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Discussion Overview

May 5th
- Transportation Plan Update Recap
- A Preview of the Plan

May 6th
- Plan costs
- Transportation finances
- Financing options
- Council guidance
Transportation Plan Update Recap

Why Update the Plan?

- Increasing traffic congestion
- Paying for current needs difficult enough
- Implement Complete Streets directive
- Bring planning to date with Regional policy
- Moving toward sustainability
- Setting the table for Comprehensive Plan update
Transportation Plan Update Recap

- Whitepapers
- Staff has completed nine “Whitepapers”
- Whitepapers provide strong background and analysis
- Whitepapers support how we develop, shape, and decide on strategies
Transportation Plan Update Recap

- Discussed TPU with Council EIDC – 3 times
- Received buy in for a Transportation Plan based on a full accounting of costs
- Reviewed survey results
- Conducted environmental scoping
- Recently completed the Transportation Plan Preview
Transportation Plan Preview

- Purposes of the Transportation Plan Preview
  - Starts the discussion
  - Summarizes key analysis
  - Highlights significant issues
  - Presents alternatives
Transportation Plan Preview

The Transportation Challenges

- Current Mode Choice
- Imbalance of needs and resources - Shared challenge (WSDOT, Pierce Transit)

Major Policy Issues

- Climate Change- State direction in development
- Sustainability
- Vision 2040, Transportation 2040
- Developing strategies that work
Challenge - Current Mode Choice

Pierce County Travel Modes - Work Trips Per Day

Pierce County Travel Modes by Percent
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Challenge - Imbalance of Needs and Resources
Challenge- Major Policy Issues

- Complete Streets
- Transportation Concurrency
- Vision 2040 Implications
- Climate Change/Greenhouse Gases
- Integration of transportation and land use planning
- Balancing the M,O,P,I,A
Challenge - Complete Streets

- “Complete Streets” promoted in Pierce County Resolution R220-89s
- Assess policies
- Identify barriers and opportunities
- Include a Complete Streets policy
Challenge – Transportation Concurrency

- GMA Requirement
- Traffic Impact Fee Program developed to help address deficiencies
- 2009 Annual Program - $32M to address transportation concurrency
- Deficiencies will “grow” in number and cost
Challenge- Vision 2040 and Transportation 2040

- Our Plan Must be consistent with PSRC’s
- Greater emphasis on growth in Cities
- More on this issue later
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Challenge - Climate Change

- Washington State has passed Greenhouse Gas Reduction Goals
- EPA has proposed finding that Greenhouse Gases “endanger public health and welfare”
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Capacity Alternatives
(Improvements Program in MOPIA)

- Base Programs
- Centers
- Vision 2040
- Concurrency
- All Plans
Key Features of the Alternatives

- Roadway Network/Improvements
- Cost
- Mobility
- Non-motorized Facilities
- Land Use
BASE ALTERNATIVE

- Follows current direction in Traffic Impact Fee Program
- Assumes current land use plans
- $2.135 billion (MOPA included)

(page 5)
CENTERS ALTERNATIVE

- “Moves” population to centers
- Additional transit and Park and Ride ($21M PT)
- More non-motorized facilities
- Same road network as Base Programs Alt.
- $2.174 billion
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VISION 2040 ALTERNATIVE

- Reduces population and employment
- Least congestion
- Least additional roadways assumed
- Most regulatory changes needed
  - land-use density/type
- $2.034 billion
CONCURRENCY ALTERNATIVE

- Assumes current levels of planned development
- Additional roadway projects
- $2.456 billion
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ALL PLANS ALTERNATIVE

- Assumes current levels of planned development
- Most roadway and non-motorized projects, most expensive
- $4.377 billion
## Mobility differences of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Miles Congested (v/s 1.0 &amp; over)</th>
<th>Hrs Congested (daily vehicle hrs delay)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Programs</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>40,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>36,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision 2040</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>32,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrency</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>38,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Plans</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>38,618</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Non-Motorized differences of Alternatives

- Base Programs 170 miles
- Centers 206 miles
- Vision 2040 143 miles
- Concurrency 204 miles
- All Plans 607 miles
Summarizing the Alternatives
Non-motorized

Nonmotorized Facilities by Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Wide Curb Lanes</th>
<th>Paved Shoulders</th>
<th>Sidewalks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Programs</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision 2040</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrency</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Plans</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miles of Facility (les)
# Land Use differences of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternatives</th>
<th>Land Use Assumption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base Programs</td>
<td>Current Plan/Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers</td>
<td>Shift Development to Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision 2040</td>
<td>Lower Current Population Growth in Unincorporated Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concurrency</td>
<td>Current Plan/Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Plans</td>
<td>Current Plan/Zoning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Summary…..

“The one thing we need to do to solve our transportation problems is to stop thinking that there is one thing we can do to solve our transportation problems”

-Robert Liberty, Executive Director of the organization 1000 Friends of Oregon
Discussion Overview

May 5th
- Transportation Plan Update Recap
- A Preview of the Plan

May 6th
- Additional Information from Yesterday
- Plan Costs
- Transportation Finances
- Financing Options
- Council Guidance
## Phone Surveys
### MOPIA Categories: Average Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety (Q35)</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation (Q18-Q19)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations (Q16-Q17)</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance (Q13-Q15)</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements (Q20-Q26)</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (Q27-Q34)</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Average ratings for Maintenance, Operations and Preservation were slightly higher than ratings for Improvements (Non-Safety) and Transit.
Q56-58. Do you support or oppose the following funding options?

- Raising more revenue for congestion relief projects: 68% support, 29% oppose
- Paying a special levy for a specific project: 55% support, 42% oppose
- Raising more revenue for pedestrian/bike improvements: 47% support, 50% oppose
Phone Surveys
Interpreting the Ratings/Funding Relationships

- Congestion
  - Although general support for raising revenue for transportation was not high (40%), a strong majority (68%) supported raising revenue to support congestion relief projects given that a high majority (62%) rated congestion as a serious problem.

- Maintenance and Preservation
  - Participants consider maintenance and preservation activities to be slightly more important than roadway improvements, although a clear majority (61%) favored spending on roadway improvements over maintaining/preserving the system.

- Nonmotorized (Pedestrian and Bicycle) Improvements
  - A majority (~ 54%) rated walking and bicycling conditions as “poor”, yet a plurality (50%) opposed raising revenue for pedestrian/bicycle improvements.

- www.piercecountywa.org/tpu
Centers
Level-of-Service in Counties & Cities

- King County = areawide average travel time
- Snohomish County = road volume & speed
- Auburn = LOS D, some E and F
- Edgewood = LOS C, some D and F
- Fife = LOS D
- Gig Harbor = LOS D, some E and F
- Lakewood = LOS D, some E
- Puyallup = LOS D
- Sumner = LOS D, some F
- Tacoma = areawide average volume/capacity
- University Place = LOS D, some Quality Service Corridors
Plan Costs

- 20 Year costs for objectives outlined (all alternatives)
  - Administration $220M
  - Maintenance $325M
  - Operations $206M
  - Preservation $341M

  subtotal $1,092M (2007 dollars)
## Plan Costs

- **20 Year costs for objectives outlined**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>$67M</td>
<td>$67M</td>
<td>$67M</td>
<td>$67M</td>
<td>$67M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion</td>
<td>$698M</td>
<td>$698M</td>
<td>$597M</td>
<td>$1,019M</td>
<td>$1,019M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$680M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add Non-Motorized</td>
<td></td>
<td>$39M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,241M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td>$765M</td>
<td>$804M</td>
<td>$664M</td>
<td>$1,086M</td>
<td>$3,007M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Cost Total</td>
<td>$1,857M</td>
<td>$1,896M</td>
<td>$1,756M</td>
<td>$2178M</td>
<td>$4,099M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w/Development</td>
<td>$2,135M</td>
<td>$2,174M</td>
<td>$2,034M</td>
<td>$2,456M</td>
<td>$4,377M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transportation Finances

- Revenues
  - MOPIA Eligible Revenues
  - Improvement (Capacity)-Only Revenues
Transportation Finances

- Revenues
  - MOPIA Eligible Revenues
    - Property Tax = $1.42/$1000 valuation
    - Fuel Tax = Counties share 5.37 cents/gallon
    - Forest Tax = based on State & Federal harvest receipts
  - Ferry Receipts = fares, rents, and subsidies
  - Other
    - Miscellaneous
    - Work for cities
    - Emergency relief
Current Revenues

Pierce County Road Fund by Source
2008

- Property Tax: 78%
- Fuel Tax: 20%
- Forest Tax: 2%
Property Tax

Pierce County Road Fund
Property Tax Revenue
1995 - 2009

Lakewood, UP, Edgewood Incorporations

Trend = 5.8%/year (excluding 1995)
Fuel Tax

Pierce County Road Fund
Fuel Tax Revenue
1995-2009

trend = 0.3%/year
(excluding 2009)
Forest Tax

Pierce County Road Fund
Forest Tax Revenue
1995-2009
Combined Revenues

Pierce County Road Fund Sources
1995-2009

Property Tax
Fuel Tax
Forest tax
Transportation Finances

- Revenues
  - Improvement (Capacity)-Only Revenues
    - Real Estate Excise Tax = 75% of 1/4%
    - Traffic Impact Fees = based on new land use
    - Motor Vehicle License Fees = eliminated in 2002
  - Grants (TIB, FMSIB, CRAB, federal, etc.)
  - Other Development Investments = roads built as part of development
  - Other Miscellaneous Revenue
Development Investments
Forecasts (20 Years)

- Projecting Existing Revenues
  - Property taxes $918M
  - Fuel Tax $182M
  - Forest Tax $16M
  - Miscellaneous $33M
  - Ferry receipts $65M
  - REET $60M
  - TIF $340M
  - Grants $160M

Total $1,774M
Forecasts

- MOPA – existing sources should suffice
  - Property tax keeps up with inflation
  - Fuel tax increases by the State will help Counties

- Improvements
  - Grants will decline
  - Addressing congestion will be difficult
    - Improvement (Capacity-only) Sources = $560M
    - Needs = $597M to $1,019M depending on alternative
  - Funding all needs is highly unlikely
Revenue vs. Alternative Cost
## Gap of Revenue vs. Alternative Cost

### Improvements Gap

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Centers</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>Concurrency</th>
<th>All Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Cost</td>
<td>$1,857M</td>
<td>$1,896M</td>
<td>$1,756M</td>
<td>$2,178M</td>
<td>$4,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>$1,774M</td>
<td>$1,774M</td>
<td>$1,774M?</td>
<td>$1,774M</td>
<td>$1,774M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>$83M</td>
<td>$122M</td>
<td>$404M</td>
<td>$2,325M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Filling the Gap” Options

- Transportation Revenue Sources Available
  - Property tax
  - Fuel tax
  - Vehicle tax
  - Sales tax
  - Traffic Impact Fees
Property Tax

- Maximum allowed = $2.25/$1000 value
- Currently at $1.42 in 2009 ($1.52 in 2008)
- $0.28 (2009) of total goes to Law Enforcement
- Levy increase requires public vote
- Could generate up to $33M/year if increase to $2.25
- Increases with inflation
Fuel Tax

- State could raise Gas Tax
- Local Option Gas Tax
  - Maximum allowed = $0.0375/gallon (10% of State)
  - Requires a public vote
  - Could generate approximately $30M/year
  - Does not increase with inflation
Vehicle Tax

- $20 Vehicle License Fee allowed with Council Vote
  - $100 VLF allowed with Public Vote
- Tied to projects
- Could generate $8M/year for County (+$8M for Cities) with $20 VLF
  - Could generate $40M/year for County (+$40M for Cities) with $100 VLF
- Does not increase with inflation
Sales Tax

- General Sales Tax
  - Already close to maximum
  - Used for other government purposes

- Transportation Sales Tax
  - 0.2% allowed in a transportation benefit district
  - Tied to projects
  - Requires a public vote
  - Could generate $9M/year
Traffic Impact Fees

- Traffic Impact Fee
- Already Assumed $340M over 20 years for existing TIF (based on development paying 40% of the project costs)
- Maximum allowed is Approx. 70%
- Requires Council vote to increase
- Could generate additional $255M over 20 year at 70% maximum allowed
- Increases with inflation
Grants

- Federal
  - Highway Trust Fund is empty
  - No vehicle mileage tax
  - Uncertain future

- State
  - Granting agencies out of gas tax
  - No call for projects in 2009 or 2010
  - TIB, FMSIB, PWTF, CRAB

- Others control our future – transportation investment that facilitates economic development
Preferred Alternative

- Could be a hybrid of alternatives, but
- One needs to be selected
  - We recommend developing a preferred alternative before the next public review
  - The Executive would like to engage the Council in the development of this preferred alternative
  - How?
Next Steps

- Select a Preferred Alternative
- Environmental review of alternatives
- Public review of alternatives
- Plan adoption in early 2010