



SKAGIT COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

August 1, 2019 - 1:30 PM

Skagit Council of Governments Conference Room

[315 South Third Street, Suite 100, Mount Vernon, WA 98273](#)

AGENDA

1. Call to Order and Roll Call
2. Approval of [June 6, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes](#)
3. Local Safety Plans - *Matthew Enders, WSDOT*
4. Obligation Status - *Mark Hamilton*
5. [2020-2025 Regional Transportation Improvement Program](#) - *Mark Hamilton*
6. [Project Selection Debrief](#) - *Mark Hamilton*
7. Roundtable and Open Topic Discussion
8. Next Meeting: September 5, 2019
9. Adjourned

Please contact [Mark Hamilton](#) at (360) 416-7876 if there are any other items that need to be brought up for discussion.

[Meeting Packet](#)



TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND VOTES

VOTING MEMBERS

Anacortes.....	1
Burlington.....	1
Mount Vernon.....	1
Sedro-Woolley.....	1
Skagit County.....	3
Skagit Transit.....	1
WSDOT.....	1
Ports.....	1
• Port of Anacortes	
• Port of Skagit	
Towns.....	1
• Concrete	
• Hamilton	
• La Conner	
• Lyman	
Tribes.....	1
• Swinomish Indian Tribal Community	
• Samish Indian Nation	

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Skagit PUD

QUORUM REQUIREMENT

A quorum consists of half the total votes (5), with Skagit County consisting of one seat toward the quorum calculation. Formal recommendations to the Transportation Policy Board can only be made when a quorum is present.

Title VI Notice: SCOG fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes and regulations. For more information, or to obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, visit SCOG’s website at <http://scog.net/about/nondiscrimination/>.

Notificación del Título VI: El SCOG cumple plenamente con el Título VI de la Ley de Derechos Civiles de 1964, así como los estatutos y reglamentos relacionados. Si desea más información o tener acceso al formulario de denuncia del Título VI, visite la página web del SCOG <http://scog.net/about/nondiscrimination/>.

SKAGIT COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, June 6, 2019
SCOG Conference Room
Mount Vernon, WA

AGENCIES REPRESENTED

- City of Anacortes..... Steve Lange
- City of Burlington Brian Dempsey
- City of Mount Vernon Mike Love
- City of Sedro-Woolley Mark Freiberger
- Port of Anacortes..... Jenkins Dossen
- Samish Indian Nation..... Nora Pederson
- Skagit County Forrest Jones
- Skagit Transit..... Brad Windler
- Swinomish Indian Tribal Community Keri Cleary
- Town of Concrete..... Cody Hart (arrived 1:39 p.m.)
- Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)..... John Shambaugh

STAFF PRESENT

- Katie Bunge..... Assistant Planner
- Mark Hamilton..... Senior Transportation Planner

OTHERS PRESENT

One member of the public attended the meeting.

1. Call to Order: 1:33 p.m.

Roll Call: Roll was taken with a quorum present.

2. Approval of May 2, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting Minutes: Mr. Freiberger moved approval of the May 2, 2019 Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes as presented, and Ms. Pederson seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
3. Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Project Selection: Mr. Hamilton presented the Surface Transportation Block Grant Program Project Selection schedule to the TAC and said that project applications have been received by SCOG and scored based on all evaluation criteria, including TAC evaluations received.

The Non-Motorized Advisory Committee (NMAC) was provided a chance to see the list of ranked projects, and has given a recommendation to the TAC: to award funding to Sedro-Woolley’s John Liner Road, Reed to Township Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements Project, and Skagit Transit’s Design and Install Speed Bumps at Skagit Station project. The NMAC also commented that Freeway Drive

Improvements is an important project in helping to address a gap in non-motorized connectivity within Mount Vernon.

Mr. Hamilton told the TAC that in this round of project selection, there are an estimated \$5,900,000 of combined Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) and Highway Infrastructure Program (HIP) federal funds to award. The Transportation Policy Board approved a minimum 10% set-aside amount for non-roadway projects through this regional call for projects, which is \$523,447. Mr. Hamilton also noted that SCOG has historically been funded through a 10% set-aside of the STBGP allocation, and Board approval would be needed to continue this four-year award from 2022–2025. Mr. Hamilton explained that due to our current programming schedule, most of the projects awarded this year will be programmed in 2024 and 2025, although the HIP funded projects need to obligate sooner, per the requirements of that program.

Mr. Hamilton noted that the two projects submitted by Sedro-Woolley could not both be awarded because one is a component of the other.

TAC members viewed and discussed the ranked list of projects for the STBGP project selection. Some members questioned whether there is an opportunity to add funding later for additional project phases, if the phases are not fully funded through this round of award decisions. Mr. Hamilton confirmed that projects not fully funded through this call for projects can apply again through future SCOG calls for projects, or be funded through other sources.

Concerns were expressed by TAC members about the accuracy of the cost estimate for the construction phase of the SR 20/Campbell Lake Road Intersection Improvement project, especially with preliminary engineering not yet being completed for the proposed roundabout.

Several projects awarded by SCOG through previous project selections did not rank highly in this project selection for their construction phase. George Hopper Interchange Improvements Phase II (Rank #7), Secondary Access Project (Rank #8) and Francis Road – Section 3 (Rank #9) were specifically discussed. Some TAC members expressed that these projects should be more highly favored for this project selection, given past awards through SCOG for earlier phases and current funding requests to complete construction of each project. Other TAC members suggested that awards through SCOG should be leveraged with other funding sources to complete a project – including the County Road Administration Board and Transportation Improvement Board – and that projects should not rely too heavily on the limited funding available through the region. Projects ranked #7, #8 and #9 were proposed for funding at \$800,000 each, divided evenly among the three projects.

Mr. Love moved to recommend the following list of projects be awarded Surface Transportation Block Grant Program and Highway Infrastructure Program funding to the Transportation Policy Board:

Agency	Project	Phase	Recommended Award
Anacortes	R Avenue Long Term Improvements	PE	\$525,488
Burlington	SR 20 (Alder St. to Cascade Hwy) Nonmotorized and Safety Improvements	PE	\$350,000
Burlington	SR 20 (Alder St. to Cascade Hwy) Nonmotorized and Safety Improvements	ROW	\$350,000
Mount Vernon	Freeway Drive Improvements (College Way to Cameron Way)	CN	\$1,082,000
Samish Indian Nation	SR 20/Campbell Lake Road Intersection Improvement	PE	\$570,900
Samish Indian Nation	SR 20/Campbell Lake Road Intersection Improvement	ROW	\$86,500

Agency	Project	Phase	Recommended Award
Sedro-Woolley	John Liner Road, Reed to Township Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements Project	PE	\$58,820
Sedro-Woolley	John Liner Road, Reed to Township Bicycle/Pedestrian Improvements Project	CN	\$442,015
Burlington	George Hopper Interchange Improvements Phase II	CN	\$800,000
Concrete	Secondary Access Project	CN	\$800,000
Skagit County	Francis Road - Section 3	CN	\$800,000
Skagit Transit	Design and Install Speed Bumps at Skagit Station	PE	\$7,464
Skagit Transit	Design and Install Speed Bumps at Skagit Station	CN	\$71,622
Total			\$5,944,809

Ms. Cleary seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

TAC members expressed that their recommendation reflects the TAC’s desire to complete the construction phase of projects that are currently programmed or already obligated.

Support was expressed for limiting the amount of funds requested per project in the future, with funding focused on more projects at lower dollar levels, rather than fewer projects at higher dollar levels. No specific threshold/amount was proposed for the maximum request. The highest funding request was \$2,300,000 in this project selection and the lowest was \$79,086.

Mr. Hamilton presented the prioritized list of contingency list projects based on TAC member scoring. TAC members discussed projects recommended for inclusion in the contingency list. Members recommended including funding for the George Hopper Interchange Improvements Phase II, Secondary Access Project, and Francis Road - Section 3 projects in the contingency list in the amounts of the remainder between the TAC recommendation for award to these projects and the funding request.

Mr. Lange moved to recommend the following prioritized projects for the contingency list, and Mr. Hart seconded the motion:

Agency	Project	Phase	Funding Request
Samish Indian Nation	SR 20/Campbell Lake Road Intersection Improvement	CN	\$1,642,600
Burlington	George Hopper Interchange Improvements Phase II	CN	\$200,000
Concrete	Secondary Access Project	CN	\$450,000
Skagit County	Francis Road - Section 3	CN	\$200,000
Skagit Transit	Bus Stop Surveys	Other	\$65,625
Skagit Transit	Design Services for Bus Pullouts along Memorial Highway	PE	\$72,925
Skagit Transit	Solar Light Upgrade to Bus Shelters	Other	\$19,463
Skagit Transit	Fixed Route Transit Coach	Other	\$393,750
Skagit Transit	Digital Signage and Real Time Information	Other	\$105,000
Skagit Transit	Bus Stop Amenities	Other	\$56,437
Skagit Transit	Design Services Sedro Woolley Transit Stops	PE	\$99,475
Total			\$3,305,275

The motion carried unanimously.

- 2020–2025 Regional Transportation Improvement Program: Mr. Hamilton reminded the Technical Advisory Committee that each year, SCOG develops a new Regional Transportation Improvement

Program (RTIP). More details regarding the upcoming 2020-2025 RTIP will be discussed at the next meeting on August 1, 2019.

5. Roundtable and Open Topic Discussion: Technical Advisory Committee members gave updates on their current projects.
6. Next Meeting: August 1, 2019. Mr. Hamilton noted there is not a TAC meeting scheduled in July due to the meeting date falling on Independence Day.
7. Adjourned: 2:58 p.m.

Attest:

Mark Hamilton, AICP
Skagit Council of Governments

Date _____

DRAFT

2020–2025 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PREPARATION TIMELINE

SCOG has begun the preparation of the 2020–2025 Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP). If you have not already done so, please use the web based STIP software – SecureAccess Washington – to roll over or add projects for the 2020–2025 RTIP. **Please submit all projects to SCOG by August 22, 2019.** All federally funded and regionally significant projects you reasonably expect to obligate in the **next four years** must be included. Federal law requires that SCOG maintain a fully programmed four-year TIP ([23 CFR 450.326](#)). SCOG prepares a new RTIP every year for consistency with the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), which is also prepared yearly and must include the RTIP as a component.

Projects must be included in local/tribal TIP prior to inclusion into the RTIP.

TIMELINE FOR RTIP PREPARATION

Preliminary review by TAC	September 5, 2019
RTIP available for public review	September 2019
Final review by TAC	October 3, 2019
Public comment period ends	October 4, 2019
Adoption by Transportation Policy Board	October 16, 2019
Submit RTIP to WSDOT	October 18, 2019
FHWA and FTA approve 2020–2023 STIP	January 2020

CONSIDERATIONS

The following changes to the 2020–2025 RTIP are proposed by staff:

- Add Emergent Need Award Process into RTIP, which was adopted by the Transportation Policy Board in April 2019;
- Revise Regional Performance Targets section to reflect federal performance-based planning and programming requirements that went into effect in May 2019;
- Add programming sheet for federal Highway Infrastructure Funds allocated to SCOG and awarded in July 2019; and
- Other changes to the RTIP include updating the project list, financial feasibility table, financial overview charts, graphics, Environmental Justice analysis and refining the text for clarity.

DISCUSSION ITEM – PROJECT SELECTION DEBRIEF

Document History

MEETING	DATE	TYPE OF ITEM	STAFF CONTACT	PHONE
Technical Advisory Committee	08/01/2019	Discussion	Mark Hamilton	(360) 416-7876

DISCUSSION

The 2018–2019 project selection process concluded with projects selected for award by the Transportation Policy Board on July 17, 2019. This project selection debrief is to continue discussion of concerns brought up by the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), discuss proposed changes to the [application](#) by SCOG staff and other subjects that arose during the application and project evaluation process.

PROPOSED SCOG STAFF APPLICATION CHANGES

1. Break out Surface Transportation Block Grant Program (STBGP) requests by phase, instead of having only total STBGP request.
2. In Economic Vitality section, include place to note page number for relevant economic plan. The application has a place to link to a plan, but no way to enter any page number for reference.
3. Revise toggle function for Freight Network criterion in Economic Vitality section. In the application, one of the five radial buttons has to be checked, but the project may not be on a freight route and would therefore not have a box checked.
4. Remove 1,000 character limit in Project Description. There was some confusion on this limitation during the application process.

SCOG STAFF DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Input from the TAC on potential changes to Maintenance & Preservation criterion is desired. Were changes to this criterion better/worse from applicants’ perspective? The intent was to make this criterion more consistent with Federal Highway Administration definitions for maintenance and preservation. Should we consider adding a requirement to explain “how” the projects address maintenance and preservation, in addition to checking a box for each?
2. Should project presentations to the TAC continue in the future? If so, should the next project presentations have more time than this year? Only five minutes was available due to meeting timeframe and number of submittals.

TAC DISCUSSION POINTS FROM JUNE 6, 2019 MEETING

1. Should more weight be given to projects awarded in the past by SCOG? This could be a change to the Project Funding & Readiness section. Projects did not score higher if they had received a past award through SCOG, through projects could receive points if they had other secured funding or had already obligated funding for the project.
2. The TAC discussed projects being nearly fully funded via STBGP vs. using STBGP funds as a project funding component, while seeking other funding (e.g. CRAB, TIB, legislative earmark)

to complete the funding package. Should documented funding from other sources warrant a higher score in the future? Other secured funding and previously obligated funds can currently receive up to 3 points, with 1 point per source.

3. The TAC discussed whether there should be a maximum that each project can be awarded per project selection process. There is no cap on what can be requested, though awards are still constrained by available funding. Some TAC members expressed desire at the June meeting to discuss limiting future funding requests, and potentially fund more projects at lower values than fewer projects at higher values.

For reference, the highest request in 2019 was \$2.3 million (Rural project). The highest request in 2017 was \$2.4 million (Urban project). In 2019, the project received a partial award, while in 2017, the project was not awarded.

PROJECT APPLICATION FORM

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM

Project Title:

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION

Date of Application Submittal:

Organization:

Contact Person:

Phone Number:

Email Address:

PROJECT INFORMATION

All eligibility criteria must be met at time of application. Projects that do not meet the STBGP eligibility criteria at the time of application will be removed from award consideration.

Project Location:

Is the project sponsor requesting Urban Areas or Rural Areas funding?

([use this map](#) to determine applicable geography)

Urban

Rural

Federal Functional Classification:

Beginning Termini:

Ending Termini:

Project Length (in miles):

Has the project been submitted to SCOG in the web based STIP software?

Yes

STIP ID:

Project Description

Include the project scope, purpose, and brief comparison of existing and proposed conditions (1,000 characters).

PLANNING & PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Is this project identified in the sponsor organization's long range plan? Yes Project ID:

Please provide link to document:

Is this project identified in the sponsor organization's six-year comprehensive transportation program (TIP) or equivalent? Yes Project ID:

Please provide link to document:

What [project in the regional transportation plan](#) (pages 59-63) is this project implementing, if any?
ID #:

Date of public meeting(s) in which the documents identified above were approved by sponsor organization's governing body:

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

	PE/ Other	RW	CN
Earliest possible obligation date (mm/dd/yyyy)			
Estimated completion date (mm/dd/yyyy)			

ATTACHMENTS

Project sponsor has included:

- Vicinity Map
- Signed Project Endorsement Form
- Engineer's Estimate (if applicable)
- Typical Section (if applicable)
- Written Concurrence (if project is within or connects to right of way of another organization)
- Written acknowledgment from Skagit Transit (If project is located on fixed-route transit line)

COST SUMMARY

A. Previous obligations (all fund sources, all phases)	\$	STBGP funding is requested for the following phases (check all that apply):
Fund Source:	\$	
Fund Source:	\$	
Fund Source:	\$	
B. Requested STBGP funds	\$	<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Engineering/Design <input type="checkbox"/> Right-of-way <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Other (planning, etc.)
C. Other secured federal funds. Source:	\$	
D. Other secured state funds. Source:	\$	
E. Secured local funds (minimum 13.5%). Source:	\$	
F. Secured private funds. Source:	\$	
G. Other planned phases	\$	
H. Total estimated project cost (all phases). Sum of A through F.	\$	

Cost summary notes (optional, 1,000 characters):

Describe the commitment of secured matching funds and the status of obtaining any unsecured funds. (Note: Matching funds must be available at the time of fund obligation. 1,000 characters)

ECONOMIC VITALITY 20 MAXIMUM

CONSISTENCY WITH ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2

Is project consistent with an adopted economic development/revitalization plan or other plan/initiative with an economic development component? If so, please cite the plan and page number that describes the economic development aspects related to the project.

Hyperlink to plan: If no hyperlink is available, please provide plan in another format.

FREIGHT NETWORK 5

Is the project located on a state designated Freight Corridor?

(use [WSDOT Community Planning Portal](#), Freight and Goods Transportation System layer to determine Freight Corridor)

- T-1 5
- T-2 4
- T-3 3
- T-4 2
- T-5 1

PRIVATE PARTNER FUNDS 4

Have private partners pledged funding to this project? If so, how much? \$

(1 point per 2% of total amount of STBGP funds requested.) Note: this does not include traffic impact fees and/or any funds identified as local match.

To receive points in this category, project sponsor must include signed pledge sheet from private partner(s) with pledged funding level.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE (SCOG WILL PERFORM THIS ANALYSIS) 4

Is project within 100 feet of low-income census tract? 2

Is project within 100 feet of minority census block? 2

EXISTING AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENT (SCOG WILL PERFORM THIS ANALYSIS) 8

Project is located in area of significant existing employment or future employment growth. SCOG will perform this analysis. For the 2012 measure, all of the submitted projects will be divided into thirds based on highest rate of existing employment per acre in the transportation analysis zones the project is within. For the 2040 measure, the projects will be divided into thirds based on the number of new jobs per acre in the transportation analysis zones the project is within. Project will receive points for the highest point value geography it touches or passes through.

Scores will not be combined, the project will receive the highest score from 2012 Employment Density or the 2040 Employment Growth Density.

2012 Employment Density

- Low density 0
- Medium Density 4
- High Density 8

2040 Employment Growth Density

- Low Density 0
- Medium Density 4
- High Density 8

Collision Type	A: Total Instances	B: Average Cost	C: Total Cost (AxB)	Annual Benefit (C/3)
Property Damage Only (vehicles)		\$6,700		
Injuries		\$375,000		
Fatalities		\$4,400,000		
Total				

Has project sponsor been awarded funding for this location in the past?

Project sponsor may not receive collision safety points if previous funding has been awarded to address safety issues at the project location. If the project is addressing a safety concern that has previously been funded, please describe how this project varies:

ACCESS MANAGEMENT 4

- Does this project include a non-traversable median to limit mid-block left turns?..... 2
- Does this project reduce the number of driveway access points along the project length? 2
- Does this project add or improve intersection turn channelization?..... 2

OTHER SAFETY 10

- Is the project located on an evacuation route? (SCOG will perform this analysis) 2
- Does this project [enhance delineation and/or friction for horizontal curves](#)? 2
- Does this project provide any physical buffer between pedestrians and roadway (including bike lane, swale, utility/planting strip)? 2
- Does this project use [safety edge surface treatment on a roadway without a curb and gutter](#)? 2
- Does this project include a [road diet](#)? 2
- Does this project include minimum 4-foot paved shoulder with painted fog stripe?..... 2
- Does this project include additional lighting that enhances visibility at night? 2
- Does this project include a transit pullout (must be a designated space for buses to pull out of the travel lanes)? 2
- Does this project include a traffic calming measure such as bulbouts, speed humps, radar signs, pedestrian crossing signs, etc? 2

MOBILITY

20 MAXIMUM

NETWORK DEVELOPMENT

- Does this project improve a route that is proximate and parallel to regional network corridor? This must be demonstrated by a formal traffic study. (Include traffic study with project submittal.) 2
- Does this project improve transit access and/or amenities on a current or planned Skagit Transit fixed route? (Include letter from transit agency to verify.) 3
- Does this project include provisions for data collection (transit ridership, vehicular counts, bicycle counts, etc.)? 2
- Does this project include bicycle wayfinding?..... 2

Note: to receive credit for the features listed below, they must be specified in the project description submitted in the web-based STIP software.

- Does this project include a paved, separated trail? 4
- Does this project add or improve sidewalks/walkways for at least 50% of the total project length? . 2
- Does this project include bicycle lanes for at least 50% of the total project length (must include clear designation such as signage and/or pavement markings)? 2
- Does this project enhance an existing unsignalized intersection with a signal or roundabout? 6

REGIONAL NATURE

10 MAXIMUM

REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS

10

- Is this project included in the Skagit 2040 Regional Transportation Plan (for capacity expansion projects)? 10

NON-REGIONALLY SIGNIFICANT PROJECTS

10

- Is project located on the Regional Roadway System or Regional Non-Motorized System (use [SCOG webmap](#) to determine if project is on either of these regional systems)? 10

PROJECT FUNDING & READINESS 15 MAXIMUM

PROJECT FUNDING (SCOG WILL SCORE THIS SECTION) 5

- Other secured or previously obligated funding (other than required match and private investment, 1 point per source) 0-3
- More than required 13.5% local match (1 point per additional 5%) 0-2

PROJECT READINESS 10

- Environmental permits approved or [categorically excluded](#) (please include applicable documentation) 5
- PS&E package complete (please include applicable documentation) 5
- Right of way acquisition complete or unnecessary (please include applicable documentation) 5

PRESERVATION & MAINTENANCE 5 MAXIMUM

PRESERVATION

- Does this project improve or sustain the condition of an existing transportation facility, restoring it to a state of good repair? 2

MAINTENANCE

- Does this project include routine or preventative maintenance of a transportation facility? 2
- Does this project extend the useful life of an existing transportation facility? 2
- Does this project implement an element of the organization's adopted asset management plan or adopted other maintenance related plan, program or strategy? 2

TAC PRIORITY 10 MAXIMUM

The TAC will rank the submitted projects relative to each other based on the anticipated regional benefit of each project. The top ranked project will receive 10 points; the second ranked project will receive 9 points, etc. Projects not ranked in the top 10 will receive zero points.