with responding to transit specific comments from the public.
 - Robin said that made sense since WSDOT cannot speak on their behalf. The project team will work with King County Metro, Pierce Transit, and jurisdictions if that comes up.
- Carl See, WSTC, asked how this will dovetail with the I-405/SR 167 Program and the Puget Sound Gateway Program?
 - Robin said they have been working closely with Olympic Region and the Megaprograms because their study areas do overlap. There is a slide in the slide deck where they discuss this. In terms of mapping and modeling, they are trying to align those processes to make sure they don't duplicate things and use your time carefully.
 - Carl said it's important to understand how those facilities overlap when planning for the corridor outside of just tolling aspects, to come up with a plan to create a seamless experience for the user.
 - Robin said they are working with the Toll Division as well. There are projects that are underway to help with that such as the 167 Toll Upgrade Project. They are thinking about the long term and how ideas would relate to land use planning within the corridor. All those pieces Carl mentioned would be folded in.

Purpose and need

Robin reviewed the problem statement, project purpose and goals.

Discussion on the "Why a Master Plan?" slide:

- Christine Wolf commented that when we talk about corridor changing demographics and increased density, especially in the south end of the corridor, the team should look at what is happening in the manufacturing and warehousing sector and add some more detail to reflect that.
- Vangie Garcia, City of Renton, suggested reordering the bullets on the Why a Master Plan? slide, specifically moving the last bullet about increased density around the cities up closer to the top of the list, since it is an important part of why there is increased travel demand and congestion.
 - Kim Becklund, King County Metro, echoed Vangie's comments and said it's good to underscore changing demographics and densities in a long-range plan.
- Ingrid Gaub, City of Auburn, commented that they should address the barrier that SR 167 creates across communities to help with connectivity within the state.

Discussion on the vision:

- Kim Becklund commented that Metro has been dialing in on people with the most need and suggested that WSDOT capture the equity piece and focus on where the needs are the greatest.
- Rob Brown, City of Kent, pointed out that the first thing mentioned on the vision slide is safety, but there is nothing about safety in the needs statement. It would be good to make that connection between safety and the mission statement.
- Christine Wolf said that she thinks of transportation as means to a variety of different ends, such as increase equity, grow the economy, or improve quality of life for people who are dependent on the corridor. With goods, freight can't take a bike or a bus, so it's different than other travel. She suggested wordsmithing that part of the vision.
 - Robin agreed the project team and Christine should have a follow-up meeting to discuss how to best describe freight and travel.
- Michael Kosa, City of Sumner, commented that we talk about transporting goods but SR 167 has become a huge freight corridor but this statement seems light on the freight aspect. Reemphasize the freight need and who is connected to that need. As for the work part, people who rely on it tend to not have other options. Building the regional trail network out more is also an important component of transportation.



- Vangie Garcia added that addressing the issues with connecting east to west in the problem statement may address what Ingrid brought up earlier.
- Carl See suggested to emphasize that it will serve the greater network as opposed to just communities along the corridor.

Discussion on the draft goals:

- Geri Poor, Port of Seattle, suggested it may be good to call out technology solutions.
- Vangie Garcia added it may be helpful to clarify what “transform” means here. If we are going to aim for something, what exactly are we aiming for?
 - Robin said the team can brainstorm on how to respond to that. It could be a more detailed definition of the vision statement.
- Christine Wolf said we may want to get clearer about a goal that aims to reduce the carbon footprint of traffic in the corridor. Technology could be a piece of that. She also reemphasized Carl’s point about this being a part of a larger system and how it has a role in ensuring the system can be resilient.

Chris Breiland, SR 167 Master Plan Project Manager, reviewed the study area as well as the approach and areas of influence.

Discussion on the study area:

- Vangie Garcia said she would like to see a more detailed map and was curious what that beige area was.
 - Chris clarified it was intentionally vague.
- Ingrid Gaub commented that, in line with what Vangie was saying, she has concerns about where it incorporates the SR 18 interchange and how long on each side of the corridor you are looking at. SR 18 has some limitations at the moment. You may need to look further than just one mile to see if that can influence SR 167.
 - Chris said the influence of SR 18 and I-5 as well as other highways is going to be included in terms of how much travel demand changes if we are affecting those other routes along the way.
 - Vangie added that the influence of SR 169 is part of why she raised her question too.
 - Chris said the team will look at that and share when we get to the existing conditions.
 - Michael Kosa echoed those comments and would like to see more regarding connecting routes like SR 512.
- Owen Kehoe, King County Metro, asked if the study is focused on state-owned facilities or can improvements on city streets be considered in the project list?
 - Chris said they are going off the community’s and PSRC’s greater vision to bring forth the vision they outlined. Those types of investments aren’t necessarily going to be WSDOT investments but they will help advance the vision of the corridor. We will highlight those.
 - Robin confirmed that yes, WSDOT would even support grant opportunities to support local jurisdictions investments or transit line investments partnered together.

Evaluation criteria

Chris introduced the evaluation criteria categories.

Discussion on evaluation criteria:

- Ingrid Gaub brought up the transformative travel piece. There is a lot of work that needs to be done with transit agencies, especially King County Metro, such as looking at equity and how that might change their services in the south King County area. That might play into how SR 167

provides those services and connections that aren't necessarily part of their current plans. It would be good to track what's going on at Metro and sync up some of the metrics they are using.

- Kim Becklund appreciated the interest in better understanding future transit planning and service investments. Kim said she could come back at the next meeting with more information on this.
- Jennifer Barnes, Puget Sound Regional Council, said she was happy to help if the team needs support from PSRC on the modeling effort. As part of their long-term planning for the regional transportation plan, they are doing a lot of mapping and providing tools/resources related to equity for various population groups. The work PSRC is doing may be on track to support this work too, so the groups should sync up to discuss.
- Cecile Malik, City of Auburn, commented it would be good to have King County Metro and Pierce Transit talk with each other to figure out a way to provide a better connection. She also asked if the project team is going to be evaluating impact that the current congestion has on local roadways, since as congestion gets bad people find other roads to use.
 - Chris said they are looking at arterial capacity ratios to see how different solutions affect traffic up and down the corridor within that one-mile range. They are also looking at a few of those parallel routes that are just outside that one-mile range, such as West Valley Highway for example. They will see if they need to adjust the boundary based on that.
- Michael Kosa commented that Sumner is not looped into the Pierce Transit service area and wanted to make a note of that. Pierce Transit is aware of that. Sumner has Sounder service and Sound Transit service but not Pierce Transit service. As the evaluation criteria is built out, something needs to be evaluated for communities that are outside of the Pierce Transit service area.
- Christine Wolf commented that there are lots of trips by people with toolboxes and gear (plumbers, electricians, etc.). Maybe there is a way to tease out percentages based on land use?
 - Chris said they may have an opportunity to quantify commercial vehicles in their next round of data collection either directly or through land use.
- Kim Becklund suggested devoting some time to a robust transit discussion among all the providers.
- Carl See encouraged comments that were made about transit being a primary factor in terms of equitable access, but in some cases transit is not always an option for people. We should make sure there is some connection/criteria around ensuring the system is usable for those who need to use it, such as the low-income toll study WSTC recently completed. Also, how can we make the area less reliant on using SR 167? From a land use perspective, are there opportunities to think about how we can support SR 167 in a way that's productive, allowing for better multi land use?
 - Kim Becklund added it would be nice to review trip model predictions and current and future land use.
- Geri Poor commented on the point on the bottom that mentions practical, implemental fundable projects and asked if it was possible to assess the benefit of investments.
 - Chris clarified that the aim of that piece is to make sure they are being cost effective, so it is in line with her thinking.
- Geri Poor noticed that the per capita under the "managing existing infrastructure" piece excludes freight and asked which of these draft criteria will get to the movement of freight?
 - Chris said they took freight out of per capita VMT because they want to make land use more efficient and have less vehicles, but that is not always relevant for freight. Looking at freight use is under "manage roadway mobility." That includes how freight gets from point a to point b. Chris said he'd welcome ideas on other metrics since they don't want to miss anything there given how important freight is on this corridor.
- Geri Poor asked if they are planning on tackling truck parking and safety as part of this. It is not related to this slide but she would be happy to meet with the project team to discuss some ideas.



- Michael Kosa echoed the comment on truck parking.
- Christine Wolf commented it would be great to talk about travel time reliability. That drives a lot of the parking demand. It would be great to have a broader conversation about this and it ties in with the technology improvements and truck parking issue Geri mentioned.

Next steps

Robin reviewed next steps, including the first Policy Advisory Committee on Nov. 17. They only have an hour with them so she encouraged TAC members to brief their PAC members before the meeting so they can move through information fairly quickly. TAC members are welcome to attend the PAC meeting but engagement should come from the executive or elected member. The project team will continue to gather data and finish up listening sessions. Robin thanked everyone for their time and adjourned the meeting at 4 p.m.