

MEETING SUMMARY
IRTPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
April 12, 2018

Member Attendance List

Nathan Howard, Island County Planning
Kim Hinds, Town of Coupeville
Cac Kamak, City of Oak Harbor
Pete Schrum, Island Transit
Stan Berryman, City of Langley
John Shambaugh, WSDOT
Bob Monize, District 3 Citizen Rep.
Connie Bowers, Island County Public Works

Members not in Attendance

Angi Mozer, Port of South Whidbey
Joe Stowell, City of Oak Harbor
Christine Boswell-Still, District 2 Citizen Rep.
Brian Tyhuis, NAS Whidbey Island
Don Meehan, District 1 Citizen Rep.
John Mishasek, Island County EDC

Other Attendees

Thera Black, SCJ Alliance

Facilitator

Brian Wood, IRTPO Staff

The meeting began at 1:00 PM

Action Items:

- Finalize ranking for federal funding application criteria
- Bring Policy Wheel Concept to Executive Board
- Bring federal funding application criteria ranking recommendations to Executive Board
- Long term: revise transportation element certification checklist to be consistent with final regional transportation plan and adopt with that document

Motions

- March minutes were approved

Updates and Action Items:

- Information from the last Executive Board meeting was reviewed for TAC members

Regional Transportation Plan Development

- Thera Black of SCJ Alliance presented a “Policy Wheel” concept where four perspective elements could be rotated around the 12 identified goals to encourage dynamic prioritization. Perspective elements included:
 - Sustainability
 - Leadership
 - System Management
 - Preparedness
- The concept was well received by TAC members.

Category Points for IRTPO Federally Funded Project Applications

- Once again, TAC members completed a forced-pairs scoring exercise to determine weights that should be assigned to the categories used to score project applications.
- Each member scored the categories independently and then compared and discussed reasons for valuations. The following ranking weights were determined:

Criteria	%	R
Equity	14.5%	1
Safety	14.5%	1
Access	13.6%	2
Opportunities & Partnerships	10.9%	3
Preservation	9.1%	4
Stewardship	9.1%	4
Economic Vitality	9.1%	4
Mobility	8.2%	5
Environment	7.3%	6
Planning Consistency	3.6%	7

- *Discussion:* In general all criteria were considered important for evaluating projects and the range in weightings reflects this. Planning Consistency was somewhat lower, as members felt that it was a given and so should not overweight a project's score. Other criteria that received considerable discussion follow:
 - Equity refers to putting extra effort toward promoting underserved populations or modes. The idea that staff and decision makers should put extra emphasis on unrepresented groups came through in the comments. Generally, improvements that serve underrepresented interests have a wider benefit (better transit connections allow lower income individuals to take the bus, which reduces the number of cars on the road, so driving trips also improve).
 - Safety was always a high priority, but there was concern that it did not dominate the conversation.
 - Access was contrasted with mobility, in that access lets a system user participate in the first place and mobility addresses how efficiently they are served by it (is it congested). Some system users may not feel capable of using an unshouldered roadway as a pedestrian or cyclist, or it may be difficult to reach transit, therefore no mobility issue is occurring for those modes.
 - Opportunities and Partnerships were recognized as less common circumstances, and therefore ones we did not want to get in the way of. Thus, this criterion ranked high.
 - Paradoxically, environment ranked lower. While all members valued a healthy environment, the engineering perspective was that environmental issues were more likely to block a project from going forward. Projects that did not introduce environmental questions, would be prioritized.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM

Next Regular TAC Meeting: May 10, 2018