

**ISLAND SUB-REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ORGANIZATION  
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**

**1:00 PM, Thursday, March 13, 2014  
Room 131, Law & Justice Building (Enter from 5<sup>th</sup> Street Parking lot)**

**AGENDA**

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Approval of February 13, 2014 minutes
3. TAP Project Selection Criteria  
*Discussion about potential changes to scoring criteria for next TAP project selection cycle*
4. STP call for projects for 2015 and beyond  
*Discussion about proposed schedule for next STP project selection cycle*
5. New Items / Roundtable discussion

Attachments: February 13, 2014 minutes  
TAP Project Selection Criteria

Please contact Doug Cox at (360) 678-7959 if there are any other items to add

Next meeting: Thursday, April 10th, 2014.

**MINUTES OF MEETING**  
**ISLAND RTPO TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**February 13, 2014**

**Attendance List**

Arnie Peterschmidt, City of Oak Harbor  
Bob Monize, District 3 Citizen Rep.  
Brian Wood, District 2 Citizen Rep.  
Cac Kamak, City of Oak Harbor  
Connie Bowers, Island County  
Curt Gordon, Port of South Whidbey  
Doug Cox, RTPO Staff  
Eric Brooks, Island County  
Greg Cane, Town of Coupeville  
John Shambaugh, WSDOT  
Pete Schrum, Island Transit  
Stan Berryman, City of Langley

**Members not in Attendance**

Brad Johnson, Island County  
Don Meehan, District 1 Citizen Rep.

Doug began the meeting at 1:00 PM. Brief introductions were made.

Doug asked if there was a motion to approve the January 9th meeting minutes. Connie made a motion to approve, with Brian seconding. The motion carried.

**Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) Project Selection Subcommittee Rankings:**

The group discussed the results of the project selection subcommittee's meeting on January 30<sup>th</sup>.

Doug reiterated that this is the first time that the projects will be selected as a region instead of by the individual sub-regions. Under this new process, each TAC ranked the projects for their sub-region. A subcommittee comprised of representatives from each TAC then met to develop a regional priority ranking by using forced-pair comparisons. The following TAC members served on the project selection subcommittee:

- Arnie Peterschmidt serving as a local agency staff representative
- Brian Wood as a citizen representative
- Connie Bowers as an Island County staff representative

The top-ranking project from each sub-region was compared to the other, and the subcommittee discussed which one is most consistent with regional priorities. Then, the next-highest ranked project from the sub-region that was chosen in the first comparison was compared to the top-ranking project from the other sub-region. This continued until all the projects had been compared and a neatly-ordered list of regional priorities was assembled. Upon recommendation from the TAC, the project list will then be brought to the individual sub-RTPO Policy Boards, and ultimately to the Skagit-Island RTPO Policy Board for final discussion and approval. Curt made a motion to recommend approval of the project list, with Pete seconding. The motion passed with all in favor.

### **Transportation System Preparedness discussion:**

Eric Brooks joined the group to provide an overview of the County's *Transportation Recovery Annex*, and how Island County fits into the Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Program. He also went into detail about some of the challenges we would likely face in a catastrophe, including access to potable water and ensuring there is sufficient fuel available to transport it where it is needed. Eric stressed the need for island residents to be prepared and to plan on being self-sufficient for as long as possible in the event of a catastrophic event. After the meeting, he provided a link to the [Regional Catastrophic Preparedness Program website](#) where the Island County Transportation Recovery Annex can be viewed and downloaded. He asked that TAC members become familiar with the document and send him questions and feedback.

Eric also informed the group of the County's participation in "[My State USA](#)", which is a website service that allows governments to provide e-alerts to residents. He asked that members sign up and encourage others to do so as well.

### **New Items**

Doug discussed the upcoming public meetings for the Transportation Element of the County's Comprehensive Plan, and asked that TAC members attend any of the three meetings that they are interested and able to. The meetings will take place at the following dates, times and places:

- Tuesday, February 18th at Whidbey Island Community Education Center (5611 Bayview Road-- Old Bayview School)
- Wednesday, February 19th at the Oak Harbor Branch of the Sno-Isle Library (1000 SE Regatta Drive)
- Thursday, February 27th at the Camano Multi-purpose Center (141 NE Camano Drive)

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM

**Next Regular TAC Meeting: March 13, 2014**

# TAP PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

Project Sponsor:

Project Name:

## *PROJECT SCREENING CRITERIA*

---

1. Is this project in an urban area? **Yes/No**
2. Is this project included or consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan? **Yes/No**
3. Does this project contain at least one eligible Transportation Alternatives category?

**Eligible Categories:** \_\_\_\_\_

4. Is the project listed in lead agency's current six-year TIP? **Yes/No**
5. If a construction project, does it include a minimum of \$150,000 in TAP or other federal funds?  
**Yes/No**

6. When is the soonest this project can obligate funds? **FFY:** \_\_\_\_\_

7. What is the amount of TAP funds requested? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Is the project sponsor able to provide matching funds? **Yes/No**

9. If requested amount of TAP funds are awarded, will it be enough to complete the construction of the project? **If Yes, 10 points**

(see reverse)

# TAP PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

Project Sponsor:

Project Name:

## *PORTION TO BE SCORED BY TAC*

---

1. How well does this project promote economic vitality? **1 to 10 points**
  
2. How well does this project maintain, preserve, and extend the life and utility of prior investments in transportation services? **1 to 10 points**
  
3. How well does this project provide for and improve the safety of the transportation customer and the transportation system? **1 to 10 points**
  
4. How well does this project improve the predictable movement of goods and people throughout the region? **1 to 10 points**
  
5. How well does this project promote energy conservation, enhance healthy communities, and protect the environment? **1 to 10 points**
  
6. How well does this project enhance stewardship (to continuously improve the quality, effectiveness, and efficiency of the transportation system)? **1 to 10 points**

**Total Score: \_\_\_\_/70**