

**Pierce County
Transportation Advisory Commission (TAC)**

Thursday, May 25, 2017

9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.

Location: Tacoma Mall Plaza Building
2nd Floor Conference Room
Tacoma, WA 98409

Call to Order: 9:04 a.m. - Chair Deryl McCarty called the Transportation Advisory Commission (TAC) meeting to order.

Roll Call: 9:05 a.m.

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

Non-Voting Members present: Hugh Taylor, Toby Rickman, Kevin Clegg for Rob Allen

Staff present: Brian Stacy, Jesse Hamashima

Additional Pierce County Staff present: Jie Chen, Gary Hendricks, Neil Quisenberry

Absent: Tom Pierson

Guests: Don Samdahl - Fehr and Peers Consultants; Amy Cruver – PC Council; Kurt Wilson – Soundbuilt Homes

Approval of Agenda: Deryl McCarty approved

Approval of Meeting Notes: Liz Kaster made a motion to approve, Jeremiah LaFranca seconded.

Traffic Impact Fee

- **Projects Within the Revised Traffic Impact Fee System (TIF)**
- **Reviewing Land Uses Exempted from the TIF Program**

The theme for this meeting: You Are Here; will be reviewing and Endorsing Traffic Impact Fee projects analyzing the financial costs and impacts for the select roadway projects.

There are 82 intersection projects in all; 19 of them signalized and 63 unsignalized. They may be simpler to implement than some of the corridor projects; they serve to increase capacity of the transportation system.

At the April 27, 2017 TAC meeting there was expressed concern regarding cost estimates, impact on the built and natural environment.

Question regarding Intersection Needs: Will the intersection projects include ADA crosswalks? Answer is yes – all projects will need to comply with ADA requirements. There are current intersections that have to be redone to meet those ADA requirements.

Crash Data: How does it align with areas for bicyclists, ADA, pedestrian areas. It would be nice to see maps of where those crashes occurred.

TIF funds: Cannot be used to address safety issues – only capacity; the priority array was discussed. There is a Safety audit approach and deficiencies have to be addressed or identified as well. Can TIF funds be used for pedestrian refuge islands? All projects are required to meet standards; other funds may need to be found to meet those standards. Standards may not meet or fit within the TIF mold, but Grants or other monetary resources will be used to meet those standards. Different monetary “buckets” may be drawn from to assist with the completion of a project. No project is 100% TIF funded.

Brian Stacy will provide the White Paper document to the group that shows the process in which the County uses for prioritization. He thinks that it would be beneficial for the group to see the Intersection Prioritization Matrices.

Discussed that we are currently at Step 3 of the 8 Step work program. Extensively examined the impact of choosing to do certain projects versus others. What is the cost, political, and other impacts in choosing to do one project and not another?

ROW addressed. How is vacant land appraised? Independent appraisal for current value of property

When the TAC looks at projects – need to consider future impact; O&M costs; if completing one project, but not another – what impact does this have?

What happens to the additional dollars? Need to identify the V/S between scenarios to help group make a determination.

Consensus on Projects:

94th Ave E (C1): Keep it on for now; Scenario 1; Widen to 3-5 lanes; Group would like to see the V/S

94th Ave E Ext (C2): This was the extension through Gem Heights Drive; No Consensus/Split Vote; This should be included in the modeling because it is in the Council realm already – should err towards what is already adopted by Council. Need to take a look at both scenarios. Run analysis with roadway.

122nd Ave E & Shaw Rd E (C-3): Worth looking at the differences – turn lanes Scenario #2, but also with 5 lanes beyond 2040 Scenario #3.

160th St E (C-4): Scenario #1: Add 1 EB Lane with Center Turn Lane

Military Rd E (C-5): Suggested that a Snow Shed similar to the Pass be built; Scenario #2 – widen to 5 lanes.

176th St E Ext (D-4, D-5): Consensus was to remove it, but question about the impact on the future capacity.

Spanaway Loop Rd S (UL-1): Consensus was to go with Scenario #1 – Restripe 2 SB Lanes, Center Turn Lane and 1 NB Lane

Public Comment: No Comments

Adjourn: 11:37 a.m.

Next Meeting: Thursday, June 22nd

Attachments: May Meeting Notes, Meeting Directions