

# Transportation Planning Advisory Committee (TPAC)

April 15, 2008 7-9p

## Meeting Minutes

TPAC members - Annie Humiston, Gary Anderson, Larry Matel, Ray Pardo, Gary Lindsey, Linda Berry-Maraist

TPAC members not in attendance - R. Shane Phillips, Dick Hayes, Ann Erickson

Citizens at Large – Bob Moyer, Ed Seifert, Ralph Sinamon, Andrej Kasniak, Jay Spady, Bill Bryan

Kitsap County Staff – Jim Rogers, Jeff Shea, Greg Cioc

The following documents were handed out at this meeting:

- TPAC Agenda
- TPAC By-laws (draft)
- LOS & Concurrency discussion questions
- LOS schedule
- WSDOT 2025 Bottleneck and Chokepoints map
- Climate Change Legislation
- Non-motorized Plan Schedule
- Current TIP Map

### **Welcome**

Jim Rogers welcomed the committee members. Members introduced themselves and talked about what area of the county they are representing and why they are interested in participating.

### **By-Laws Discussion**

As an official Advisory Committee to the County, By-laws will need to be approved. Ray Pardo and Annie Humiston volunteered to develop the Advisory Committee By-laws and a Draft TPAC By-law document was presented at this meeting. The by-laws were reviewed and one particular issue needs to be addressed, that of staggering the terms of the participants to maintain continuity of the group. This issue was tabled until next meeting to allow members to consider a proposal to have 1, 2 and 3-year terms and who would be assigned to each length of term.

### **General Discussion**

One member stated that it would be nice to have Executive Summaries of the issues as reading the Comprehensive Plan was quite onerous.

Discussion also focused on the number of issues the Committee would address. Jim Rogers stated that it would be best to keep the number of issues at any one time to two ie. current Level of Service/Concurrency discussion and the pending Non-Motorized Plan Update.

### **Level of Service Discussion**

Jim Rogers then began a discussion on Level of Service (LOS) issues on county roads. He presented a power point presentation that discussed LOS and had visual depictions of various LOS in Seattle.

The methodology for determining county LOS was presented (Volume of traffic divided by the Capacity of the facility). This ratio is then compared to the LOS table to determine if the facility is in or out of compliance with the county's adopted LOS standard of 'C' for rural roads (outside the Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) or 'D' for urban roads within the UGAs). It was then presented that Kitsap County is unique in that we allow for 15% of the county arterial roads to be out of compliance countywide.

### **Concurrency**

Concurrency was the next issue tackled as Jim discussed concurrency and its relation to LOS. The 15% buffer allows for development to be approved as long as we remain within that percentage. Since currently the county is at 4.3% there is little danger of a moratorium on construction. The county is not expected to be above 15% until approximately 2018. These facts generated much interest within the Committee regarding the 15% buffer and whether this is the right approach to enforcing the provisions of GMA.

### **Road Impact Fees**

This issue focused on the cost of constructing a residential unit and commercial development. The current impact fee for a residential unit is ~\$570, while commercial development is costed out by square footage and land use type. Everyone seemed to agree that the county's impact fees were low, especially compared to peer groups. Andrej Kasniak from Poulsbo Public Works pointed out that Poulsbo's fees were \$3,000 to \$3,500 for a single-family residential unit with the potential for doubling in the future. Greg Cioc discussed the fee structure that McCormick Woods voluntarily selected in order to fund projects along Old Clifton Road to accommodate the significant increase in construction anticipated in the next few years.

### **Questions to be addressed by the County**

Do we measure LOS by peak hour or average daily traffic?

What are the total fees developers pay now for all impacts; roads, schools, parks and permits?

### **Other Issues**

The committee was concerned about State Highways, Highways of Statewide Significance LOS issues, and the lack of control the county has over state highways. The committee asked how it could encourage the state to provide capacity within the county to accommodate development. This is a universal problem and may be a topic for future meetings with the committee and WSDOT representatives.

Jim reiterated that the County does not have the authority to set LOS for the state, but that the county worked with both WSDOT (and WSF) when we developed the 10-year update to the County Comprehensive Plan.

### **Take Homes**

At the end of the meeting, Jim asked members to think about opinions about the current LOS standards, the phasing out or continuation of the 15% rule and opinions on the fee structure and how it could be sold to the public.

### **New Issues**

Jim asked if there were new issues to be considered. The following were mentioned:

- Traffic safety (High accident locations (HALs))
- Alternative fuel vehicles and their affect on climate change
- General climate change issues
- Non-motorized incentives for trails ie. tax breaks
- Signage standards
- Signal warrants (stop signs to stop lights)
- Land use and transportation linkages

These issues will be integrated appropriately into the scope of the committee's Work Plan.

The Meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:00 pm.

**Next meeting: May 20, 2008 7-9p, Silverdale Community Center**

Level of Service/Concurrency will again be the primary topic of discussion.