

## **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN AMENDMENTS - TRANSPORTATION POLICY BOARD ACTIONS**

This document summarizes the proposed amendments to the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the corresponding Transportation Policy Board action. Also noted are the sections and page numbers implementing the amendment in the redlined version of the plan document. As a reminder, the full public comments report – including all comments by subject matter, comment type and a PSRC staff response – may be found on PSRC’s website at <https://www.psrc.org/our-work/rtp>.

Due to the significant overlap across proposed amendments and topics, specific amendment packages were developed that combined similar themes and intent. **Group 1** topics were considered technical corrections to the plan document and staff was directed to move forward to implement these corrections, as well as the technical corrections noted during public comment, for inclusion in the final plan. **Group 2** topics were considered as proposed amendments for board review, and the TPB reviewed and took action on each proposal and package as indicated.

**Group 1: Board Proposed Technical Corrections/Clarifications**

**March 31 TPB action: Recommend staff move forward to implement the suite of Technical Corrections (from public comment and proposed board member amendments as identified in Group 1) for inclusion in the final draft plan. Motion passed unanimously.**

Topic: Bicycle/Pedestrian				
<p><b>Group 1 BP-1</b></p>	<p>Bellevue</p>		<p>Provide clarity about the need for increased emphasis on projects that will help meet VISION 2050’s walk distance to high-capacity transit</p>	<p><b>Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: The importance of bike/ped connectivity to transit is addressed in many areas of the plan, but in particular on page 27 in the Transit section and pages 56 and 59 of the Bicycle/Pedestrian section in Chapter 1, and in the What’s Ahead sections of Chapter 4. Staff proposes to review these sections and provide additional language and emphasis on the access to transit needs and the relationship to the Regional Growth Strategy.</p> <p><u><b>See p. 57; p. 59; p. 62</b></u></p>
<p><b>Group 1 BP-2</b></p>	<p>Bellevue</p>		<p>Provide information about how region’s safety goals relate to the bicycle/pedestrian section</p>	<p><b>Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: An emphasis on safety is included in the What’s Ahead section of the Bicycle/Pedestrian section in Chapter 1 of the plan. Staff proposes to incorporate any additional safety elements amended into the plan from current board discussions and update the language in this section to provide more clarity and emphasis as feasible.</p> <p><u><b>See p. 59</b></u></p>

**Topic: Big Ideas / Technology**

<p><b>Group 1 BI-1</b></p>	<p>Seattle / King County / State of WA / Port of Seattle</p>		<p>Recognize the Ballard-Interbay Regional Transportation System (BIRT) report and its objectives in the plan</p>	<p><b>Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: The draft plan discusses the need for preservation and maintenance, including specific needs for the region’s bridges and in particular for freight movement and in the region’s manufacturing/industrial centers. Staff proposes to further include a sidebar identifying and discussing the BIRT report on p.73 in Chapter 1’s Streets and Highways section.</p> <p><b><u>See p. 71</u></b></p>
<p><b>Group 1 BI-2</b></p>	<p>Bellevue</p>		<p>Provide additional context to the emergence of autonomous vehicles in the region</p>	<p><b>Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: In the “New and Emerging Technologies” section, staff proposes to expand the discussion of “Connected and Autonomous Vehicles” to provide additional details on current trends and work such as that of the Washington State Autonomous Vehicle Work Group (<a href="https://avworkgroupwa.org/">https://avworkgroupwa.org/</a>).</p> <p><b><u>See pp. 102-103</u></b></p>
<p><b>Group 1 BI-3</b></p>	<p>Bellevue</p>		<p>Highlight the opportunity to leverage new data source options</p>	<p><b>Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: At the conclusion of the “ITS Assets” section, staff proposes to emphasize the availability, trends and potential benefits of new and better-integrated data sources to cost-effectively operate and manage the region’s transportation system.</p> <p><b><u>See p. 100</u></b></p>
<p><b>Group 1 BI-4</b></p>	<p>Bellevue</p>		<p>Develop a framework for updating the Transportation System Visualization Tool</p>	<p><b>Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: Staff proposes to identify the need and planned work to maintain the visualization tool in the What’s Ahead section of Chapter 4. The board has already begun a conversation on PSRC’s transportation work program post plan-adoption and a proposed timeline for this work, with further discussions expected later in 2022. In addition, staff proposes to identify the intention to regularly update the Transportation System Visualization Tool with available data in support of future RTP development in the “Amending the Regional Transportation Plan” section on p. 185 of the plan.</p>

[See p. 180](#)

## Group 2: Amendments / Proposals Requiring Further Board Review and Direction

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: Project Amendments</b>			
PA-1a	Kitsap Transit	Correction to the alignment of Routes 8, 217 and 390.	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: Staff is preparing an analysis that addresses these proposed revisions and additional projects and will provide analysis results for inclusion in the SEPA addendum. Minimal impact to the regional analysis is expected.</p> <p>Board direction requested to proceed with revisions and update analysis data for SEPA publishing.</p> <p><b><i>March 31 TPB Action: Staff is directed to proceed with revisions PA-1a-d and update the RTP analysis data for SEPA publishing. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p>
PA-1b	Community Transit	Correction to the alignment of the Blue Line and Silver Line; correction to the alignment and terminus of the Orange Line at Edmonds College.	
PA-1c	Tacoma	<p>Add four new projects:</p> <p>Portland Avenue: I-5 to 72nd St E</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>I-5 to 29th:</b> shared use path on east side of road with possible changes to vehicular lane capacity</li> <li><b>29th to 72nd:</b> Convert two through lanes (one in each direction) to protected bike lanes</li> </ul> <p>Orchard St/Lakewood Dr: S 56th St to S 74th St</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove center turn lane; use width for a widened shared use path on one side of the street</li> </ul> <p>S 74th/72nd St: S Cedar St to Waller Rd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Convert two through lanes (one in each direction) to protected bike lanes</li> </ul> <p>South Tacoma Way from Pine Street to South 47th St</p>	

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Convert the eastbound through lane to protected bicycle lanes or a shared use path</li> </ul>	
PA-1d	WSDOT	<p>Modify two projects:</p> <p>Project #4194, I-5/DuPont-Steilacoom Rd to Thorne Ln Corridor Improvements: changing from “constructing an additional lane on I-5 between the DuPont-Steilacoom Road and Thorne Lane interchanges” to “construct additional HOV lanes in both directions of I-5 between DuPont-Steilacoom Road and Thorne Lane interchanges.”</p> <p>Project #4419, I-5/Mounts Rd to DuPont-Steilacoom Rd Corridor Improvements: changing from “construct additional general purpose lanes in both directions between Mounts Rd and DuPont-Steilacoom Rd...” to “construct additional HOV lanes in both directions...”</p>	

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: Big Ideas / Technology</b>			
<b>BI-1</b>	<i>From public comment</i>	Take bolder action on lidding I-5 and work with partners to secure funding and convene regional stakeholders	<p><b>Board direction requested – Staff proposed Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: PSRC does not have a direct role in proposing or advocating for specific projects as suggested with this comment; rather, PSRC provides support to project sponsors and engages at the regional scale. We encourage the commenter to work with WSDOT and the City of Seattle to pursue particular investments and include projects in the comprehensive planning process.</p> <p>However, staff proposes to update language in Chapter 4 to strengthen reference to innovative work such as that noted with the lidding of I-5; per the March 10 board meeting discussion, this language will address this type of work throughout the region and not just within the City of Seattle.</p> <p><b><i>March 31 TPB Action: Recommend staff move forward with a technical correction to the plan as described. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><i><u>See Chapter 4, pp. 177-178</u></i></b></p>
<b>BI-2</b>	<i>From WSDOT public comment</i>	Strengthen implementation aspects of the RTP, provide more detail on next steps, actions, and timelines	<p><b>Board direction requested - Staff proposed Technical Correction and future PSRC Work</b></p> <p>Staff response: staff proposes to improve and strengthen the current language in the plan regarding necessary implementation actions to the extent possible within the timeframe remaining before plan adoption. Staff further proposes to work with the board on development of an action plan after the plan is adopted, to include more robust and specific details on the various implementation steps included in the RTP. The PSRC Transportation Policy Board began a discussion of PSRC’s transportation work program earlier in the year, with intent to continue this discussion post plan-adoption. Further board direction on specific priorities and timing for PSRC’s work program and resources will be required, given the numerous implementation items and topics to be addressed.</p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
			<p><b>March 31 TPB Action: Recommend staff move forward with a technical correction to the plan as described, and identify the future PSRC work program and development of an action plan. Note: staff proposes to engage the board on the discussion of priorities and timelines immediately after plan adoption. Motion passed unanimously.</b></p> <p><b><u>See Chapter 4 What's Ahead section – pp. 185</u></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: Coordinated Mobility Plan / ADA Transition Plans</b>			
<b>CMP-1</b>	Rep. Wicks	<p>Add following to Coordinated Mobility Plan as high priority strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritize land use and transportation plans and funding to create ability-friendly &amp; age-friendly communities</li> <li>• Convene stakeholders to set a baseline service level goal for providing transit and door-to-door services within the rural context</li> </ul>	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: The strategies and priorities included in the Coordinated Mobility Plan (CMP) were thoroughly vetted and reviewed through extensive outreach with affected stakeholders and PSRC's Special Needs Transportation Committee.</p> <p>The current CMP addresses necessary ADA infrastructure for walk/bike/roll modes, as well as transit needs in the rural area. PSRC does not have a role in operational decisions related to transit services; individual transit agencies, mobility coalitions and non-profit service providers work together on those types of operational decisions. Representatives of these bodies are on PSRC's Special Needs Transportation Committee.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p> <p><b>March 31 TPB Action: The plan is maintained as is with no amendment. Motion passed unanimously.</b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>CMP-2</b>	Rep. Wicks	Maintain a regional list and track progress of all local ADA Transition Plans, Complete Streets ordinances and plans, and other active transportation plans	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: These three proposals relate primarily to a PSRC role with ADA Transition Plans. As part of the RTP data collection efforts in 2019-2020, PSRC researched the current status of active transportation plans, policies and ordinances. This can be a regularly maintained data set for each future plan update. At this point in time PSRC does not have a role related to the tracking, development or analysis of ADA transition plans. It is our understanding that WSDOT and FHWA monitor and evaluate these plans for consistency with state and federal requirements. Staff can coordinate with these agencies on roles and responsibilities and report on the status of these plans.</p>
<b>CMP-2a</b>	Pierce County / Tacoma / Rep. Wicks	Support development and analysis of ADA transition plans & hire a regional ADA plan coordinator	<p>Board direction is requested on this topic. At board direction, PSRC would work to identify and incorporate resources in the budget and work program to support this planning work.</p>
<b>CMP-2b</b>	Pierce County / Tacoma / Rep. Wicks	Identify a regional funding source to support implementation of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) transition plans and other active transportation plans	<p><b><i>March 31 TPB Action: Recommend staff elevate ADA transition planning and implementation by including more detailed information in the “What’s Ahead” section of the RTP, and identify future PSRC work on this topic. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><u>See p. 185</u></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: Equity</b>			
<b>E-1</b>	Pierce County / Tacoma	<p>Develop a methodology for project level displacement risk analysis</p> <p><i>Note: E-1 from Group 1 was brought down and discussed in tandem with this proposal; see below</i></p>	<p><b>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: PSRC does not have a direct role in project level mitigation, however we do provide resources and guidance such as PSRC’s displacement risk tool, particularly as part of PSRC’s project selection process. Page 126 of the RTP has a section called “Resources for Project-Level Analysis and Mitigation” that identifies data sets, resources, and tools for project-specific equity analysis. Staff proposes to update this section to identify the regional Displacement Risk and Opportunity Mapping tools.</p> <p>PSRC continues to work on refining and improving regional equity analyses, tools, data, and technical assistance for its members as part of the PSRC Equity work program. This includes developing improved displacement risk tools and methodologies, particularly for people of color and people with low-income. The equity section on p. 127 of the RTP will be expanded to identify this ongoing work.</p> <p>Page 126 of the equity section also references potential displacement risk mitigation measures identified in the VISION 2050 Final SEIS. These measures will be included more explicitly in the plan’s Equity Analysis, Appendix F.</p>
<b>Group 1 E-1</b>	Pierce County / Tacoma	<p>Include displacement of people of color and people with low-income in regional equity analyses, including potential mitigation measures</p> <p><i>Note: this item was pulled from Group 1 and moved to Group 2 to be discussed in tandem with the proposal above</i></p>	<p><b>Group 1 – Proposed Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: PSRC continues to work on refining and improving regional equity analyses, tools, data, and technical assistance for its members as part of the PSRC Equity work program. This includes developing improved displacement risk tools and analysis, particularly for people of color and people with low-income. Staff proposes to expand the equity section on p. 127 of the RTP to identify this ongoing work.</p> <p>In addition, the Equity Analysis Summary section references potential displacement risk mitigation measures identified in the VISION 2050 Final SEIS. These measures will be included more explicitly in the plan’s Equity Analysis, Appendix F.</p> <p><b><i>March 31 TPB Board Action: Recommend staff move forward with a technical correction to the plan as described under both proposals. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>See pp. 128-129</i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
E-2	Pierce County / Tacoma	Identify Equity Advisory Committee role in development of future Project Selection frameworks	<p><b>Board direction requested - Staff Proposed No Action Needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: RTP page 131 identifies this role for the Equity Advisory Committee as part of the creation and implementation of the Regional Equity Strategy.</p> <p><b><i>March 31 TPB Action: The plan is maintained as is with no amendment. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p>
E-3	Pierce County / Tacoma	Include a future work program commitment to analyze the equity of current transportation funding of all funds and all modes, and develop clear criteria to determine whether transportation funding is distributed equitably (racial equity, low-income communities and geography)	<p><b>Board direction requested - Staff Proposed No Action Needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: PSRC completes an Equity Analysis as part of each Transportation Improvement Program (<a href="https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/tip2020-appendixf-equityanalysis.pdf">https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/tip2020-appendixf-equityanalysis.pdf</a>). The analysis evaluates distribution by project mode (transit, roadway, bicycle/pedestrian, etc.), and proximity to and benefit or burden to different demographic groups.</p> <p>In addition, as background supporting regional project selection cycles, PSRC conducts an analysis of the historic distribution of funds it manages by mode and county. In addition, equity was significantly enhanced as part of the 2022 Policy Framework for PSRC's Federal Funds, and a commitment made to conduct an evaluation of the recommended projects, including subsequent work with the Equity Advisory Committee to debrief the process and conduct a new Equity Pilot Program regional funding competition, to be conducted in early 2023. Further, PSRC has committed to a board discussion in 2022 of the methodology for equitably distributing FTA formula funds.</p> <p><b><i>March 31 TPB Action: Recommend staff update the language in the plan to clearly identify this work program as described. Motion passed with one no vote.</i></b></p> <p><b><i><u>See p. 182</u></i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: Water Quality</b>			
<b>W-1a</b>	<i>From public comment</i>	Partner with transportation agencies to develop a plan avoid or mitigate impacts to salmon and Southern Resident Killer Whales and ensure the transportation sector does not infringe on tribal treaty rights	<p><b>Board direction needed – Staff Proposed Technical Correction</b></p> <p>Staff response: PSRC does not have a role in project-level mitigation nor does the agency currently have expertise in the area of water quality. PSRC is committed to continuing to work with partner agencies such as the Puget Sound Partnership, Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Ecology to share best practices and information related to transportation’s impact on water quality, emerging issues, new requirements, etc.</p>
<b>W-1b</b>	<i>From public comment</i>	Identify and implement strategies to provide significant and sufficient treatment of stormwater from roads and addressing 6PPD	<p>Staff proposes to add more information and language to the plan specific to the issues of tribal treaty rights, new contaminants from stormwater, and emphasizing the importance of the treatment of road runoff and stormwater best practices.</p> <p>In addition, projects must comply with requirements related to stormwater discharge under the oversight of resources agencies such as the WA Department of Ecology and the National Marine Fisheries Service.</p> <p><b><i>March 31 TPB Action: No amendment proposed.</i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: Financial Strategy</b>			
<b>F-1</b>	Rep. Wicks	<p>Add language to Financial Strategy:  “Make policy decisions on collection and distribution of user fees, <u>aligning pricing and revenue expenditures with achieving regional climate, equity, and mobility goals</u>”</p>	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: The RTP Financial Strategy assumes implementation of a Road Usage Charge (RUC) starting in 2030 to begin replacement of the state motor fuel tax. As modeled for the plan, mileage charges are assessed at ten cents per mile in peak periods and five cents in non-peak periods. The Washington State Transportation Commission’s RUC studies assume a flat 2.5 cent per mile charge at all times, generally equivalent to current motor fuel tax rates.</p> <p>These and other pricing mechanisms (state facility / express lane tolls, etc.) do have a demand management impact, reducing vehicle miles traveled and associated emissions. These pricing mechanisms are also part of the region’s 4-Part GHG strategy. The Financial Strategy assumes that a RUC would be designed and administered in a manner that addresses potential inequities for lower-income motorists and those without access to transportation alternatives.</p> <p>The RTP Financial Strategy states the assumption that revenues from a RUC would not be restricted to highways and roadways and would therefore be available for investments in all transportation modes, including transit and bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and services.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on the additional language proposed.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: The plan is maintained as is with no amendment. The motion failed to pass with 13 no votes and 7 yes votes.</i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
Topic: Bicycle/Pedestrian			
BP-1	CM Gelder / Rep. Wicks	Support updates and analysis of the Active Transportation Plan, in addition to regional capacity projects, to close substantial gaps in the facility network; Include Leafline Trails Network	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: The current (2018-20240) RTP includes an “Active Transportation Plan” appendix. This is a lengthy document that includes a substantial amount of background and historical information, and over the past several years it was determined that this document has not been well utilized in further planning work. In coordination with PSRC’s Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee, the approach for the draft (2018-2050) RTP was to integrate bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and needs more fully into the full plan, recognizing its importance and alignment with other elements such as access to transit. The Transportation System Visualization Tool was also developed, with a much more robust data set for existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, and inclusion of forecast and planned investments. The intent was to update and maintain this visualization tool over time and utilize the BPAC and PSRC’s website as ongoing repositories of these bicycle and pedestrian products. In addition, regarding specific projects, the draft RTP includes an estimate of programmatic bicycle/pedestrian needs in the financial strategy and identifies priorities for connectivity, safety, and access to transit; further, projects meeting the threshold for inclusion on the Regional Capacity Projects list are represented in the plan, but only if they are derived from and included in a local, transit or state planning document.</p> <p>Board direction is requested if this approach should be modified for future updates.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: Recommend staff amend the plan to identify future work to develop a stand-alone Active Transportation Plan document built from the existing work and RTP documentation. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><u><i>See p. 185-186</i></u></b></p>
BP-2	CM Gelder	Add a “Regional Active Transportation Network” section to Chapter 4 that	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: Page 180 of Chapter 4 includes “What’s Ahead” steps related to the bicycle and pedestrian element of the plan, including ongoing improvements to connectivity particularly to the</p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
		<p>outlines the value of completing active transportation spines and networks, regional needs, work to date, and PSRC role</p>	<p>transit system; addressing equity; emphasizing safety; and refining performance metrics. Please note an additional amendment related to expanding the implementation steps from the RTP is proposed under <del>BI-6</del> <i>Group 1, BI-2</i> that may address this proposal in further detail.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on the inclusion of additional elements as noted.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: Recommend staff include a “Regional Active Transportation Network” to Chapter 4. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>See p. 172</i></b></p>
<p><b>BP-3</b></p>	<p>CM Gelder</p>	<p>Prioritize development of qualitative and quantitative active transportation performance measures and objectives to analyze regional access to “all ages and abilities” facilities; address in regional capacity projects</p>	<p><b>Board direction needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: As noted in the preceding section, page 180 of Chapter 4 includes “What’s Ahead” steps related to the bicycle and pedestrian element of the plan, including ongoing improvements to connectivity particularly to the transit system; addressing equity; emphasizing safety; and refining performance metrics. In addition, the analysis of the RTP includes mobility metrics such as walk/bike trips and proximity of households within walk/bike distance of jobs and transit. Design level details are not applicable at the scale of the regional analysis, however every project submitted for inclusion in the RTP must respond to the adopted “RTP Prioritization Measures,” which address nine policy objectives: emissions, freight movement, jobs, multimodal alternatives (i.e., transit and bike/ped), Puget Sound land and water, safety and security, equity and access to opportunity, centers and travel/congestion. Staff proposes to continue coordination with PSRC’s Bicycle / Pedestrian Advisory Committee on working to improve the region’s understanding and implementation of context specific investments and the evaluation of projects at the long-range RTP vs. project selection scale.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: Recommend staff continue work to develop and improve active transportation performance measures, including as they relate to access for all ages and abilities. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>See p. 186</i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: Climate</b>			
<b>C-1a</b>	Pierce County / Tacoma / CM Upthegrove	Include reference to the region's 2030 greenhouse reduction goal as an interim step to achieving the 2050 reduction goal	<p><b>Board direction requested – Proposed Plan amendment and future PSRC work</b></p> <p>Staff response: Each of these comments (C-1a-c) relate to development of a work program for PSRC to work with partners to develop an interim year analysis and plan, consistent with the Four-Part Greenhouse Gas Strategy, towards achieving not just the 2050 climate goal but the 2030 climate goal.</p> <p>Staff proposes to add language committing to this future work program that would develop an interim 2030 analysis year, in coordination with the region's transit agencies and other partners including PSCAA. Please note the timeframe for completion of the 2030 analysis is tbd, since additional information related to land use, transit networks, shorter-term EV trends and other data will need to be obtained and assessed.</p>
<b>C-1b</b>	CM Balducci / Pierce County / Tacoma / Rep. Wicks	Identify actions needed to support achievement of the interim 2030 greenhouse gas reduction goal as a future work program; monitor progress towards achievement of the 2030 and 2050 goals	<p>Also, as a reminder ongoing work is currently underway and reflected in the plan in the Climate and What's Ahead sections related to the Regional Electric Vehicle Collaborative, which is building a clearinghouse and technical assistance to advance the implementation of electric vehicles throughout the region, as well as the Puget Sound Regional Emissions Inventory project, which is updating the region's greenhouse gas emissions inventory and developing climate 'wedges' from all sectors to assess planned and necessary actions to achieve climate goals. This project is expected to conclude in 2022.</p>
<b>C-1c</b>	CM Balducci	Develop Climate Implementation Strategy. Continue to collaborate with PSCAA and other regional and state partners to develop an implementation plan to achieve both 2030 and 2050 greenhouse gas reduction goals.	<p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: Recommend staff amend the plan to identify the work as proposed and for staff to use the best available data moving forward. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Note: staff proposes to engage the board on the discussion of work program priorities and timelines immediately after plan adoption.</i></b></p> <p><b><i><u>See p. 141; p. 189</u></i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
C-2	Pierce County / Tacoma	Increase PSRC capacity to analyze resiliency and environmental justice impacts and to engage affected populations. Consider hiring an environmental/climate justice specialist	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: The draft RTP includes commitment to the continuation of PSRC’s resilience work and ongoing engagement and equity work across our planning programs. This includes the ongoing partnership in the Puget Sound Climate Preparedness Collaborative. Staff proposes to strengthen this language and commitment on the pages referenced to the right. Board direction is requested on this topic related to further priority and emphasis in the work program. At board direction, PSRC would work to identify and incorporate resources in the budget and work program to support this planning work.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: Recommend staff amend the plan to strengthen the language and emphasis on resilience and environmental justice impacts. Further discussion on staff capacity and resources will be held as part of the board discussions on the work program priorities and timelines immediately after plan adoption. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><u><i>See pp. 128-129, p. 188</i></u></b></p>
C-3	Rep. Wicks	Provide regional analysis and assistance to local jurisdictions to ensure local planning and growth targets are consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy	<p><b>Board direction requested - Staff Proposed No Action Needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: PSRC’s Growth Management Planning Division actively works with counties and cities in the development of local growth targets and evaluates consistency with the VISION 2050 Regional Growth Strategy. PSRC is in the process of developing guidance for how to address a variety of policy areas in local comprehensive plans.</p> <p>Further, once local growth targets have been adopted consistent with VISION 2050, PSRC will review and update the regional land use dataset and incorporate in future regional analyses.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: No amendment proposed.</i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: Safety</b>			
<b>S-1</b>	Bellevue	Adopt a goal of zero fatalities and serious injuries with a Safe Systems Approach	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: VISION 2050 calls for the region to “Improve the safety of the transportation system and, in the long term, achieve the state’s goal of zero deaths and serious injuries.” The draft RTP includes a number of implementation actions and ongoing work to help support this goal and recognizes the Safe Systems Approach.</p> <p>Board direction is requested regarding the adoption of the goal as described.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: Recommend staff amend the plan to append the reference to the VISION 2050 safety goal as noted above, by adding “The RTP will implement this goal with a Safe Systems Approach.” Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><i><u>See p. 105</u></i></b></p>
<b>S-2a</b>	CM Balducci / Bellevue / Pierce County / Tacoma	Develop a regional safety plan as a future work program item. Include actions, targets, and performance indicators. Seek funding from USDOT.	<p><b>Board direction requested - Proposed Plan amendment and future PSRC work</b></p> <p>Staff response: The Safety section of the plan identifies ongoing and future work related to safety, including ongoing and improved data collection and monitoring; prioritization of safety and equity in project development; continued assessment of PSRC’s project evaluation criteria; development of best practices and resources; and convening of regional partners and stakeholders on meeting safety goals with the lens of a Safe Systems Approach.</p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
S-2b	Bellevue / Rep. Wicks	Convene regional partners and stakeholders to set an aspirational target year for achieving zero traffic fatalities and serious injuries and develop a regional plan with best practices for achieving the safety goal. Address full spectrum of safety elements and a Safe Systems Approach	<p>Staff proposes to update this section of the plan to reflect the specific proposals for PSRC's future work program that are reflected here.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic related to further priority and emphasis in the work program. At board direction, PSRC would work to identify and incorporate resources in the budget and work program to support this planning work.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: Recommend amendment of the plan to include the action items and future work as described. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p>
S-2c	Bellevue	Publish an annual regional safety progress report	<p><b><i>Note: staff proposes to engage the board on the discussion of work program priorities and timelines immediately after plan adoption.</i></b></p>
S-2d	Bellevue	Pursue resources for safety projects and programs	<p><b><i><u>See p. 105; pp. 187</u></i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: RTP Project Evaluation</b>			
<b>PE-1a</b>	Pierce County / Tacoma	Create policy addressing inclusion of adequate bike/walk/transit/roll infrastructure in regional capacity projects; consider an “all ages & abilities” minimum standard	<p><b>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed future work program</b></p> <p>Staff response: These three proposals relate to the evaluation of projects submitted for inclusion on the RTP Regional Capacity Projects list. As a reminder, every project submitted must respond to the adopted “RTP Prioritization Measures,” which address nine policy objectives: emissions, freight movement, jobs, multimodal alternatives (i.e., transit and bike/ped), Puget Sound land and water, safety and security, equity and access to opportunity, centers and travel/congestion.</p>
<b>PE-1b</b>	<i>From public comment</i>	Require a Safe Systems Approach be used for all projects	<p>It is important to note that the RTP addresses the full transportation system, and recognizes the integrated nature of each component of the system – transit, bicycle/pedestrian, freight, streets and highways, TDM, etc. No one element or project is expected to accommodate all users, and the RTP and transportation system as a whole is focused on addressing the combined needs of all users of the system. Individual investments are proposed to address specific needs within the context of specific locations.</p>
<b>PE-1c</b>	<i>From public comment</i>	Commit to a plan to revisit the RTP Prioritization Framework	<p>Staff proposes to work with the board on updating and refining the RTP Prioritization Measures prior to the next plan update, addressing the evaluation of future projects for inclusion into the RTP.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: Recommend staff amend the plan to identify a future work program to update the RTP Prioritization Measures and how projects are evaluated at point of submission into the next RTP, to include consideration of all ages and abilities and a Safe Systems Approach. Motion passed with one no vote.</i></b></p> <p><b><i><u>See p. 181, p. 191</u></i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
<b>Topic: Project Selection</b>			
PS-1	CM Balducci	Develop a plan to sequence the RTP and federal funding processes; address alignment so the RTP guides upcoming funding cycles	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: To date, the RTP has not been directive to the PSRC project selection process; the funding process has been directly guided by the adopted VISION plan, and Policy Frameworks are developed prior to each cycle per recommendation from a Project Selection Task Force. The RTP is updated on a 4-year cycle, and PSRC’s project selection processes are updated every 2 years.</p> <p>To align the timing as described and have the RTP guide the subsequent funding cycles, two options could be considered. For context, the 2022 project selection process was launched in January 2022, with preparation of the Policy Framework conducted between April and December 2021. The development of the RTP began by the board in January 2020, with adoption scheduled in May 2022.</p> <p>Option 1 – advance the schedule for the next RTP update so that adoption is well in advance of the Policy Framework and Project Selection Task Force work. This would suggest that the 2026-2050 RTP would need to be adopted by June 2025, a full year earlier than normal. To do so would have the next update begin in 2023, only one year after adoption of the 2022 plan. Staff believes this schedule would hamper the implementation activities of the RTP that are expected to begin after plan adoption in May 2022.</p> <p>Option 2 – advance the schedule for the next RTP update so that adoption is scheduled for December 2025, six months earlier than normal. In order for the RTP to guide the funding process, this means that decisions on the Policy Framework would need to become part of the overall RTP development process. Staff presumes this work would then influence both the 2026 and 2028 funding cycles. The subsequent RTP adoption would be in 2029/2030.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: Recommend staff amend Chapter 4 of the plan to clarify that the Project Selection Task Force will take into account the most recent RTP, and staff will look into a longer-term work plan regarding the alignment of RTP and project selection schedules. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>See p. 182</i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-2	Rep. Wicks	Require all bikeways funded through PSRC to be designed for all ages and abilities; establish corresponding design standards	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: Project evaluation criteria are established for each project selection process that includes elements related to the safety and comfort of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, recognizing the unique context-specific needs and attributes of each project location. In addition, there are specific state and federal standards that projects must adhere to regarding specific design elements and setting design standards is outside of PSRC’s expertise and authority. PSRC’s Bicycle / Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) has provided guidance to the regional and countywide project evaluation committees in prior funding cycles to help guide the scoring and recommendation of bicycle and pedestrian projects. Staff proposes that the ongoing education and assessment of “all ages and abilities” as it relates to project evaluation would continue under the auspices of BPAC and the countywide forums responsible for recommending project funding.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: The plan is maintained as is with no amendment. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p>
PS-4	Rep. Wicks	Set aspirational goal that each funding round will reduce GHG emissions in line with 2030 and 2050 targets	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: Every project submitted into PSRC’s project selection process is evaluated for potential emission reductions. However, staff believes the evaluation of emissions in line with the overall regional climate goals is more relevant and appropriate at the full system scale. Projects are submitted by sponsors into PSRC’s funding competitions every two years based on specific local timing decisions and other needs, and every project must be derived from and consistent with adopted comprehensive plans. Further, there is a wide diversity of individual projects submitted at any given time, addressing various modes, needs and locations. The interaction of the full transportation system, reflective of all modes, networks, land use and other attributes and factors is a more realistic and feasible assessment of GHG emissions.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: The plan is maintained as is with no amendment. The motion failed to pass with 11 no votes and 7 yes votes.</i></b></p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-9	Rep. Wicks	Make low-scoring projects ineligible for funding until resubmitted/reevaluated	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: In every funding cycle, prioritized lists of contingency projects by forum are adopted should additional funds become available prior to the next project selection process. In addition, given the annual delivery target requirements for PSRC's FHWA funds, these contingency lists are used to fund immediately ready-to-go projects when necessary to ensure the region is not at risk from losing federal funds.</p> <p>Board direction is requested to address this proposed policy decision regarding contingency list policies and funding.</p> <p><b><i>April 14 TPB Action: The plan is maintained as is with no amendment. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p>
<p><b>The following amendments (PS-3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10) were proposed by staff as having no action needed.</b>  <b><i>April 14 TPB Action: The plan is maintained as is with no amendment. Motion passed unanimously.</i></b></p>			
PS-3	Rep. Wicks	Encourage local jurisdictions to package complete networks of bicycle, pedestrian, and ADA infrastructure into single project applications when seeking STP and CMAQ funding	<p><b>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: This proposal is outside of the RTP and addresses the strategic decisions made by sponsors on what projects are submitted into PSRC's competitions. Staff cannot guarantee that packaging as described would result in high scoring and recommended projects, as each project is evaluated based on the specific grant application against the adopted criteria.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p>
PS-5	Rep. Wicks	Require all highway capacity project applications to estimate GHG emissions	<p><b>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: Every project submitted into PSRC's project selection process is evaluated for emission reductions, using PSRC's project-level emissions estimation tool. This tool is provided as a resource as part of the published Call for Projects, and PSRC staff performs the evaluation of every project for this criterion.</p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
PS-6	Rep. Wicks	In alignment with the Regional Growth Strategy, prioritize walking, bicycling, and ADA infrastructure within designated regional growth centers, and in proximity to HCT stations	<p><b>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: The policy focus of PSRC’s funding is directed in VISION 2050 to be support for centers, with the distinction of regionally designated centers for regional funds and countywide and local centers for countywide funds. In addition, the project evaluation criteria incorporate provision of walk and bike access to transit, as well as equity considerations for a variety of community groups.</p>
PS-7	Rep. Wicks	Require higher level of scrutiny for highway capacity projects in areas with higher proportions of historically marginalized communities	<p><b>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: The 2022 Policy Framework significantly strengthened the criteria related to equity that is applied to all projects competing for PSRC’s federal funds.</p>
PS-8	Rep. Wicks	Require all projects funded by STP and CMAQ dollars to utilize “practical design” and “Safe Systems Approach,” following best safety practices	<p><b>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: The 2022 Policy Framework significantly strengthened the criteria related to safety, including providing resources related to FHWA’s Safe Systems Approach, that is applied to all projects competing for PSRC’s federal funds.</p>
PS-10	Rep. Wicks	Create a regional project list for smaller walk, bicycle, ADA, and transit projects that	<p><b>Board direction requested – Staff Proposed No Action Needed</b></p> <p>Staff response: Projects are not required to be on the Regional Capacity Projects list in order to be eligible to compete for PSRC’s federal funds. The majority of the investments in the RTP are included programmatically in the plan’s financial strategy and are eligible to compete</p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
		are eligible for PSRC funding and are not subject to the Regional Capacity Projects requirements	<p>for funding as long as they are consistent with local comprehensive or other plans. In fact, the majority of PSRC funds are awarded to those investments that fall below the threshold of requiring to be on the RTP Regional Capacity Projects list (refer to page 12 of the 2021-2024 Regional TIP documentation, <a href="https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/tip2020-overviewof2021-2024regionaltip.pdf">https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/tip2020-overviewof2021-2024regionaltip.pdf</a>).</p> <p>In addition, there are multiple funding processes in which these types of investments may compete, e.g., the recent Transportation Alternatives Program, the Rural Town Centers and Corridors Program, the WSDOT Coordinated Grant Program, etc. Also as a reminder, the countywide forums conduct their processes for PSRC funding based on supporting countywide and local centers.</p>
<p><b>The following amendments (PS-11,12,13) were forwarded from public comment and were not proposed as amendments by board members. A motion to maintain the plan as is with no revision per these three proposals was proposed and seconded; an amended motion was offered to consider PS-13 separately but did not pass.</b>  <b>April 14 TPB Action: The plan is maintained as is with no amendment. Motion passed unanimously.</b></p>			
PS-11	<i>From public comment</i>	Require 75% of PSRC funding each project selection round be targeted for bike/walk/transit/roll investments in transit sheds and growth centers, consistent with VISION 2050 RGS 65%/75% goal	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: Noted earlier is the policy focus and project evaluation criteria that address active transportation and transit supporting regional and local centers.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this funding priority topic.</p>
PS-12	<i>From public comment</i>	Adopt a policy prioritizing investments in transit and sidewalk connectivity in areas with high concentrations of	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: Noted earlier is the policy focus and project evaluation criteria that address active transportation and transit supporting regional and local centers.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this funding priority topic.</p>

Amendment ID	Sponsor	Proposed Amendment	PSRC Staff Assessment
		people with specialized transportation needs	
PS-13	<i>From public comment</i>	Require all PSRC funded projects to have VMT reduction plan	<p><b>Board direction requested</b></p> <p>Staff response: As noted in the response to PS-4, there is a wide diversity of individual projects submitted into the funding competitions each cycle, addressing various modes, needs and locations. Projects are submitted by sponsors into PSRC’s funding competitions every two years based on specific local timing decisions and other needs, and every project must be derived from and consistent with adopted comprehensive plans. Not every project will address or have an impact on VMT reduction, and other factors such as land use and other area programs such as TDM may contribute to VMT reduction within a given area. As noted earlier, the interaction of the full transportation system, reflective of all modes, networks, land use and other attributes and factors provides a more robust and realistic assessment of VMT and emissions.</p> <p>Board direction is requested on this topic.</p>