Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board

JANUARY 19, 2018
9:00 AM to 1:15 PM

WSDOT Headquarters
310 Maple Park Avenue
Nisqually Conference Room 1D2
Olympia, WA

AGENDA

9:00 Welcome/Introductions  Dan Gatchet  Informational
9:05 Meeting Minutes  Dan Gatchet  Action
9:10 FMSIB Budgets  Brian Ziegler  Informational
9:20 Director's Report  Brian Ziegler  Informational
9:50 Board Reports  Board Members  Informational
10:10 Synopsis of Legislative Visits  Board Members  Informational
10:25 Project Updates (Marysville, SeaTac Refund)  Brian Ziegler  Action
10:55 Project Delivery Issues  Brian Ziegler  Informational
11:40 Call for Projects Update  Brian Ziegler  Informational
11:55 MCF Update - Talking Points  Chris Herman, WPPA  Informational  
12:10 Working Lunch
  Rep. Ed Orcutt
  Sen. Steve Hobbs
  Sen. Curtis King
1:10 Future Meetings  Dan Gatchet  Action
1:15 Adjourn  Dan Gatchet
FREIGHT MOBILITY STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD
MEETING MINUTES

November 17, 2017
Vancouver, WA

Board members present: Mr. Dan Gatchet, Chair; Mr. Leonard Barnes; Mr. Matt Ewers; Mr. Erik Hansen; Mr. Johan Hellman; Mr. Pat Hulcey; Secretary Millar; Mr. Art Swannack; Mr. Tom Trulove; and ex-officio Mr. Aaron Hunt

Board Members not present: Mr. John Creighton and Mr. Bob Watters

WELCOME
Chair Dan Gatchet opened the meeting with welcoming comments.

MINUTES
Chair Dan Gatchet entered a motion to adopt the September 15, 2017, minutes as presented. Mr. Swannack so moved to adopt the minutes and Mr. Hulcey seconded the motion. MOTION CARRIED

FMSIB BUDGETS
Director Ziegler gave an overview of the 2017-19 biennium budget for both the operating and capital budgets. To date, FMSIB has expended 80 percent of the operating budget and 70 percent on the capital budget. The largest operating budget cost in this biennium is the one-time allotment of $60,000 for the Road-Rail Study. There will be two annual reports produced during this biennium, which are budgeted at approximately $20,000 each. The agency will have to go out to bid for a new contract in 2018 so the exact cost is unknown.

The current FMSIB capital budget is funded with six distinct fund sources. FMSIB did complete a Supplemental Budget Request to reappropriate $585,909 for the capital budget. Copies of the Supplemental Budget request were shared with all Board members present.

Secretary Millar asked how much of the 17-19 budget was reappropriation. Director Ziegler stated that it was about $9.5 million. Secretary Millar expressed a concern about a possible bow wave effect with a $50 million budget and an appropriation shy of $30 million. Spending money this way becomes an attractive target and we need to be paying more attention. Secretary Millar discussed what FMSIB is doing to actively manage its portfolio and helping these projects to get the money spent. Maybe this is something the Board needs to be looking at. The Director can be a resource to the applicants and determine why the projects are not moving to completion. Chair Gatchet said that there is some work to do on this cash flow topic and that it warrants more discussion. Mr. Swannack suggested that maybe there should be principal statement that as a strategic investment board, we will not expect a standard timeline for projects to reach completion.
DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Director Ziegler gave a brief overview of the below Director’s Report:

Washington Freight Advisory Committee (WAFAC)

FMSIB staff provided scheduling support and meeting minutes for the WAFAC meeting held in Seattle on October 3. In addition, I attended a related WSDOT briefing to MPO’s and RTPO’s on October 10.

On October 23, the Governor’s Office convened a meeting of freight stakeholders to discuss the state’s progress implementing the National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) funding in Washington State. Attendees included the Governor’s Office, WSDOT, FMSIB, AWC, WPPA, and WSAC. The parties agreed to continue the conversation about freight project prioritization and work together to improve communication and transparency.

National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) Project Funding Status

The following Exhibit was included in WSDOT’s Draft Freight Plan, and I spoke to it in my September 15 Director’s Report. You will note that Federal Fiscal Years 2019 and 2020 do not yet show any funded projects. WSDOT is continuing their validation process and has not shared the Secretary’s final project selection decisions. Before submitting the Plan to FHWA by the December 4 deadline, WSDOT committed to making those project funding decisions and advising WAFAC about the projects WSDOT has selected for these last two years of federal funding.

Exhibit 1-7: National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) Funded Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>NHFP Funds</th>
<th>Matching Funds</th>
<th>Total Project Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>I-5 SB 88th St to SR 531</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>$3,650,373</td>
<td>$375,858</td>
<td>$4,026,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>I-90 / Adams Co Line to Spokane Co Line</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>$11,514,801</td>
<td>$578,839</td>
<td>$12,093,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>I-90 / 468th Ave SE to W Summit Rd EB 1</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>$22,307,797</td>
<td>$5,400,726</td>
<td>$27,708,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>South Terminal Modernization Project Phase II</td>
<td>Port of Everett</td>
<td>Multimodal</td>
<td>$1,812,200</td>
<td>$48,287,800</td>
<td>$50,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>S Lander St Grade Separation and Railway Safety Project</td>
<td>City of Seattle</td>
<td>Grade Separation</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$122,000,000</td>
<td>$125,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>I-90/ Floating Bridges - Replace Anchor Cables</td>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>$5,769,979</td>
<td>$246,172</td>
<td>$6,016,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Pacific Highway E/54th Ave E Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>City of Fife</td>
<td>Roadway Improvement</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$7,261,741</td>
<td>$9,261,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>142nd Ave &amp; 24th St</td>
<td>City of Sumner</td>
<td>Preservation</td>
<td>$4,707,200</td>
<td>$840,206</td>
<td>$5,547,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Bigelow Gulch - Forker Road Connector- Project 4A; CRP 2989A</td>
<td>Spokane County</td>
<td>Roadway Improvement</td>
<td>$5,871,876</td>
<td>$3,550,875</td>
<td>$9,422,751</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington Highway Users Federation

This organization has existed for many decades and exists to advocate for improved capacity and safety on Washington’s highways. FMSIB is an ex-officio member of the Board. I attended a recent Board meeting in Tacoma and then the Annual Interim Meeting on September 28. The day-long agenda usually includes legislative updates from state and congressional representatives and a current topic presentation or two. We enjoyed several lively discussions this year:

1) CONGRESSIONAL UPDATE
   a) Tommy Bauer, State Outreach Director (Senator Cantwell)
   b) Beth Osborne, Deputy Staff Director (Senator Murray)
2) SOUND TRANSIT PRESENTATION
   a) Ric Ilgenfritz, Executive Director - Planning, Environment, and Project Development
3) CARBON TAX PRESENTATION
   a) Mo McBroom, Director of Government Relations, Nature Conservancy
4) LEGISLATIVE PANEL
   a) Senator Steve Hobbs
   b) Rep. Jake Fey
   c) Rep. Ed Orcutt

FMSIB, TIB, and CRAB Collaboration

The three new directors of these organizations met on October 2 to introduce themselves and discuss common issues. Your former FMSIB director and now TIB Director Ashley Probart needs no introduction. However, the new director of CRAB, John Koster, may not be familiar to the Board.

To take on the new job as Executive Director of CRAB, John resigned his post as a Republican state representative from the 39th District (Arlington). Prior to the Legislature, John served on the Snohomish County Council. He served on the CRAB Board as a county councilmember.

Ashley, John and I are collaborating to develop 2018 legislation affecting recently- enacted revenues for our three agencies. This topic is a Board action on today’s meeting.

Project Issues

- Several FMSIB projects finished in 2017. At today’s meeting, the Board will consider moving these projects from “Active” status to “Completed” status.
- I attended a project closeout meeting October 12 in SeaTac for the recently opened “Connecting 28th – 24th Ave. S.” project.
- I also attended a ribbon cutting October 12 for the recently completed Des Moines project “South 216th Segment - 1-A” completion.

Pacific Northwest Waterways Association (PNWA)

I attended my first PNWA Conference this year October 17-19 in Portland. With 80 years of experience and over 100 member businesses, ports and other organizations from the Pacific Northwest, PNWA has a broad regional perspective on economic development. PNWA advocates for funding for navigation projects around the region, including those on the Columbia Snake River System, in the Puget Sound and along the Oregon and Washington coasts.

Highlighted presentations included the following:

1) MARAD SUPPLY CHAIN INNOVATIONS
   a) Rebecca Dye, Commissioner
2) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION UPDATE
   a) Travis Brouwer, ODOT, Federal and Legislative Relations
   b) Allison Camden, WSDOT, Intergovernmental and Tribal Relations
3) USACE COMMANDERS PANEL
   a) Major General Scott Spellman, Commander, Northwestern Division
4) ESA CONSIDERATIONS FOR COLUMBIA RIVER VESSEL TRAFFIC
I participated in a conference call on October 20. Two items of interest to FMSIB were discussed. First, the new INFRA Grant process rule making is in progress and CAGTC provided comments on behalf of its members. Second, there was much discussion about the White House schedule for announcing its infrastructure plan. The consensus was that nothing would be introduced until the tax reform plan passes Congress. This delays any infrastructure package into early 2018.

At least two freight mobility funding proposals have been introduced (Lowenthall and Smith), or re-introduced in Congress. Both rely on some form of cargo tax in order to fund a nationwide discretionary and formula grant program.

Road-Rail Conflicts Advisory Committee Meeting
The first meeting of this Advisory Committee was well attended and participants were highly engaged. We used webinar technology to share the slides and conversation with as many as possible. Next Steps include:

1. Staff and consultant team to meet with the MPO/RTPO Coordinating Committee on November 14. They will request of the MPO’s and RTPO’s to help the Advisory Committee answer a few questions:
   a. Based on the Phase 1 list of conflict priorities, can you sort them into three tiers in your region:
      i. Tier 1 – Projects that are in design and awaiting full construction funding.
      ii. Tier 2 – Projects that are planned and/or scoped but have not proceeded to engineering of any kind.
      iii. Tier 3 – No project has been studied, scoped, or identified in the regional plan.
   b. Do you have any comments on the criteria the Committee is considering for defining a “corridor”:
      i. The railroad is the spine of the corridor, roadway crossings are the focus
      ii. Train length and frequency a factor
      iii. Proximity of crossings are important
      iv. The mobility concern is cross-railway travel
   c. Can you review the data used to prioritize crossings in your region and verify it contains no obvious errors or omissions? Are there any crossings that should come off?
2. The consultant team will begin to draft a Scope of Work for Phase 2 to present to the next Advisory Committee meeting.
3. FMSIB staff will set-up a website for posting meeting agendas, presentations, and minutes. The next Advisory Committee meeting has not been scheduled, but staff is targeting late December or early January.
**Project Status Updates**

This month’s Board meeting will include briefings on three projects requiring Board attention:

1. Pierce County: Canyon Rd.
2. City of Marysville: I-5, SR-529 Interchange
3. City of Lacey: I-5, Hogum Bay Road

**Road Usage Charge (RUC) Study**

The State Transportation Commission has been studying this issue in phases since 2012. A Steering Committee of public and private officials has assisted in the study oversight, as well as a variety of consultants in tolling, finance, and public outreach. The study has been funded for a pilot test of various RUC technologies and the Commission is recruiting participants. To date, over 3,000 people have signed up to participate in the pilot. The discussions are getting substantial media interest. I have served on this Steering Committee representing Counties. The team asked me to remain involved because of the impacts this new transportation revenue source might have on freight mobility in Washington. I attended the most recent Steering Committee meeting on Mercer Island.

**ROAD-RAIL CONFLICT STUDY UPDATE**

Director Ziegler gave an update on the Road-Rail Conflict Study. The 2017 Transportation Budget provisos $60,000 dollars for Phase 2 of the Road-Rail Conflict Study to identify and recommend a statewide list of projects using a corridor based approach. The Road-Rail Study Advisory Committee reconvened in October to develop preliminary criteria for identifying crossing project elements, such as scope, schedule, budget, benefits, etc. The final report is due to the Legislature in September 2018. The Committee is going to rely on MPO/RTPOs for the work they have already done on grade crossing improvements. The regions are helping divide the list of projects into three categories (Tier 1: Ready-to-go projects; Tier 2: Projects in the regional plan but have not proceeded to any kind of design, and Tier 3: Projects that are in the top 100 from Phase 1 study but have not been identified in the regional plan) by January. The Committee will then take the input MPO/RTPOs and start developing some prioritization criteria. Director Ziegler clarified that this Committee is advisory to FMSIB and that FMSIB will submit the report to the Legislature. Secretary Millar discussed that the Road-Rail Phase 1 study identified the problems and maybe what we ought to be doing instead of asking everybody for their list of projects is to ask if we can create projects that meet the identified criteria. Mr. Hansen reiterated that the proviso specifically states that a project list is to be submitted to the Legislature. Mr. Trulove stated that FMSIB is on the right track with getting input from MPO/RTPOs. Mr. Hellman commented that early outreach and discussion with railroads is an important step in ensuring that structures across railroads are shovel-ready and advance within a reasonable timeframe.

**CODIFYING FMSIB REVENUES**

Director Ziegler requested direction from the Board on what he should do regarding the possibility of FMSIB pursuing legislation along with TIB and CRAB for codifying revenues. Below is a briefing provided by Director Ziegler on codifying FMSIB new revenues:

**Purpose**

This briefing describes how state law dedicates FMSIB revenues for certain purposes and requests the Board to consider legislation that would ensure the same legal dedication for the new revenues provided by the 2015 Connecting Washington transportation package.
Background
FMSIB projects are funded from six distinct transportation accounts:
1. Motor Vehicle Funds (state)
2. Motor Vehicle Funds (Federal)
3. Freight Investment Funds - FMIA (state)
4. Freight Multimodal Funds – FMMA (state)
5. Freight Multimodal Funds (UP)
6. Highway Safety Account
Several of these accounts receive appropriations only in order to complete legacy projects historically funded from those accounts. When those projects are complete and unless the Legislature changes something, FMSIB projects will be funded from only two accounts:
3. Freight Investment Funds - FMIA (state)
4. Freight Multimodal Funds – FMMA (state)
State law provides for annual transfers from other state accounts into these two accounts:
- RCW 46.68.295 - Transfers $3 million from the TPA (gas tax) to the freight mobility investment account (FMIA) created in RCW 46.68.300.
- RCW 46.68.415 - Assigns $3 million of motor vehicle weight fee and motor home vehicle weight fee to freight mobility multimodal account (FMMA) created in RCW 46.68.310.
These dedications and transfers assure $12 million in project revenues per biennium. The Board can make awards to project sponsors and know with some level of assurance that funds will be deposited in those accounts on schedule.

Current Situation
In the 2015 Connecting Washington transportation package, the Legislature approved a 16-year financial plan with new revenues allocated to at least 30 separate transportation accounts (see attached document titled “LEAP Transportation Document 2015 NL-2 as developed June 28, 2015”). Four accounts managed by TIB, CRAB, and FMSIB (Lines 9, 10, 11, and 22 on the LEAP document) are not currently codified.
The $123 million allocated to FMSIB over 16 years equates to approximately $17 million additional funding every biennium, bringing the biennial amount to about $29 million.

Benefits
These new revenues were provided to the three agencies in order to fund additional county, city, and freight mobility projects. As such, certainty of cash flow is a high priority so project proponents can rely on the funding commitments made by the three agencies.

Secretary Millar expressed it is a substantial ask from the Legislature to tie their hand, and it leaves everyone else wanting to be codified as well. Mr. Trulove pointed out most FMSIB projects have TIB and CRAB money and that FMSIB doesn’t want to be an outlier if TIB and CRAB pursue this legislation. Mr. Swannack asked if there is any downside to this if the mileage tax goes through instead of the gas tax. Director Ziegler said that it is many years out.

Board Discussion on Codification
Mr. Trulove made a motion to give Director Ziegler the authority to enter discussion about codifying FMSIB funding from Connecting Washington legislation and for the Board to communicate via email or conference to take action prior to January 18. Secretary Millar
seconded the motion and wanted to clarify that this Board has not taken a motion to support codifying funding but a motion to explore the potential benefits and disadvantages of codifying. In further clarification of the motion, Mr. Swannack stated his understanding is that the motion is for the Director to further explore codifying and to provide to the Board a proposed piece of legislation at which time the Board would then make a decision as to whether or not to go forward with the legislation.

Based on further Board member discussion, Mr. Trulove amended his motion to state that the Board authorizes the Director to enter into discussions with the other parties, TIB and CRAB in particular, about potential legislation to codify our new revenues from the Connecting Washington transportation legislation and to bring the information back to the Board in a meeting to determine whether the Board supports codification legislation or not. Secretary Millar seconded the motion and clarified that motion is to direct staff to explore the advantages and disadvantages of codifying and not for the Director to state that FMSIB wants to codify. Mr. Swannack further clarified that if, based on the Director’s discussions, codifying made sense, then the Director would provide a proposed piece of legislation for the Board to approve or not. 

**MOTION CARRIED**

**GUEST PRESENTATIONS**

Patrick Sweeney, Principal Transportation Planner, City of Vancouver, gave a slide presentation (see FMSIB website [www.fmsib.wa.gov](http://www.fmsib.wa.gov)) on the “32nd Ave Industrial Access Feasibility Study.” This project may be an applicant for future FMSIB Calls for Projects.

Letticia Neal, P.E., Pierce County, gave a slide presentation (see FMSIB website [www.fmsib.wa.gov](http://www.fmsib.wa.gov)) on the “Canyon Road East Freight Corridor Improvement” project. This major project includes two FMSIB-funded projects (#53 for $3 million and #20 for $2 million) which have been on the FMSIB Deferred Project List for six years and are candidates for review and/or removal from the Deferred Project List. The County is requesting these two projects remain on the Deferred List as they are the last two pieces of this major project. Both FMSIB projects are scheduled to go to construction in 2022. Director Ziegler clarified that the FMSIB financial commitments were pulled from these projects when they were put on the Deferred List. If the Board chooses to allow the county to stay on the Deferred List then the county, when ready, can request to be reactivated at the original award amount or they can choose to reapply through the Call for Projects. Ms. Neal indicated the county would likely come back to the Board within the next two years to request those funds.

Secretary Millar moved to keep the FMSIB Project #53 & #20 on the Deferred List. Mr. Barnes seconded the motion. Mr. Hulcey recused.

**MOTION CARRIED**

**PROJECT DEFINITIONS**

Director Ziegler reviewed the FMSIB Project Definitions, which were added to the FMSIB bylaws in 2014. He also reviewed the Project Status Matrix to assist the Board in reviewing project status.
PROJECT UPDATES/ACTION
Director Ziegler gave an overview the below projects for possible Board action:

City of Marysville’s I-5 / SR-529 Interchange Project:
In June 2015, this project received full funding through Connecting Washington. FMSIB could ask for a full refund since the Legislature funded the entire project cost as presented by the City ($50 m appropriation vs. $47.5 m cost estimate). The City has been approached about this. They asked if the funding could be transferred to another freight project and were told this is not possible. WSDOT staff stated they believe the City underestimated the project costs and provided copies of the WSDOT’s Scoping Estimate, which shows the project cost at $55 million in 2012:
- $47.25 million Construction
- $7 million PE
- $0.75 million R/W
The Legislature funded this project at $50 million, and the WSDOT staff argue this appears to presume a $5 million FMSIB contribution. Secretary Millar does not think the Legislature intended to fully fund this project. The Northwest Region is progressing with the design build contract, and they want to update this project estimate. The estimate is on schedule to be completed at the end of the year. Mr. Hansen said he will review OFM’s budget system that will show if the Legislature assumed a $5 million local funding piece. Director Ziegler stated that at the September Board meeting the Board chose to wait for WSDOT’s revised estimate scheduled for 4Q17 (Design-Build scheduled due date) and to revisit it at the November 2017 or January 2018 Board meeting.

Director Ziegler suggested if the Board chooses to revisit this again, then they need to consider the local agency agreement with the City since WSDOT is now a project sponsor and we will have to see if the agreement is transferable. In addition, the project scope and cost have changed considerably since Marysville applied and we need to know if the OFM budget request matched legislative assumptions in the budget for the $5 million FMSIB contribution. The Board chose to revisit this topic at the January 2018 meeting with any updates the Director has.

City of Lacey’s Hogum Bay Road Truck Route Project:
- The original FMSIB application included truck slip ramp from I-5 SB to Hogum Bay Road, as well as widening of Hogum Bay Rd. Not much progress was made by the City of Lacey in securing remaining funding.
- The City reactivated the project in 2015 and created a Phase I ($1.2 m) and Phase II ($2.8 m) delivery approach.
- In the meantime, Connecting Washington fully funded a completed Marvin Rd. interchange at $72 million.
The current WSDOT design appears not to include the truck slip ramp. FMSIB staff conclusion/recommendation:
- The current WSDOT design does not include a direct access slip ramp to Hogum Bay Road.
- This direct access was a key determinant in awarding the project $4 million
- Recommendation: Advise the City (and WSDOT) that the $2.8 m remainder (currently deferred) of the City’s original $4 million award will not be reactivated.
Secretary Millar made a motion to not reactivate the project. Mr. Trulove seconded the motion. **MOTION CARRIED**

**2017 COMPLETED PROJECTS**
Director Ziegler presented the below completed projects to the Board for action to acknowledge completion so the FMSIB website can be updated:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58-0</td>
<td>Port of Seattle</td>
<td>E. Marginal Way Truck Crossover</td>
<td>4/20/2015</td>
<td>Need to update Board and website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-0</td>
<td>City of Fife</td>
<td>Port of Tacoma Truck Offramp - Phase 1</td>
<td>6/28/2016</td>
<td>Date is Council Resolution accepting project. Scope: Wetland Mitigation Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-0</td>
<td>City of Des Moines</td>
<td>So. 216th St., Segment 1A</td>
<td>2/8/2017</td>
<td>Ribbon cutting held 10/12/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-0</td>
<td>City of Everett</td>
<td>Port of Everett to I-5</td>
<td>6/26/2017</td>
<td>Date is Substantial Completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-0</td>
<td>City of SeaTac</td>
<td>Connecting 28th/24th Ave. S.</td>
<td>8/21/2017</td>
<td>Date opened to traffic. Ribbon cutting held 8/9/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-1</td>
<td>City of Seattle</td>
<td>Duwamish Spot Improvement</td>
<td>8/24/2017</td>
<td>Final contract payment made this date. Scope: SW &amp; S Spokane Street Arterial Paving Project and SW Spokane Street Railroad Crossing Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-0</td>
<td>City of Spokane Valley</td>
<td>Sullivan Road Bridge</td>
<td>9/12/2017</td>
<td>Date is Physical Completion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. Ewers made the motion to move the above projects to the completed projects list. Mr. Barnes seconded the motion. **MOTION CARRIED**

**FGTS BRIEFING AND ADOPTION**
Wenjuan Zhao, WSDOT, presented the 2017 strategic freight corridor update based on the Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS). FMSIB is required to update the list of designated strategic freight corridors and tonnage every two years. Mr. Swannack inquired as to why Whitman County was missing on the documents when the Port of Wilma now qualifies as a T-2. Ms. Zhao will look into it.

Chair Gatchet entered a motion to adopt the 2017 FGTS Strategic Corridor Report. Secretary Millar so moved and Mr. Hulcey seconded the motion. **MOTION CARRIED**

**PLANNING FOR FMSIB DAY ON THE HILL**
Mr. Trulove gave an overview on the FMSIB Day on the Hill process.
Chair Dan Gatchet requested a motion to hold the next FMSIB Board meeting on January 19, 2018, in Olympia, WA. Mr. Ewers so moved and Mr. Hulcey seconded the motion.

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chair Dan Gatchet adjourned the meeting at 1:15 p.m.

**MEETING ADJOURNED**

Dan Gatchet  
Chair

Attest: Brian Ziegler  
Director
FREIGHT MOBILITY STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING
FMSIB CODIFICATION LEGISLATION

MEETING MINUTES

January 4, 2018
Conference Call

Board members present: Mr. Dan Gatchet, Chair; Mr. Leonard Barnes; Mr. John Creighton; Mr. Erik Hansen; Mr. Matt Ewers; Mr. Johan Hellman; Mr. Tom Trulove; Mr. Art Swannack, and Mr. Bob Watters.

Interested parties present: Ms. Sheri Call, Mr. Bryon Moore, Mr. James Thompson

WELCOME

Chair Dan Gatchet called the meeting to order.

ROLL CALL

Ms. Saelid called the roll. Mr. Hellman requested an oral recap of Board members attending. Final count was nine members on the call. Quorum Obtained.

FMSIB BYLAWS: ARTICLE IV QUORUM

Director Ziegler reviewed the below FMSIB Bylaws Article IV Quorum:

The presence of a majority of the current Board membership shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of the business of the board. It shall require a majority of those members in attendance to carry any motion and/or resolution unless otherwise set forth in these rules.

CODIFYING FMSIB NEW REVENUES-BRIEFING PAPER

Director Ziegler referred to the briefing paper titled “Codifying FMSIB New Revenues – Rev. January 4, 2018” which was provided to the Board members prior to today’s meeting:

Codifying FMSIB New Revenues
Rev. January 4, 2018

Purpose
This briefing describes how state law dedicates FMSIB revenues for certain purposes and requests the Board to consider legislation that would ensure the same legal dedication for the new revenues provided by the 2015 Connecting Washington transportation package.
Background
FMSIB projects receive funding from six distinct transportation accounts:
1. Motor Vehicle Funds (state)
2. Motor Vehicle Funds (Federal)
3. Freight Investment Funds - FMIA (state)
4. Freight Multimodal Funds – FMMA (state)
5. Freight Multimodal Funds (UP)
6. Highway Safety Account
Several of these accounts receive appropriations only in order to complete legacy projects historically funded from those accounts. When those projects are complete and unless the Legislature changes something, FMSIB projects will be funded from only two accounts:
3. Freight Investment Funds - FMIA (state)
4. Freight Multimodal Funds – FMMA (state)
State law provides for annual transfers from other state accounts into these two accounts:
- RCW 46.68.295 - Transfers $3 million from the TPA (gas tax) to the freight mobility investment account (FMIA) created in RCW 46.68.300. (See later for actual code language)
- RCW 46.68.415 - Assigns $3 million of motor vehicle weight fee and motor home vehicle weight fee to freight mobility multimodal account (FMMA) created in RCW 46.68.310. (See later for actual code language)
These dedications and transfers assure $12 million in project revenues per biennium. The Board can make awards to project sponsors and know with some level of assurance that funds will be deposited in those accounts on schedule.

Current Situation
In the 2015 Connecting Washington transportation package, the Legislature approved a 16-year financial plan with new revenues allocated to at least 30 separate transportation accounts (see attached document titled “LEAP Transportation Document 2015 NL-2 as developed June 28, 2015”). Four accounts managed by TIB, CRAB, and FMSIB (Lines 9, 10, 11, and 22 on the LEAP document) are not currently codified.
The $123 million allocated to FMSIB over 16 years equates to approximately $17 million additional funding every biennium, bringing the FMSIB biennial appropriation amount to about $29 million.

Benefits
The Legislature appropriated new revenues to TIB, CRAB, and FMSIB in order to fund additional county, city, and port projects. Codifying these new revenues does not change the legislatively adopted financial plan; codification of the new revenues implements the legislatively adopted financial plan. For local governments, the principal benefit will be that their grant awards are more assured (Award agreements will always include termination language if the legislature does not appropriate funds in a particular budget cycle). For the granting agencies, codification provides greater assurance of fund availability so the boards can make longer-term financial commitments to counties, cities, and ports. Codification also allows scarce agency staff resources to remain focused on serving grant recipients and avoids diverting staff resources towards “protecting” the financial plan allocations every budget cycle.
Requested Action
The Board authorize staff to work with CRAB and TIB in developing and obtaining sponsorship for legislation to codify revenues planned in the 2015 Connecting Washington financial plan. Board members and staff could also then state publicly their support for such legislation.

Existing FMSIB Statutory Distributions
These distributions total $6 m annually / $12 m biennially
1. Freight Mobility Investment Account – FMIA (RCW 46.68.295)
   Transportation partnership account—Transfers.
   (1) On July 1, 2006, and by each July 1st thereafter, the state treasurer shall transfer from the transportation partnership account created in RCW 46.68.290:
      (a) One million dollars to the small city pavement and sidewalk account created in RCW 47.26.340;
      (b) Two and one-half million dollars to the transportation improvement account created in RCW 47.26.084; and
      (c) One and one-half million dollars to the county arterial preservation account created in RCW 46.68.090(2)(i).
   (2) On July 1, 2006, the state treasurer shall transfer six million dollars from the transportation partnership account created in RCW 46.68.290 into the freight mobility investment account created in RCW 46.68.300 and by July 1, 2007, and by every July 1st thereafter, three million dollars shall be deposited into the freight mobility investment account.
   [ 2006 c 337 § 6. ]

2. Freight Mobility Multimodal Account – FMMA (RCW 46.68.415)
   Motor vehicle weight fee, motor home vehicle weight fee—Disposition.
   (1) The motor vehicle weight fee imposed under RCW 46.17.365(1) must be deposited every July 1st as follows:
      (a) Three million dollars to the freight mobility multimodal account created in RCW 46.68.310; and
      (b) The remainder to the multimodal transportation account created in RCW 47.66.070.
   (2) The motor vehicle weight fee:
      (a) Must be used for transportation purposes;
      (b) May not be used for the general support of state government; and
      (c) Is imposed to provide funds to mitigate the impact of vehicle loads on the state roads and highways and is separate and distinct from other vehicle license fees. Proceeds from the fee may be used for transportation purposes, or for facilities and activities that reduce the number of vehicles or load weights on the state roads and highways.
   (3) The motor home vehicle weight fee imposed under RCW 46.17.365(2) must be deposited in the multimodal transportation account created in RCW 47.66.070.
   [ 2010 c 161 § 813. ]
2015 Connecting Washington Added Revenues
The financial plan for implementing Connecting Washington added $123 m over 16 years to these two accounts, split equally between them ($61.5 m each biennium to each account over 16 years). The math to determine the ongoing biennial amount is a little convoluted, hence the need to create the spreadsheet below.

| FMSIB New Law Appropriation Calculations 16-year Plan for $123 million |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Dec. 11, 2017      |                 |               |
| Note: Identical fiscal plan allocations of $61.5 m were made to both the FMIA and FMMA accounts |
| Note: OFM Plan provided by Erik Hansen, OFM this date |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biennium</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>$1,922,000</td>
<td>Revenue startup - Partial biennium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-19</td>
<td>$8,511,000</td>
<td>OFM Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>$8,511,000</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>$8,511,000</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>$8,511,000</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-27</td>
<td>$8,511,000</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-29</td>
<td>$8,511,000</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-31</td>
<td>$8,511,000</td>
<td>&quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-33</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Balance of $61,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$61,500,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, a portion of the total allocation was provided in the 15-17 biennium ($1.922 m per account) and then the full biennial amount of $8,511 million per account begins in 17-19 (this number was confirmed for me by Erik Hansen at OFM).

Since this $17 m biennial increase represents a substantial increase in FMSIB grant authority (From $12 m to $29 m a biennium) and since it is not assured, the Board would necessarily need to move cautiously in making any grant awards from this revenue stream. Hence, the Board desires to explore codification in order to achieve the full benefits of the new revenues.

**Code Changes**
If the Board approves proposed legislation, the bill language would be very simple: For each of the two existing statues above, the “three million dollars” wording would be replaced with “$7,255,500.”

**BOARD DISCUSSION**

Mr. Hansen noted that this codification would require a slightly different statutory change to appropriate the new revenue from the Connecting Washington account. Director Ziegler acknowledged that FMSIB staff would rely on legislative staff to revise the statute to achieve the Board’s desire.
Mr. Watters inquired as to the politics of this request and the pros/cons involved. Director Ziegler stated that the real benefit to codifying these funds is to our funding partners. When the Legislature makes a 16-year commitment, then cities, counties, and ports know it is more guaranteed and can plan accordingly for capital improvements.

Mr. Trulove asserted that FMSIB, TIB, and CRAB serve the same constituents and it is important for all three boards to pursue codification.

Mr. Swannack asked about the pushback from WSDOT. Chair Gatchet stated that the January Board meeting will include a presentation addressing WSDOT’s “bow-wave” concerns.

Mr. Hansen reminded the Board that codification shows legislative intent, but there are still ways to sweep money.

Director Ziegler said that at the January meeting he will provide a historical overview of FMSIB’s fund balance, which has been low. It is important we manage the fund balance but in his perspective, this is a secondary question. The primary question is if it is a good idea for FMSIB to pursue codification on behalf of our constituencies who rely on that funding.

Chair Dan Gatchet asked for a motion for the Board to move forward in seeking codification of FMSIB Connecting Washington revenues. Mr. Trulove so moved for the Board to authorize staff to work with CRAB and TIB in developing and obtaining sponsorship for legislation to codify revenues planned in the 2015 Connecting Washington financial plan. Mr. Swannack seconded the motion.

Mr. Ewers expressed concerns about maintaining accountability if the funds were to be codified. It is important for FMSIB to spend time every year in front of the legislators or FMSIB may lose steam.

Mr. Trulove agreed to the importance of continuing to meet with legislators and to make sure they appreciate what FMSIB is doing. He also pointed out the previous FMSB revenues were codified.

Chair Gatchet stated that Larry Pursley (prior Washington Trucking Association CEO) wanted FMSIB to go before the Legislature every year because weights fees were used as a source of revenue for FMSIB grants. Chair Gatchet said that FMSIB would continue to do annual outreach and Day on the Hill every year.

Mr. Swannack suggested that maybe the Board could create a polity that dictates how FMSIB communicates with legislators annually.

Mr. Trulove shared that FMSIB has a long history of being good stewards and spending time with legislators.
Mr. Hellman shared that whether codification affects rigor of our lobbying efforts is academic. Agencies need to go visit legislators every year and make their case anyway. The Board needs to decide whether codification is important on its own merits. 

*Final Vote Taken: six ayes, two nays, and one abstention.*

**MOTION CARRIED**

Chair Dan Gatchet adjourned the meeting at 9:38 a.m.

**MEETING ADJOURNED**

Dan Gatchet  
Chair

Attest: Director Ziegler

**RETURN TO AGENDA**
## FREIGHT MOBILITY STRATEGIC INVESTMENT BOARD

**CURRENT BIENNUM 17-19 Budget $ 818,000**

| FMSIB Budget | Biennium Appropriation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>511,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service Contracts</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Thru Dec 31, 2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 818,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditure Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries:</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditures July 1, 2017 - June 30, 2019</th>
<th>Budgeted Expenditures thru Dec 31, 2017</th>
<th>Actual Expenditures thru Dec 31, 2017</th>
<th>Biennium To Date Dollar Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salary</td>
<td>511,000</td>
<td>127,750</td>
<td>129,690</td>
<td>-1,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Salary</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 511,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>127,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>129,690</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1,940</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Travel</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>4,664</td>
<td>2,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Travel</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>3,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Travel</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 57,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,250</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,274</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,976</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods &amp; Services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other State Agency Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT Labor &amp; Svcs/TIB Svcs</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>3,471</td>
<td>6,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS DES Services</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>2,679</td>
<td>1,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS TIB - Office Rent &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>11,250</td>
<td>5,735</td>
<td>5,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS Attorney General</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misc. Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Office, Mtg, Equipment Costs</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>2,339</td>
<td>6,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Goods &amp; Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 140,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,224</strong></td>
<td><strong>20,776</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service Contracts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultant Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Rail Study</td>
<td>60,000</td>
<td>7,495</td>
<td>7,495</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18 - 2017 Annual Report (Lund)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19 - 2018 Annual Report (TBD)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Personal Service Contracts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 110,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,495</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,495</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Thru Dec 31, 2017</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 818,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>198,495</strong></td>
<td><strong>173,683</strong></td>
<td><strong>24,812</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FY 2017-19 Capital Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2017-19 Total</th>
<th>Est Reapprop</th>
<th>18 Supplemental</th>
<th>19 Supplemental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Funds (state)</td>
<td>$3,250,000</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Funds (Federal)</td>
<td>$22,462,000</td>
<td>$45,909</td>
<td>$22,507,000</td>
<td>$  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Investment Funds (state)</td>
<td>$21,843,000</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
<td>$22,283,000</td>
<td>$  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Multimodal Funds (state)</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>$  -</td>
<td>$1,320,000</td>
<td>$  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight Multimodal Funds (UP)</td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,775,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$585,909</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,360,000</strong></td>
<td>$  -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Projects currently authorized to incur expenditures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total FMSIB Commitment</th>
<th>Previous Bien Exp</th>
<th>2017-19 Planned Expenditures</th>
<th>Current biennium exp</th>
<th>Future Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Des Moines</td>
<td>S 216th St Segment 1-A</td>
<td>$892,000</td>
<td>$673,337</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$(218,663)</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>Port of Everett to I-5 Improvements</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>I-5/54th Ave E I/C Improvement - Ph 1</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Pt of Tacoma Rd Interchange Improvements Ph 1</td>
<td>$2,334,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,334,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Pt of Tacoma Rd Interchange Phase 2</td>
<td>$4,333,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$4,333,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Pt of Tacoma Rd Interchange Phase 3</td>
<td>$7,533,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$7,533,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>S 228th Street Extension &amp; Grade Separation Ph 1 &amp; 2**</td>
<td>$9,750,000</td>
<td>$5,250,000</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Hogum Bay Road Slip Ramp &amp; Road Improv</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>SR 432/SR 411 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Seattle</td>
<td>Marginal/Diagonal Approach &amp; Argo Gate</td>
<td>$3,750,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$3,750,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Vancouver</td>
<td>Bulk Facility Track Location</td>
<td>$3,450,000</td>
<td>$3,450,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Strander Blvd/SW 27th St Connection</td>
<td>$6,500,000</td>
<td>$6,496,872</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaTac</td>
<td>Connecting 28th &amp; 24th Ave South</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Lander Street Overcrossing</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Duwamish Truck Mobility Improvement</td>
<td>$2,383,000</td>
<td>$579,091</td>
<td>$1,758,000</td>
<td>$1,068,589</td>
<td>$45,909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagit Co</td>
<td>BNSF Overpass Replacement</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$377,999</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Co</td>
<td>Bigelow Gulch / Forker Rd Realignment</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$5,900,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Co</td>
<td>Park Road BNSF Grade Separation</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>Sullivan Road W. Bridge Replacement</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$1,560,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$440,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane Valley</td>
<td>Barker Rd / BNSF Grade Separation</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>SR 410 Traffic Ave/E Main</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Total FMSIB Commitment</td>
<td>Previous Bien Exp</td>
<td>2017-19 Planned Expenditures</td>
<td>Current biennium exp</td>
<td>Future Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>SR 99 Puyallup River Bridge</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>$ 1,753,180</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>SR 509/D Street Ramps</td>
<td>$ 6,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Strander Blvd/SW 27th to West</td>
<td>$ 5,000,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 2,400,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 105,625,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 21,509,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 48,525,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,581,105</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,368,909</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Union Pacific Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>S 277th St (2003-05)</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>$ 600,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>D Street Grade Separation (swapped w/Tukwila, 180th St)</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
<td>$ 750,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Pacific</td>
<td>Payment (cancelled Pierce Co 8th Ave S)</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>$ 500,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Seattle</td>
<td>East Marginal Way Ramps</td>
<td>$ 480,000</td>
<td>$ 480,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Seattle</td>
<td>Marginal/Diagonal Approach &amp; Argo Gate</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 70,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Willis Street Grade Separation</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>S 212th St</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>228th Street Extension and Grade Separation**</td>
<td>$ 1,250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 1,250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current planned UP Commitments Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 3,650,000</td>
<td>$ 2,330,000</td>
<td>$ 1,320,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FMSIB GRAND TOTAL**  
$ 109,275,000  
$ 23,839,300  
$ 48,525,000  
$ 3,581,105  
$ 35,368,909  

**Funds Remaining**  
$ 47,193,895
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Total FMSIB Commitment</th>
<th>Previous Bien Exp</th>
<th>Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn</td>
<td>M St SE Grade Separation</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton Co</td>
<td>Pt Kennewick/Piert Rd (7/09)</td>
<td>$65,520</td>
<td>$61,320</td>
<td>- $400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton Co</td>
<td>Piert Road Extension (refund)</td>
<td>$459,000</td>
<td>$458,680</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colville</td>
<td>Colville Alternate Truck Route (4/13) (refund)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$93,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>E Marine View Drive Widening (1/13)</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>70th &amp; Valley Ave Widening/SR 167 Alternate (8/12)</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>SR 432/433 Turn Lanes (11/10)</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Seattle</td>
<td>East Marginal Way Ramps (9/13)</td>
<td>$7,400,665</td>
<td>$7,400,329</td>
<td>$336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Seattle</td>
<td>East Marginal Way Truck Access (8/15)</td>
<td>$994,000</td>
<td>$994,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Tacoma</td>
<td>Lincoln Ave Grade Separation (5/12)</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Vancouver</td>
<td>West Vancouver Freight Access (3/11)</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>$3,700,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Vancouver</td>
<td>Rail Tie-In to Mainline (WVFA) (8/15)</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puyallup</td>
<td>Shaw Rd Extension</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renton</td>
<td>Green Valley BNSF</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>$1,250,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Duwamish Intelligent Transportation Systems (11/11)</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
<td>$2,293,032</td>
<td>$206,968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snohomish Co</td>
<td>Granite Falls Alternate Route Ph 1 &amp; 2 (3/12)</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Freya Street Bridge (10/11)</td>
<td>$2,720,000</td>
<td>$2,136,423</td>
<td>$583,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spokane</td>
<td>Havana St/BNSF Separation</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla Co</td>
<td>SR 125/SR 12 Interconnect-Myra Rd Ext (7/09)</td>
<td>$4,230,000</td>
<td>$4,230,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla/ College Place</td>
<td>Myra Rd at Dalles Intersection (12/14)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodinville</td>
<td>SR 202 Corridor-SR 522 to 127th PI NE</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSDOT</td>
<td>SR99/Spokane St Bridge/Replace</td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>Grade Separated Rail Crossings (5/15)</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakima</td>
<td>River Rd Improvements - 6th Ave to 16th Ave</td>
<td>$640,000</td>
<td>$639,000</td>
<td>- $420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RETURN TO AGENDA
Road-Rail Conflicts Study – Phase 2 Update
MPO/RTPO Data Request - A data request letter was sent to all MPO’s and RTPO’s in Washington. I sent the letter on behalf of the Advisory Committee and asked the regional planning organizations to sort the Top 100 Phase 1 recommended crossings into three categories:

- Tier 1 – Projects that are in design and awaiting full construction funding.
- Tier 2 – Projects that are planned and/or scoped but have not proceeded to engineering or design of any substantial kind.
- Tier 3 – A Road-Rail conflict ranked in the Top 100 from Phase 1 but for which no project has been studied, scoped, or identified in the regional plan for that location.

The letter also requests regional feedback on proposed initial definition of a “Corridor Approach” (as required by the legislation):

1. The railroad is the spine of the corridor, roadway crossings are the focus.
2. Train length and frequency are a factor.
3. Proximity of crossings is important.
4. The mobility concern is primarily focused on vehicle delays that occur at the rail crossings.

The above information was requested by January 31.

Project Schedule - The following project schedule was prepared and attached to the MPO/RTPO data request letter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHEDULE FOR ROAD-RAIL PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Updated 12/1/17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASKS</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obtain Project Data from MPO/RTPOs</td>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore Project Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Project Priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize Project Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETINGS</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Committee Meeting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPO/RTPO Coordinating Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMSIB Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advisory Committee Meeting Topics**

1. Confirm Project Evaluation Criteria
2. Provide Feedback on Project Priorities
3. Confirm Project Priorities

Note: Legislative Deadline is 9/1/18
Advisory Committee Changes - I met on November 21 with the newest addition to the Advisory Committee, Commissioner Jay Balasbas from the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission. You might remember Jay from his days with Governor Inslee’s team as his chief Transportation Policy Advisor. I briefed Jay on the Phase 1 Study results and the work to date on Phase 2. He was aware of and we discussed the role of safety in the original prioritization of Phase 1 road-rail crossings. This discussion was in reference to a letter sent by WSDOT and WUTC on this topic.

Next Advisory Committee Meeting - The next meeting of the Advisory Committee is scheduled for January 29. The agenda will be focused on developing and confirming criteria for prioritizing road-rail conflict projects. Those criteria will be shared with the MPO’s and RTPO’s and discussed with them on February 27.

Legislative Visits
On December 5, Gena and I visited legislative offices and delivered personal invitations to specific members to attend the January 19 Board meeting lunch panel. In addition, at Senator Steve Hobbs request, we met with him and his staff to provide an overview of FMSIB and discuss any upcoming legislative issues.

Project Status Updates
City of Lacey, Hogum Bay Road Truck Route – In November, the Board voted to cancel Phase 2 of this project, which had been on the FMSIB Deferred List. This cancelation was based on the fact the Phase 2 scope of work (i.e., the addition of a truck slip ramp connecting I-5 southbound to Hogum Bay Road) is not included in the WSDOT design for the Marvin Road Interchange. I called the City of Lacey Public Works Director to let him know that a cancelation letter was forthcoming. The letter was sent December 21.

City of Marysville, SR-529 / I-5 Interchange Expansion – This project has been discussed at the September and November FMSIB meetings. At issue is whether the $5 million commitment to the City should continue given the Connecting Washington funding that appears to have fully funded the interchange project. In November, the Board provided direction to investigate whether OFM’s budget assumptions included the FMSIB commitment or not. This topic is included for discussion in the January 19 meeting agenda.

City of Des Moines, So. 216th Street - Segment 1A – The ribbon was cut in August and the final costs have been tallied. It turns out the project was delivered for less than the City originally planned. As a result, FMSIB is due a refund of reimbursements made to the City. Here is the calculation that determines the amount of the refund:
The refund of $218,663.24 is being processed and should be available for award in the 2018 Call for Projects.

City of Tukwila, Strander Boulevard – Met December 7 with Tukwila staff to discuss funding options. FMSIB has committed $5 million to the project, but the City is well short of obtaining the needed $10 million to $15 million more. TIB staff were also present to offer technical assistance and funding options.

**Day on the Hill Preparations**
Email invitations have been sent to all members of the House and Senate Transportation Committees. As of January 1, 16 appointments have been confirmed. The 60-day Regular Session begins January 8 and ends March 8.

**FMSIB Annual Report Preparation and 2018 Solicitation**
After multiple reviews, edits, and soliciting pictures from project sponsors, the 2017 Annual Report was sent to the printer on January 3. Proofs were reviewed Jan. 8-9 and final print approval granted Jan. 10. The Final Annual Report will be handed out at Day on the Hill and the Board meeting.

Given that the current contract for services to prepare our annual report is expiring, we are preparing to solicit RFP’s for the future annual reports. Once received, proposals will be reviewed and scored by FMSIB staff and others. A new two-year contract with extensions should be in place by mid-2018.

**Truck Parking and Platooning Seminar**
The Cascadia Center sponsored a seminar on truck parking and platooning. Presentations included a Caltrans report on their truck platooning research pilot, a Caltrans “Smart Parking” pilot using parking lot sensors, a summary of WSDOT’s Truck Parking Study (Ron Pate), a Seaport Alliance discussion about Truck Terminal Congestion and Extended Hours (Zack Thomas), Trucking Industry perspectives (Sheri Call), and perspectives from Teamsters Local 741 on port truck congestion.
FAST Freight Advisory Committee
At PSRC’s request, I made a presentation to this Advisory Committee December 13 on the Road-Rail Conflicts Phase 2. For those not familiar with PSRC committee structure, the FAST Freight Advisory Committee is composed of representatives of interested PSRC members (essentially government employees). The PSRC is reviewing all committee structures. They are particularly looking at ways to engage the freight community. Some may recall Dan O'Neil (who recently passed). He was a former member of FMSIB and chair of the Freight Roundtable. This is a PSRC regional forum of freight stakeholders, elected officials, and legislators. PSRC is also looking for ways to connect the Freight Roundtable and the FAST Freight Advisory Committee. In the past, there was direct communication between the Freight Roundtable and the PSRC Policy Board.

FMSIB Project Selection Process Improvement Opportunities
In the interest of improving how FMSIB prioritizes projects and helps applicants complete the FMSIB required data elements, I met with Jeff Monsen of the CRAB Board, who has served as a Technical Team member for several years. Jeff has identified improvement opportunities, and we explored ways to incorporate traffic analysis into project prioritization and project team interviews. We also discussed Jeff’s impending retirement from CRAB and wrote a role statement for future CRAB staff involvement. CRAB staff will:

- Confirm traffic and functional class data submitted by applicant
- Evaluate traffic results (Using data supplied by applicant on either supplemental sheets or on the FMSIB form)
- For the marginal projects (i.e., ones that are otherwise "on the bubble" for getting an interview), convene a discussion between the Technical Committee and applicant's engineer, if deemed necessary to resolve marginalia status
- Prepare presentation to the Technical and Project Selection Committees
- Facilitate discussion of committees and answer questions

Lower Columbia Transportation Association (LCTA)
This organization consists of ports and shippers in the Longview/Kelso area. On January 11, I presented an overview of FMSIB, recent projects, the upcoming Call for Projects, the Marine Cargo Forecast, and the Road-Rail Conflicts Phase 2 Study.
DEAR FRIENDS OF FREIGHT:

The Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board is at a significant milestone as we celebrate our 20th Anniversary. We are poised to embark on the next generation of freight mobility strategic investments, building on our transparent and strategic project selection and prioritization process. We are well positioned for this next phase with our new Director, Brian Ziegler, who has extensive background in freight mobility projects at the state and local levels.

In 1997, the Washington State Legislature’s Freight Mobility Advisory Committee recommended the state adopt a freight mobility policy and a dedicated funding source for freight projects. The Legislature responded by adopting Chapter 47.06A RCW, establishing the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB). The decision by the Legislature to take action and to address freight strategically and statewide has been proven to be wise as the economic importance of the freight system throughout the state has grown. Since 1997, state Gross Domestic Product (GDP) has grown from $260 to $477 billion. At the end of 2016, our state’s GDP had the highest percent increase of any state in the United States. In real dollars, our state’s GDP has grown by almost 16 percent in the last five years alone.

By providing a dedicated funding source, the Legislature has leveraged state funds of $294 million to provide nearly $1.9 billion in strategic freight projects on state highways, county roads, city streets, and at ports throughout the state. These projects, completed and underway, have increased safety, reduced delays, and contributed to economic competitiveness. The partnership projects funded by FMSIB have helped to build grade separations and improved intermodal port access. Each FMSIB dollar spent has leveraged over six dollars in other funds for freight projects.

In 2017, FMSIB and the Washington Public Ports Association completed a Marine Cargo Forecast of rail, truck, and waterway cargo volumes. Other countries, such as Canada, are making substantial investments in their freight systems and they are successfully redirecting our traditional market share of freight to their ports. The Northwest Seaport Alliance, an initiative between the ports of Seattle and Tacoma, is a strategy to manage the region’s marine cargo in a way that can improve our state’s competitiveness. FMSIB has funded important port intermodal access projects statewide to improve cost effective movement of goods by rail, truck, barge, and ship.

While the transportation network is trying to accommodate more volume, technology is playing an important role. Logistics companies are providing mobile apps that allow carriers to better manage their fleets, assign jobs to drivers, and fine-tune freight delivery times. More density on freeways is possible with the use of adaptive cruise control and expectations for safe autonomous vehicles. The Northwest Seaport Alliance is in the early stages of implementing a drayage truck wait-time awareness program and app that will improve the supply chain’s system efficiency, safety, and productivity. FMSIB is continuing to fund Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) as part of freight projects to ensure coordinated signal timing and provide for real-time information on freight corridors.

The ability of our state to maintain its competitive advantage over the next 20 years will depend on continued improvements to our transportation system to accommodate freight and general mobility. The FMSIB board is made up of individuals with expertise from the public and private sectors who understand the needs and opportunities within the freight network, including the concerns of the general public about safety and congestion. We need continued commitment from our federal, state, and local policy makers to invest in our freight network with vision and leadership.

Sincerely,

Dan Gatchet
Chair, Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board
For two decades, FMSIB has been fostering public-private and intergovernmental agency partnerships to improve freight mobility in the state to benefit the people of Washington.

### 20 YEARS FMSIB INVESTMENT

- **$1.9 BILLION VALUE**
- **$294m STATE FMSIB**
- **82 PROJECTS COMPLETED AND UNDERWAY**

### $1: $6.40

$6.40 LEVERAGED FOR EACH $1 IN FMSIB FUNDS SPENT

### EXPORTED 2016

- **$79.6b [DECLINED BY 8%]**

### IMPORTED 2016

- **$46.9b [DECLINED BY 8%]**

### JOBS SUPPORTED BY EXPORTS

- **375,009**

### AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS EXPORTED

- **$10.0b**

### POPULATION GROWTH

- **31%**
- 1997: 5.6 million | 2017: 7.3 million

### STATE GDP INCREASE

- **83.5%**
- 1997: $260 billion | 2017: $477 billion

### LOCAL JOBS

- **$24b Cargo value**
- **44 Million tons of international trade**
- **3,200 Miles RAILROAD LINES**
- **40k LOCAL JOBS**
- **75 Ports**

### TRUCKING

- **64.3% FREIGHT MOVED BY TRUCK IN WASHINGTON**
- **1.5% projected annual growth**
- **5 international border crossings - 2 are among the slowest in the US**

### MOST CONGESTED FREIGHT LOCATIONS IN THE US:

- #14 Seattle I-5 at I-90
- #16 Tacoma I-5 at I-705/SR 16
- #18 Auburn I-5 at SR 18
- #21 Bellevue I-90 at I-405
- #36 Vancouver I-5 at the Columbia River

### RAILROAD

- BNSF operates 1,400 route miles
- Union Pacific operates 500 route miles
- 23 short line railroads operate 1,300 miles
- Freight rail contributes at least $28.5 billion to the Washington State economy

### MARITIME

- 3,200 Miles RAILROAD LINES

### TRUCKING

- **3,166 Miles HIGH TONNAGE TRUCK CORRIDORS**
- **816 miles** designated National Freight Network
- **81.66 miles** of Critical Urban Freight Corridors
- **163.31 miles** of Critical Rural Freight Corridors
- **835 miles** of first/last mile connectors and missing links
- **368 miles** on city streets handling high-tonnage freight
- **190 miles** county roads carrying 4–10m tons of freight per year

### Top Issues:

- Driver shortage/retention
- Hours of service/compliance
- Truck parking

### Source:

- US Census Bureau & International Trade Administration
- WSDOT & American Transportation Research Institute

---

[Source: WSDOT & American Transportation Research Institute]
Twenty years ago, the Washington State Legislature heard recommendations from a committee representing all sectors of the freight mobility system - federal, state, county, city, port, railroad, barging, and shippers - about how best to guide investment decisions in the freight transportation system. The Legislature adopted Chapter 47.06A RCW establishing a freight mobility policy and the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB). Since 2008, FMSIB has contributed funding to 82 projects statewide and leveraged its $294 million contribution with partnership funding to achieve $1.9 billion in freight transportation system investments. FMSIB staff and board members have also provided leadership and technical assistance to facilitate project partnerships, to undertake special studies that advance the state’s freight policy, to reduce impacts on communities from freight movement, and to encourage system efficiencies that can keep the state economically competitive.

HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE PUGET SOUND REGION

ARGO YARD TRUCK ACCESS - CITY OF SEATTLE

With half a dozen participating entities in the Argo Truck Access Project, FMSIB was able to enter as an unbiased party and developed a memorandum of understanding among the project partners with the sole concern of bringing a freight mobility project to a successful completion. The Argo Yard Truck Access Project created a dedicated truck only gateway that carries 45 percent of the Port of Seattle’s regional truck traffic from the Port’s marine terminals to the UP Argo Yard rail gate in the City of Seattle. It improves safety by eliminating a difficult weaving maneuver from southbound SR 99 to Diagonal Avenue, creates greater intermodal and multimodal efficiency and improves air quality by reducing delay-related idling trucks.

EAST MARGINAL WAY - PORT OF SEATTLE

The East Marginal Way Grade Separation Project on Duwamish Avenue South is one of the original FAST Corridor projects. FMSIB contributed funding to the new overpass improving road and rail access to Port terminals, to BNSF and UP intermodal rail yards, and to regional manufacturing and distribution facilities. Motorists and industrial traffic also benefit by moving more efficiently to and from West Seattle. The new overpass routes traffic over existing train tracks that serve Harbor Island, West Seattle, and the south downtown industrial area.

SR 518 - SEA-TAC AIRPORT TO I-5/405 INTERCHANGE - PORT OF SEATTLE

Eastbound mobility from Sea-Tac Airport to I-5 and I-405 was made safer and more efficient in early June 2009, when a new eastbound lane was completed on SR 518. Traffic growth on eastbound SR 518 had created difficult merge conditions for drivers attempting to merge onto I-5 and I-405. FMSIB helped fund this project that is improving traffic flow for air cargo trucks and other vehicles during airport and freeway rush hours thereby yielding travel-time savings. The new lane on SR 518 also improves safety by simplifying the merge from the North Airport expressway.

LINCOLN AVENUE - PORT OF TACOMA

Trains arriving and departing in the Port of Tacoma average 8,000 feet in length. This project raised Lincoln Avenue over key railroad tracks in the Port area, removing the at-grade conflict between rail activities and heavy vehicular traffic. Lincoln Avenue is the primary connector between I-5 and the Port for a high volume of trucks. Rail switching operations and mainline trains caused vehicular delays of up to 30 minutes every two hours on Lincoln Avenue. The grade separation significantly improved rail and road efficiency, as well as air quality.
**HIGHLIGHTS FROM EASTERN WASHINGTON**

**FREYA STREET BRIDGE - CITY OF SPOKANE**

Freya Street is a T-1 designated heavy volume truck corridor through Spokane. It is the only north-south heavy freight corridor through the city. The deteriorating condition of the Freya Street Bridge resulted in weight restrictions impeding freight movement. The Freya Street Bridge Project consisted of constructing a new bridge across the BNSF’s mainline and branch tracks. Two structurally and functionally obsolete bridges were replaced by one new bridge with wider travel lanes.

**PIERT ROAD EXTENSION - BENTON COUNTY**

The Piert Road Extension Project is the final 1.75 miles of new roadway, from SR 397 to Bowles Road in eastern Benton County. The extension included two travel lanes, a two-way left-turn lane, and sidewalks. The Piert Road Extension Project provides direct access for the Port of Kennewick and the southeast industrial area of Finley to SR 397 and I-82. It is providing semi-trucks a direct route from Finley to the intertie, reducing heavy truck traffic on residential streets. Agricultural business benefiting from this project includes vegetables, grains, fruit, and livestock.

**HIGHLIGHTS FROM WESTERN WASHINGTON**

**GRAIN TERMINAL TRACK IMPROVEMENTS - PORT OF KALAMA**

The Port of Kalama upgraded a 1960’s era elevator to include a unit-train receiving-track for a grain terminal. This project cleared congestion from the mainline and added throughput capacity at the terminal. The initial investment by FMSIB along with Port funding leveraged nearly $200 million by TEMCO to renovate the terminal in 2014, boosting its grain handling operation threefold. The new facility has a 6.5 million bushel storage capacity and can load 120,000 bushels per hour.

**WEST VANCOUVER FREIGHT ACCESS - PORT OF VANCOUVER USA**

The Port of Vancouver’s West Vancouver Freight Access Project is a state-of-the-art unit train facility. Construction began in 2007 and is nearly complete in 2017. FMSIB has been a funding partner since project inception. The project is improving the ability to move freight through the Port and along the BNSF and UP mainlines. The project will reduce current delays in rail traffic by as much as 40 percent and will lower costs for U.S. manufacturers and farmers, making them more competitive in global markets.

**LINCOLN AVENUE AND MARTIN LUTHER KING JR. BOULEVARD GRADE SEPARATIONS - CITY OF YAKIMA**

The American Public Works Association named Yakima’s Railroad Grade Separations Project a 2016 Public Works Project of the Year in the transportation category. FMSIB participated in funding two rail grade separation underpasses: one located at Lincoln Avenue and the other at Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard. The project is critical to the movement of truck freight, emergency vehicles, and downtown access. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard and Lincoln Avenue are the two main arterials for the Yakima central business district and function as a one-way east-west couplet. Each street is a primary route for emergency response vehicles serving east and north Yakima.
FMSIB Project Map

Freight Corridors

- **R-1 corridors**: carrying more than 5m gross tons per year
- **T-1 corridors**: carrying more than 10m tons per year
- **T-2 corridors**: carrying 4 to 10m tons per year


Projects **Completed** 1998-2017

**PUGET SOUND REGION**

- 18 City of Des Moines, South 216th Street Segment 1-A
- 19 City of Auburn, 3rd Street SW BNSF Crossing
- 20 City of Auburn, South 277th Street Grade Separations
- 21 City of Auburn, M Street South East Grade Separation
- 22 City of Fife, 70th Avenue and Valley Avenue Widening
- 23 City of Fife, Pacific Highway East/Port of Tacoma Road to Alexander Ave.
- 24 City of Everett, 1-5/41st Street, Phase 1 Ramp
- 25 City of Everett, East Marine View Drive Widening
- 26 City of Everett, Port of Everett to I-5 Improvements
- 27 City of Everett, 41st Street Overcrossing/Riverfront Parkway
- 28 Port of Everett, California Street Overcrossing to Port of Everett
- 29 City of Kent, South 228th Street Extension & Grade Separation, Phase 1
- 30 Pierce County, 8th Street East Grade Separation
- 31 Pierce County, Cross Base Highway, Phase 1
- 32 City of Puyallup, Shaw Road
- 33 City of SeaTac, Connecting 28th and 24th Avenue South
- 34 City of Seattle, Duwamish Intelligent Transportation System (ITS)
- 35 Port of Seattle, East Marginal Way Truck Crossover & Argo Yard Truck Roadway
- 36 Port of Seattle, SR 518 at Airport Drive Eastbound Lane Addition
- 37 Snohomish County, Granite Falls Alternative Route, Phase 1
- 38 City of Tacoma, D Street Grade Separation
- 39 Port of Tacoma, Lincoln Avenue Grade Separation
- 40 City of Tukwila, 180th Street Grade Separation
- 41 City of Woodinville, SR 202 Corridor Improvement
- 42 WSDOT, SR 519 Intermodal Access Project
- 43 WSDOT, SR 509/Port of Tacoma Road Grade Separation
- 44 WSDOT, SR 18 Weyerhaeuser Way to SR 167 Truck Lane
- 45 City of Renton, SW 27th/Strander Boulevard Connection
- 46 King County, South Park Bridge Replacement
- 47 Port of Seattle, East Marginal Way Truck Crossover
**Projects Underway In 2017**

1. City of Fife, Port of Tacoma Road Interchange
2. City of Lacey, Hogum Bay Road
3. City of Marysville, SR 529/I-5 Interchange Expansion
4. City of Seattle, South Lander Street Grade Separation
5. City of Tacoma, SR 99 Puyallup River Bridge
6. Port of Vancouver USA, Bulk Facility Track Location
7. City of Kent, South 228th Street Grade Separation Phase 3
8. City of Seattle, Duwamish Truck Mobility Improvements
9. Spokane County, Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road Realignment
10. Skagit County, Burlington Northern Overpass Replacement

**Projects Scheduled 2018-2022**

11. City of Kent, South 212th Street BNSF Grade Separation
12. City of Spokane Valley, Barker Road/BNSF Grade Separation
13. City of Tukwila, Stranger Boulevard/SW 27th to West Valley
14. City of Tacoma, Taylor Way Rehabilitation Project
15. City of Longview, SR 432-SR 411 Intersection Improvements
16. City of Sumner, SR 410 Traffic Avenue/East Main
17. City of Fife, 1-5/54th Avenue East Interchange Improvement

**WESTERN WASHINGTON REGION**

48. City of Bremerton, SR 3/304 Transportation Improvement
49. City of Kelso, Allen Street Bridge Replacement
50. Port of Kalama, Industrial Park Bridge
51. Port of Kalama, Grain Terminal Track Improvements
52. City of Longview, SR 432/SR 433 Turn Lane Improvements
53. City of Longview, SR 432 Improvements/3rd Avenue Off Ramp Widening
54. Port of Longview, Port Alternate Rail Corridor
55. WSDOT-City of Sumas, SR 9-SR 546/Nooksack Road Vicinity to SR 547/Cherry Street
56. Port of Vancouver USA, Port Rail Access, Phases 1 and 2
57. Port of Vancouver USA, Rail Tie-in to Mainline

**EASTERN WASHINGTON REGION**

58. Benton County, Pier Road Extension
59. City of Colville, Colville Alternate Truck Route
60. City of Kennewick, Columbia Center Boulevard Railroad Crossing
61. Port of Pasco, SR 397 Ainsworth Avenue Grade Crossing
62. WSDOT-City of Pasco, US 395 Hillsboro Street Interchange
63. City of Prosser, Wine Country Road
64. City of Spokane, Havana Street/BNSF Grade Separation
65. City of Spokane, Freya Avenue Bridge
66. Spokane Valley, Sullivan Road West Bridge Replacement
67. City of Union Gap, Valley Mall Boulevard Extension
68. City of Walla Walla, Myra Road at the Dalles-Military Rd & US 12/SR 125 Interconnect
69. City of Yakima, River Road Improvements
70. WSDOT, US 12/124 to SR 730
71. City of Yakima, Lincoln Avenue and MLK BNSF Grade Separation
SOUTH 216TH STREET SEGMENT 1A AND 28TH/24TH AVENUE SOUTH CORRIDOR
These two projects located in the cities of SeaTac and Des Moines improve freight access associated with Sea-Tac Airport and surrounding industrial/manufacturing land.

SOUTH 216TH STREET, SEGMENT 1A - CITY OF DES MOINES
This project was opened in October of 2017. The project widened South 216th Street to five lanes from 24th Avenue South to SR 99. The project is being integrated with recent improvements on 24th Avenue South, north of South 216th Street; and South 216th Street Segment 2, west of 24th Avenue South. The west leg of South 216th Street at SR 99 was widened to accommodate an additional westbound through-lane and a U-turn receiving pocket. The project also includes larger turning radii and thicker pavement to accommodate larger trucks.
Total project cost: $7.5M, FMSIB share $0.9M

28TH/24TH AVENUE SOUTH CORRIDOR - CITY OF SEATAC
This project was opened to traffic in August of 2017. The 28th/24th Avenue South improvements complete a new five-lane principal arterial road corridor between South 188th Street in SeaTac and South 216th Street in Des Moines. The project will help relieve congestion on International Boulevard (SR 99), provide access from the south to Sea-Tac International Airport and to existing and future freight related businesses along the corridor. The project will be connected to the future SR 509 and provide expanded access to the Des Moines Creek Business Park.
Total project cost: $24.3M, FMSIB share $2.5M

DUWAMISH SPOT IMPROVEMENTS - CITY OF SEATTLE
Final payment on these improvements was made in August 2017. The project consists of five small-scale improvements to the City of Seattle street system to improve connections between the Port, railroad intermodal yards, industrial businesses, and the regional highway system. FMSIB is contributing funding to the Southwest and South Spokane Street arterial paving project and to the Southwest Spokane Street railroad crossing rehabilitation project.
Total project cost: $2.1M, FMSIB share $0.6M

PORT OF EVERETT TO I-5 - CITY OF EVERETT
This project was substantially completed in June 2017. The Port of Everett’s continued growth has created increased demand for freight capacity between the Port’s south terminal and I-5. This project is improving access to the Port of Everett and Naval Station Everett and benefits commercial vehicle mobility and pedestrian safety. The project redirects the truck route to improve access to and from I-5. Improvements are at the 41st and Rucker crossing; Pacific and Rucker crossing, and the Pacific and West Marine View Drive crossing. Improvements include larger turning radii at intersections, traffic and pedestrian signal upgrades, and modifications to traffic channelization to optimize traffic through the corridor.
Total project cost: $4.5M, FMSIB share $0.4M

SULLIVAN ROAD BRIDGE - CITY OF SPOKANE VALLEY
This project was completed in September of 2017. Built in 1951, the Sullivan Road Bridge was rated as structurally deficient in 2009. It is a critical transportation link that connects industrial areas north of Spokane and in Spokane Valley with I-90. The project replaces the existing 2-lane bridge with a new 4-lane bridge. The structure carries about 26,000 vehicles per day and has a truck volume of about 24 percent. The new bridge allows weight restrictions on the route to be lifted.
Total project cost: $15.6M, FMSIB share $1.6M
THE SUPPLY CHAIN AND YOU

CUSTOMER ORDERS ONLINE

LOCATE ITEM

CREATE SHIPMENT

CONTAINER TO TRAIN

MARINE CARGO

TRAIN TO TRUCK

WAREHOUSE

OUT FOR DELIVERY

CUSTOMERS’ ORDER ARRIVES
FMSIB IS SEEKING APPLICATIONS FROM CITIES, COUNTIES, PORTS AND THE WASHINGTON STATE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR PROJECTS THAT DIRECTLY IMPROVE FREIGHT MOVEMENT AND/OR PROJECTS THAT MITIGATE FREIGHT MOVEMENT IMPACTS ON COMMUNITIES.

SELECTION CRITERIA

Freight Mobility for The Project Area ................................. 35 Points
Reduce truck, train, or car delays.................................25
Increase capacity for peak truck or train movement ..........10

Freight Mobility for the Region, State, and Nation ..........35 points
Importance to regional freight system and regional economy .... 10
Importance to state freight system and state economy ..........10
Direct access to ports or international border ..................10
Provide a corridor/system solution .................................5

General Mobility .................................................................25 points
Reduce vehicular traffic delays ..................................10
Reduce queuing and backups .................................... 7
Reduce delay from use of alternative railroad crossing ....... 5
Address urban principal arterials .................................3

Safety ............................................................................... 20 points
Reduce railroad crossing accidents ..............................5
Reduce non-railroad crossing accidents ....................... 5
Provide emergency vehicle access ............................... 5
Close additional related railroad crossings .................... 5

Freight and Economic Value ................................. 15 points
Benefit mainline rail operations ................................5
Access to key employment areas ................................. 5
Support faster freight train movements ....................... 5

Environment ................................................................. 20 points
Non-attainment area ...................................................... 5
Reduce train whistle noise in crossing vicinity ............... 5
Air quality or improved carbon footprint ....................... 5
Environmental and other permits/agreements required ....... 5

Partnerships ................................................................. 25 points
Public/Private sector participation .........................20 (max)
Critical timing of partner investments .......................... 5

Consistency with Regional and State Plans ......... 5 points
Address in regional and or state-level transportation plan .... 5

Cost ................................................................. 10 points
Cost-effectiveness ....................................................... 7
Degree to which least-cost alternatives are considered ...... 3

Special Issues ................................................................. 8 points
Address special or unique circumstances ...................... 8

SCHEDULE

Call for Projects Initiated .......................... January 15, 2018
Submittals Due ........................................ March 30, 2018
Preliminary Selection ................................. May 1, 2018
Project Interviews .................................. May 14-15, 2018
Final Project List Adoption ................. June 1, 2018

An estimated $10 million will be available for projects in 2019-2021. Another $15 million is anticipated to be available in 2021–2023.

For application forms and detailed information on eligibility requirements, see the FMSIB website at www.fmsib.wa.gov

• Cities, counties, ports, and Washington State Department of Transportation may apply.
• State law requires projects to be on corridors that meet freight tonnage volume thresholds.
• Projects must be ready to go to construction between 2019-2023.
• Studies will not be considered at this time due to the large unmet backlog of freight construction needs.
• Project sponsors will be asked to present their project to a selection panel for consideration after the initial scoring is completed.
• Statements indicating project benefits for rail, truck or port operations will need to be supported by endorsement letters from the beneficiary freight mode.
• A 35 percent funding match is required by statute. Higher funding matches will improve scores.
In 1998, the State Legislature had the foresight to create the first comprehensive and strategic freight mobility investment program in the country. They also established the Washington State Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board to oversee the program.

The Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board includes representatives from ports, railroads, the marine sector, trucking, cities, counties, the state, and a citizen at large. This representation is key to FMSIB’s success in facilitating partnerships to fund and build complex projects.

“It is the policy of the state of Washington that limited public transportation funding and competition between freight and general mobility improvements for the same fund sources require strategic, prioritized freight investments that reduce barriers to freight movement, maximize cost-effectiveness, yield a return on the state’s investment, require complementary investments by public and private interests, and solve regional freight mobility problems. State financial assistance for freight mobility projects must leverage other funds from all potential partners and sources, including federal, county, city, port district, and private capital.”

FMSIB creates a comprehensive and coordinated state program to facilitate freight movement.

The Board:
• Proposes projects that soften the impact of freight movement on local communities
• Advocates for strategic freight transportation projects that bring economic development and a return on investment to the state
• Focuses on timely construction and operation of projects that support jobs
• Leverages funding from public and private stakeholders
• Creates funding partnerships
• Invests in a freight solution regardless of mode or jurisdiction
• Serves as the de facto freight-project screening agency for state and federal policy makers
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I–5/SR–529 Interchange
City of Marysville
Project identified by both the City of Marysville City Center Access Study and City of Everett Freight access and Mobility Study

The SR 529 / Interstate 5 Interchange Expansion Project would complete the current half interchange by constructing a new Interstate 5 northbound off-ramp onto SR 529 and new southbound on-ramps from SR 529 to Interstate 5.
Project Benefits

- Reduces traffic volumes and congestion on SR 528 Corridor (between I–5 & State Street)
- Provides Access for local and regional traffic to and from I–5 that avoids crossing the BNSF mainline
- Reduces vehicle/train conflicts with at-grade BNSF railroad crossing
- Provides alternate emergency vehicle access to I–5
In May of 2014, the City applied for and received FMSIB contribution of $5 million towards a Total Project Cost of $47.5 million.

In June 2015, the State Legislature passed Connecting Washington and funded the project at $50 million.

In June of 2017, the State Legislature combined this project with another I–5 widening project to create the “I–5 Peak Hour Use Lanes and Interchange Improvements” project funded at $84.4 million.
Issues

- FMSIB could ask for a full refund since the Legislature funded the entire project cost as presented by the City ($50 m Legislative Funding vs. $47.5 m City Request to FMSIB).
- The City has been approached on this. They asked if the funding could be transferred to another freight project (which is not possible).
WSDOT staff believe the City underestimated the project costs. WSDOT provided copies of their Scoping Estimate which shows the project cost at $55 million:
- $47.25 million Construction
- $7 million PE
- $0.75 million R/W

The Legislature funded this project at $50 million, which WSDOT argues appears to presume a $5 million FMSIB contribution.
Board Options

(9/15/17 Board Presentation)

1. Do nothing and provide $5 million in the 2019–21 biennium as planned.
2. Remove FMSIB funding allocation from this project and advise the City. Allocate the $5 million to other projects in the 2018 Call for Projects.
3. Await WSDOT revised estimate, scheduled for 4Q17, and revisit issue at beginning of 2018.
“Based on Board discussion, it was decided to follow option 3 and defer a decision and to revisit the topic at the November 2017 or January 2018 Board meeting.”
Board Discussions
(11/17/17 Vancouver Board Meeting)

- FMSIB’s Local Agency Agreement is with the City, not WSDOT.
- The project scope and cost have changed considerably since Marysville applied.
- We need to know if OFM’s budget assumptions matched legislative assumptions for the $5 million FMSIB contribution.
- The Board chose to revisit this topic at the January 2018 meeting with any updates the Director has.
OFM staff confirmed that the 2015 Transportation Budget assumptions did not include any contribution from the City (FMSIB). This would have been indicated by a “Local Funds” amount in the budget and none was evident.

This can be interpreted two ways:

- The Local Funds got overlooked by the City, WSDOT, and OFM in the 2015 budgeting process, or
- The Local Funds were intentionally excluded and the Legislature fully-funded the project anyway
The Board can choose to commit the original $5 million to the project. This will require cancelation of the current agreement with Marysville and creating a new one with WSDOT.

The Board can choose to cancel the $5 million commitment to Marysville, in which case the 2018 Call for Projects will increase by $5 million.

Regardless which option the Board chooses, it’s clear the originally planned freight mobility improvements are likely to be implemented.
Questions?
Note:
This chart links to spreadsheet titled: FMSIB 17-19 program draft - bjz edits.xlsx
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>17 - 19 Planned Expenditure</th>
<th>17-19 Phase / Status</th>
<th>Delivery Risk</th>
<th>Forecasted Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-06</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>S Lander St Grade Separation</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>CN / Advertised / 12-19 completion</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6LP132F</td>
<td>Spokane Co</td>
<td>Bigelow Gulch / Forker Rd Realignment</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>CN / Awarded / 10-18 completion</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3LP101F</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>SR 99 Puyallup River Bridge</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>DB / CN Start 3-18 / 4-19 completion</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01F035A</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>S 228th Street Extension &amp; Grade Separation Ph 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>CN / Phase 1 complete / Phase 2 completion 6/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3LP139F</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Port of Tacoma Rd Interchange Phase 2</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>CN / Ad 12-17 / 12-19 completion</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LP104F</td>
<td>Pt Seattle</td>
<td>Marginal/Diagonal approach &amp; Argo Gate</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>Design / No firm completion date</td>
<td></td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-01</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>I-5/54th Avenue E I/C Improvement - Phase 1</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>Design / CN Start mid-2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LP908F</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>S 212th St BN Grade Separation</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>Design / CN start late-2018 / Not fully funded</td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LP137F</td>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Strander Blvd/SW 27th to West Valley</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>Design / Not fully funded</td>
<td></td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9LP999B</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Port of Tacoma Rd- Interchange Improvements - Phase 1</td>
<td>2,334</td>
<td>CN / Ad 12-17 / 12-19 completion</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-07</td>
<td>Skagit Co</td>
<td>Burlington Northern Overpass Replacement</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>CN / 2018 completion</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LP912F</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Duwamish Truck Mobility Improvement</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>CN / 1-18 completion</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-12</td>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>SR 410 Traffic Ave/E Main</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>Design / Not fully funded</td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-03</td>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>SR 432/SR 411 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>Design / Not fully funded</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3LP135F</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Hogum Bay Road Slip Ramp &amp; Road Improvements</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>CN / 11-18 completion</td>
<td></td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planned 48,525  Forecasted 32,037  Forecasted Expenditure 66%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>17-19 Planned Expenditure</th>
<th>17-19 Phase / Status</th>
<th>Delivery Risk</th>
<th>Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016-06</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>S Lander St Grade Separation</td>
<td>8,000 CN</td>
<td>CN / Advertised</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6LP132F</td>
<td>Spokane Co</td>
<td>Bigelow Gulch / Forker Rd Realignment</td>
<td>5,900 CN</td>
<td>CN / Awarded</td>
<td>5,310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3LP101F</td>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>SR 99 Puyallup River Bridge</td>
<td>5,000 DB</td>
<td>DB / Start 3-18</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01F035A</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>S 228th Street Extension &amp; Grade Separation Ph 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>4,500 CN</td>
<td>CN / Phase 1 complete</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-07</td>
<td>Skagit Co</td>
<td>Burlington Northern Overpass Replacement</td>
<td>2,000 CN</td>
<td>CN / 2018</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LP912F</td>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>Duwamish Truck Mobility Improvement</td>
<td>1,758 CN</td>
<td>CN / 1-18 completion</td>
<td>1,582</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3LP135F</td>
<td>Lacey</td>
<td>Hogum Bay Road Slip Ramp &amp; Road Improvements</td>
<td>600 CN</td>
<td>CN / 11-18 completion</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>27,758</td>
<td></td>
<td>24,982</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3LP139F</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Port of Tacoma Rd Interchange Phase 2</td>
<td>4,333 CN</td>
<td>CN / Ad 12-17</td>
<td>2,889</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9LP999B</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>Port of Tacoma Rd- Interchange Improvements - Phase 1</td>
<td>2,334 CN</td>
<td>CN / Ad 12-17</td>
<td>1,556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>6,667</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,445</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LP104F</td>
<td>Pt Seattle</td>
<td>Marginal/Diagonal approach &amp; Argo Gate</td>
<td>3,750 Design</td>
<td>Design / No firm</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-01</td>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>I-5/54th Avenue E I/C Improvement - Phase 1</td>
<td>3,000 Design</td>
<td>Design / CN Start</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LP908F</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>S 212th St BN Grade Separation</td>
<td>2,500 Design</td>
<td>Design / CN start</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1LP137F</td>
<td>Tukwila</td>
<td>Strander Blvd/SW 27th to West Valley</td>
<td>2,400 Design</td>
<td>Design / Not fully</td>
<td>240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-12</td>
<td>Sumner</td>
<td>SR 410 Traffic Ave/E Main</td>
<td>1,250 Design</td>
<td>Design / Not fully</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-03</td>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>SR 432/SR 411 Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>1,200 Design</td>
<td>Design / Not fully</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>14,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,610</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Planned</td>
<td>48,525</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forecast</td>
<td>32,037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Washington State Budget Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session (Even)</td>
<td>60 Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session (odd)</td>
<td>105 Days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biennial Budget Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental Budget Preparation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Roughly 80% of all construction expenditures occur in Calendar Year Quarters 2 and 3.
2. Budget preparation must finish at least a quarter before the legislative session begins.
3. Each biennial budget will be "supplemented" twice.
4. Planning for Supplement 1 begins in the first quarter of a new biennium.
5. Planning for Supplement 2 begins in the fifth quarter of the biennium.
FMSIB Capital Budget

- Biennium
- Supplemental 1
- Supplemental 2
- Expenditure

Budget amounts for different biennia:
- 2005-2007
- 2007-2009
- 2009-2011
- 2011-2013
- 2013-2015
- 2015-2017
- 2017-2019
Marine Cargo Forecast

Chris Herman
Sr. Director of Trade and Transportation
Washington Public Ports Association
Purpose of Briefing

- Refresh the Board on the Marine Cargo Forecast Results
- Identify Potential Next Steps
- Flag key messages that would transmitted to Legislature along with the Final Report
Key Forecast Takeaways

- Global Economic Forecast
  - Global population is expected to continue to increase. GDP growth will lead to increased consumption in many developing nations.

- Commodity Forecasts
  - While growth varies widely between commodities, we continue to see existing lines of business grow. Many commodities are currently outpacing their forecasts.

- Rail Capacity
  - The forecast found that with only a few exceptions, existing rail capacity is sufficient to manage near-term demand. With that said, railroads have completed projects in 2017 which address bottlenecks.
16 Participating Ports
### Public Port Project List*

#### Summary of Port Project Needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORT</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>Rail</th>
<th>Terminals</th>
<th>Dock</th>
<th>Dredging</th>
<th>Business Park Infrastructure</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Property Purchase</th>
<th>Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS)</th>
<th>Grade Separations</th>
<th>Studies</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anacortes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalama</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Columbia River Ports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Seaport Alliance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPPA - Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ports</strong></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Gathered from 16 participating Ports and crossed-walked with WAFAC 2016 Priority List. There are projects on each respective list that does not included on the other list. This list tries to be inclusive of both.
Project needs

- Ports are placing a stronger emphasis on non-port projects, recognizing freight and/or congestion mitigation will be needed in order to keep growing.
- There are local access/congestion issues that will require improvements to meet future growth.
- The process for accessing federal funds is changing as the new administration changes project selection criteria and considers a return to earmarks.
- In order to be eligible for FAST Act National Highway Freight Program funds, port projects must either be in the TIP or STIP. This requirement means ports must increase participation with local and regional planning.
Port Takeaways & Strategies

How do we prepare for the future?
Coalitions – Great Northern Corridor Coalition

Why it’s important? Strong Trade Corridors are critical to the PNW Gateway’s success.
Why Participate in Coalitions?

- **Goals**
  - **Commercial Strategy** that drives new way to increase economic development.
  - Collaborative effort that seeks increased competitiveness through targeted infrastructure spending.

- **Other Coalitions or Collaborative Efforts**
  - West Coast Corridor Coalition
  - Columbia River Channel Deepening
  - PNW Inland OSOW Corridor
  - WA/OR River Crossings
Freight Mobility Needs Identification

- Road/Rail Conflict Study – Phase 2 Underway
- Washington State Freight Transportation Network Optimization Strategy
  - By employing dynamic modeling tools and by leveraging both private and public sector supply chain data sets Washington State will develop a Statewide Freight Transportation Network Optimization Strategy that will ensure infrastructure investments are meeting performance objectives such as increased economic vitality and reduced transportation costs.
Funding

- Retain dedicated funding for freight in future federal transportation legislation.
- Look for alternatives to one-off capital requests for funding dredging projects.
- Continue to find ways where ports can help facilitate private investment in community assets.
What Key Messages for Legislators?
Questions?

Christopher Herman
Senior Director, Trade & Transportation
Washington Public Ports Association
1501 Capitol Way S., Suite 304
Olympia, WA 98501
360-943-0760
cherman@washingtonports.org

RETURN TO AGENDA
CHARTING WASHINGTON STATE’S ECONOMY:

WHY FREIGHT MATTERS

A Freight Primer by the Washington Public Ports Association and the Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board
Dear Friends of a strong and healthy state economy,

The state of Washington stands astride an international trade route that links our state to the world’s economy. Imports and exports through our ports sustain thousands of Washington businesses. Imports not only bring consumer goods and raw materials into our state, they also increase opportunities for Washington producers to export their products at lower costs by providing container capacity. Staying competitive in global markets supports jobs and helps families stretch paychecks further.

Much of the cargo received at Washington’s ports is discretionary and can move through alternative gateways. In order to preserve the shipping options available to local producers, we must compete aggressively to preserve and expand access to trade routes.

The Washington Public Ports Association (WPPA) has been forecasting waterborne cargo through the state’s port system since 1979. The 2017 Marine Cargo Forecast assesses and evaluates the distribution of cargo through the state’s transportation network, including waterways, rail lines, roads, and pipelines by commodity and cargo type from 2015 through 2035. The Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB) is a co-sponsor of the project as we leverage agency partnerships to achieve the strongest economic future for our state’s citizens and businesses.

While the forecast provides insight about trade opportunities, it also reveals risks to our state if we do not remain competitive. The projected growth rates for containers are substantially lower than in past Marine Cargo Forecasts. Competing ports in British Columbia have gained market share at Washington’s expense. The main reason for these lower rates is the success that British Columbia ports have had in capturing United States bound intermodal traffic. Cargo moving through ports in British Columbia is not subject to the Harbor Maintenance Tax resulting in lower costs for shippers while cargo moving through United State’s ports is subject to the tax.

Barriers to efficiently moving cargo such as aging infrastructure, deficient landside intermodal access, rail capacity, road-rail at-grade crossings, and highway congestion all affect our competitive advantage. The key to maintaining and expanding Washington’s place in the global economy is to continue investing in our transportation infrastructure.

The recent $183 million federal investment to deepen over 100 miles of the Lower Columbia River has already led to over $1.08 billion in public and private investments at ports and terminals along the route.

This 2017 Marine Cargo Forecast charts a course for strengthening our state’s economy by providing data to drive investment in our port and transportation infrastructure that will yield measurable benefits in jobs, tax revenue, and access to markets for consumers and businesses. Meeting demand will require upgrades and investment, particularly in rail capacity. We must make wise choices now and invest in Washington’s freight network, the backbone of our economy.

---

Why does trade matter to the state of Washington, its citizens, and businesses?

The state of Washington exported $79.6 billion in goods in 2016. Goods exports accounted for 19.2% of Washington’s state Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 2014, according to the United States Department of Commerce, International Trade Administration. With more than 95% of the world’s population and 80% of the world’s purchasing power outside of the United States, future American economic growth and job creation depends on open markets abroad.

What is traded?

Customers in 214 countries and territories buy Washington-made goods and services, including billions of dollars in annual exports to top markets like China, Canada, and Japan. Washington is America’s ninth largest exporter of agricultural products. It is the largest exporter of apples and the second largest exporter of other non-citrus fruits, potatoes, and grapes. Wheat, corn, barley, soybeans, grain sorghum, and some animal feeds dominate Washington exports. Washington State serves as a funnel for the export of Washington and Midwest grain. Eighty-five to 90% of Washington wheat is sold for export, making export sales critical to Pacific Northwest farmers. The Port of Kalama ranks #2 on the West Coast for grain exports, according to the United States Department of Agriculture.

Breakbulk exports from Washington ports consist primarily of forest products, including lumber, pulp, and paper.

Between 2000 and 2015, auto exports moving via Pacific Northwest ports increased at an annual rate of 23%, due mainly to shipments from Grays Harbor and Portland, Oregon to China. The Lower Columbia River (on both sides of the river) and Central Puget Sound have extensive industry clusters of construction and manufacturing firms that use imported steel.
Our international trade partners.

The share of trade moving between the Pacific Northwest and China grew from less than 10% in 2000 to more than 29% in 2015. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of containers imported and 90% of containers exported through Washington ports either come from or go to Asia. Total Gross Domestic Product (GDP) for China doubled approximately every five years, between 1980 and 2010. Between 2010 and 2015, per capita GDP in China grew from $4,684 to $6,603; it is projected to reach $8,478 by 2020, $10,733 by 2025, and $13,696 by 2030 (as measured in 2010 dollars). China’s increased buying power is a trade growth opportunity for the Pacific Northwest.

### Summary of Pacific Northwest Trade Share by World Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>Containerized (%) of TEU</th>
<th>Non-Containerized (% of Metric Tons)</th>
<th>Total (% of Metric Tons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Subcontinent</td>
<td>1.8% (2000) 2.5% (2015)</td>
<td>0.9% (2000) 1.4% (2015)</td>
<td>1.2% (2000) 1.8% (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>0.6% (2000) 1.1% (2015)</td>
<td>2.9% (2000) 2.2% (2015)</td>
<td>2.4% (2000) 3.6% (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>1.5% (2000) 3.5% (2015)</td>
<td>2.5% (2000) 1.7% (2015)</td>
<td>2.0% (2000) 2.5% (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>0.2% (2000) 0.3% (2015)</td>
<td>3.2% (2000) 0.2% (2015)</td>
<td>2.2% (2000) 0.2% (2015)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: BST Associates using WISERTrade data

### What is a TEU?

A twenty-foot equivalent (TEU) is a standard unit for describing a ship’s cargo carrying capacity, or a shipping terminal’s cargo handling capacity. A standard forty-foot (40x8x8 feet) container equals two TEUs (each 20x8x8 feet).

### Our domestic trade partners.

A substantial portion of Pacific Northwest waterborne cargo moves to and from domestic locations, primarily Alaska and Hawaii. As measured in tonnage, Alaska accounted for most of the domestic trade. Crude oil accounted for most of this tonnage, and as crude oil production has dropped in Alaska, so has Alaska’s share of Pacific Northwest waterborne trade. Fish is the other key product type shipped from Alaska to domestic destinations, and most of this fish is processed in Washington and moves through ports on Puget Sound.

The Midwest has become increasingly competitive with the Pacific Northwest for container imports because importers have increasingly chosen to use East Coast ports via the Panama or Suez Canal, rather than shipping through West Coast ports. In addition, cargo is also reaching the Midwest via Canadian ports and rail putting Pacific Northwest ports at further disadvantage because cargo through Canada is not subject to the United States’ Harbor Maintenance Tax.

### Potential Impact from Shifting Trade Patterns

[Map showing potential impact from shifting trade patterns]
What transportation modes move cargo?

Marine cargo is interdependent on rail, trucks, barges, and ships for efficient and cost-effective movement of goods.

**Rail** transport is the preferred mode for large volumes of cargo moving at least 500 miles, such as containers imported from China and destined for Chicago. Rail is also efficient for moving large volumes of heavier cargo on shorter routes, such as petroleum coke movements from Ferndale to Longview. Nearly all of the grain currently and forecasted to be exported through the Puget Sound/Lower Columbia River region is moved by rail. Rail moves 100% of export automobiles and approximately 80% of auto imports. The other 20% of the auto imports remain in the region and are distributed by truck.

**Trucks**, heavy, mid, and light play important roles in cargo movement and goods distribution. Truck transport is more likely for cargoes moving within the state or region. Trucks are used to haul (dray) the containers from port terminals to railroad intermodal yards or transload facilities. In Seattle, this means that port container traffic must use city streets to reach container yards. While truck traffic is expected to grow between now and 2035, auto traffic will increase even faster. The challenge will be to protect the functionality and reliability of the system for truck transport. Road capacity development will be critical for continued economic growth. Trucks account for moving an estimated 70% of breakbulk cargo and they move an estimated 95% of all logs transported.

**Barges** connect the Upper Columbia and Snake Rivers with the Lower Columbia River, a critical connection for wheat farmers. Essentially all wheat exports from the state’s farmers move through terminals on the Lower Columbia River. The Columbia-Snake River navigation system allows Washington-grown agricultural products to move from farm to market, and creates price competition between modes of transportation. The Columbia River deepening project has greatly benefited shippers who use Washington and Oregon ports along the Lower Columbia by creating transportation cost savings.

**Vessels** that handle imports and export at our ports are getting bigger and shipping companies are consolidating through mergers, acquisitions, and vessel-sharing agreements. These changes mean that carriers have more leverage in choosing which ports they will use. Bigger ships require a different type of infrastructure such as longer berths, bigger cranes with a broader reach, more terminal area and backlands to support, along with yard handling equipment and technology that allows for efficient handling of more containers in a shorter period of time. Ports need to modernize and upgrade facilities to compete for this business.

---

**Summary of Port Project Needs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PORT</th>
<th>Project Needs</th>
<th>Port Project Needs</th>
<th>Port Project Needs</th>
<th>Port Project Needs</th>
<th>Port Project Needs</th>
<th>Port Project Needs</th>
<th>Port Project Needs</th>
<th>Port Project Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anacortes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellingham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkston</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grays Harbor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelso</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longview</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Columbia River Ports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Seaport Alliance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pasco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacoma</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPPA - Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ports</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2017 Marine Cargo Forecast Chapter 6
Rail Volumes and Future Growth

BNSF and UP operate on track built and maintained without taxpayer funds. Their investments are a key partnership with our ports and are integral to the freight network. In 2016, BNSF and UP invested over $234 million in rail improvements in Washington.

The mainline rail system in the Pacific Northwest does not currently experience delays due in part to significant investments that have been made in the I-5 rail corridor; however, as projected rail traffic grows, capacity on the region’s rail system will likely require infrastructure improvements. For example, the height of Stampede Pass Tunnel may need to be increased to allow for double-stack traffic and auto carriers. Intermediate rail yards are also likely to experience delays with growth.

Intermediate rail yards are also likely to experience delays with growth. Double-stack traffic and auto carriers may need to be increased to allow for growth. Capacity on the region’s rail system will likely require infrastructure improvements. These investments have helped to reduce key capacity constraints.

Forecasts that were either constructed or are under construction. These investments have helped to reduce key capacity constraints.

A complete list of port access and infrastructure needs (indicated by dots in black, both lettered and blank) is displayed in the table on page 6.

Port Infrastructure Investment

Successes and Needs

The 2017 Marine Cargo Forecast identifies key locations where investments may be needed. This map illustrates those needs as well as a number of projects identified in previous Marine Cargo Forecasts that were either constructed or are under construction. These investments have helped to reduce key capacity constraints.

A complete list of port access and infrastructure needs (indicated by dots in black, both lettered and blank) is displayed in the table on page 6.
Challenges

Competing ports in British Columbia and Los Angeles have gained market share at our expense. Shippers save money when they move cargo through British Columbia because they are not subject to the Harbor Maintenance Tax (HMT) while cargo moving through United States’ ports is taxed. The HMT creates an unintended incentive for international importers to divert cargo through non-United States’ ports.

The HMT is a fee collected from users of the maritime transportation system in order to fund the Army Corps of Engineers’ operation and maintenance activities. Despite the fact that adequate revenue is being collected (approximately $1.7 billion annually), Congress has restricted spending on harbor maintenance due to budgetary constraints. In 2014, Congress took the first step to address HMT expenditure targets in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act (WRRDA), calling for full use of HMT revenue and setting forth spending targets between FY2015-25. This work needs to continue.

Another challenge is that ships are getting bigger and are handling greater volumes. This trend is happening at the same time as the consolidation of shipping lines into fewer and bigger and are handling greater volumes. This trend is happening at the same time as the consolidation of shipping lines into fewer and bigger ships, and the ability to handle big ships, and the result is that carriers have significant leverage negotiating with ports due to the amount of cargo the carriers control.

Regions that can accommodate larger ships have an advantage attracting these carriers over regions that cannot accommodate the big ships. Big ships require deeper berths as well as more landside capacity to handle peak volumes. Accommodating the big ships will require capital investment.

Inland navigation would be negatively affected if policy makers decide to breach dams on the Snake River. Barges would no longer be viable throughout the system resulting in higher transportation costs and lower levels of service. Since Washington farms sell to world markets, they have little ability to raise their selling price to recover additional transportation costs.

Opportunities

If we can better leverage the trade and cargo movement programs identified in the Marine Cargo Forecast, more opportunities will be available to the citizens and businesses in our state. China’s economic expansion and per capita GDP growth create market opportunities. We should pursue them to this market.

Significant capacity has been added on the Columbia River through federal funding, and the deepening has attracted public and private investment and added freight volume. This is an opportunity to move more of our state’s agricultural products cost effectively. And we must also ensure the deepened navigation channel is maintained.

Significant rail capacity has been added to the system through private investment by BNSF and UP, and partnership funds have removed some road-rail conflicts. This capacity should be preserved by continuing to make strategic investments in rail corridors.

The creation of the Northwest Seaport Alliance is a competitive advantage for the state by having the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma working together to attract business. This Alliance is the first of its kind in North America and is now the fourth-largest container gateway in the United States. The Northwest Seaport Alliance’s Strategic Plan identified the need to respond to challenges such as the consolidation of shipping lines, the ability to handle big ships, and the need to improve terminal utilization.

International Trade and the State of Washington—A Timeline of Global Milestones

1971-80

- President Nixon visits China opening trade relations and ending the trade embargo.

1980

- China joins the World Trade Organization (WTO)
- American exports to China increased by 81 percent and imports rose by 92 percent in the three years after China joined the WTO.

1981

- Ports in British Columbia double container volumes on non-United States ports.

1986

- Canada launches Asia Pacific Gateway & Corridor Initiative. This has led to $1.4B in public investment in 37 discrete projects across Western Canada designed to speed the flow of container traffic from the ports of Vancouver and Prince Rupert to United States interior gateways of Chicago, Detroit, and beyond.

1986-2005

- Three port districts merge to form what is today known as the Port of Vancouver, B.C.

1989

- The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers completes the Columbia River Channel Improvement Project to deepen the 115-mile Lower Columbia River navigation channel to a depth of 43 feet.

1990

- The Port of Vancouver, B.C. launches a Container Capacity Improvement Initiative designed to triple the port’s capacity by 2030.

1998

- The Prince Rupert Port Authority increases container capacity by 60%, up to 1.3M TEU’s per year, by adding 50K TEU’s of capacity.

2000

- China becomes the world’s second-largest economy.

2007

- The Prince Rupert Port Authority increases container capacity by 60%, up to 1.3M TEU’s per year, by adding 50K TEU’s of capacity.

2008

- The Prince Rupert Port Authority increases container capacity by 60%, up to 1.3M TEU’s per year, by adding 50K TEU’s of capacity.

2010

- The Port of Vancouver, B.C. launches a Container Capacity Improvement Initiative designed to triple the port’s capacity by 2030.

2012

- The Northwest Seaport Alliance is formed as a marine cargo operating partnership of the Ports of Tacoma and Seattle.

2015

- China’s economic expansion and per capita GDP growth create market opportunities. We should pursue them to this market.

2016

- Significant capacity has been added on the Columbia River through federal funding, and the deepening has attracted public and private investment and added freight volume. This is an opportunity to move more of our state’s agricultural products cost effectively. And we must also ensure the deepened navigation channel is maintained.

2017

- Significant rail capacity has been added to the system through private investment by BNSF and UP, and partnership funds have removed some road-rail conflicts. This capacity should be preserved by continuing to make strategic investments in rail corridors.

- The creation of the Northwest Seaport Alliance is a competitive advantage for the state by having the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma working together to attract business. This Alliance is the first of its kind in North America and is now the fourth-largest container gateway in the United States. The Northwest Seaport Alliance’s Strategic Plan identified the need to respond to challenges such as the consolidation of shipping lines, the ability to handle big ships, and the need to improve terminal utilization.

- The Northwest Seaport Alliance is formed as a marine cargo operating partnership of the Ports of Tacoma and Seattle.

- The Prince Rupert Port Authority increases container capacity by 60%, up to 1.3M TEU’s per year, by adding 50K TEU’s of capacity.
A CALL TO ACTION:
Invest in Washington’s Freight Network the Backbone of our Economy

International container volumes are projected to grow and that growth is an economic opportunity for citizens, businesses, ports, and communities in our state. Our ability to capture that growth will depend on the ability of local ports to compete globally. We need broader understanding about the importance of freight and the interdependent network that moves goods including ports, rail, trucks, barges, and ships. That understanding will help to inform policy and investment decisions needed to be competitive in a global economy.

Spread the word: Freight Matters

Reform Harbor Maintenance Tax to ensure equity
Support modernization of port facilities
Support landside investment at ports with funding, land use decisions, regulatory permits

Create funding opportunities:

• Significant investments will be required in port infrastructure, including longer berths, larger container cranes, increased water depth in channels and alongside berths, and additional on-dock rail to quickly move cargo off dock.

• Invest in eliminating chokepoints with public/private and inter-jurisdictional partnerships.

• Continue to fund investments in grade separations.

The Washington Public Ports Association (WPPA) was formed by the Legislature in 1961. WPPA promotes the interests of the port community through effective government relations, ongoing education, and strong advocacy programs, www.washingtonports.org

1501 Capitol Way South, Suite 304
Olympia, WA 98501
(360) 943-0760

The Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board (FMSIB) proposes policies, projects, corridors, and funding to the State of Washington Legislature to promote strategic investments in a statewide freight mobility transportation system, www.fmsib.wa.gov

505 Union Avenue Southeast, Suite 350
Olympia WA, 98504-40965
Phone: (360) 586-9695
Rep. Judy Clibborn’s Biography

This is Representative Clibborn’s 15th year in the legislature, and her 10th year as Chair of the House Transportation Committee.

CURRENT HOUSE COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS:
Transportation, Chair
Health Care & Wellness

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES:
Creating a sound transportation system that protects trade-dependent businesses throughout the State and keeps Washington’s economy globally competitive
Continuing to increase job opportunities for working families
Ensuring adequate health care coverage is accessible to all Washingtonians

PUBLIC SERVICE:
Mayor of Mercer Island
Mercer Island City Councilwoman

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Executive Director of the Mercer Island Chamber of Commerce
Registered Nurse, Harborview Medical Center

PERSONAL:
Mercer Island resident for 47 years. Married with three adult children and four grandchildren.

EDUCATION:
BS / RN from the University of Washington
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Ed Oreutt

PERSONAL:
Born May 4, 1963 in New Vineyard, Maine. Ed and his wife have been married since 1996 and reside in Kalama.

EDUCATION:
Mt. Blue High School, diploma and a certificate of completion in forestry, 1981
University of Maine, A.S. in Forest Management, 1984
University of Idaho, B.S in Forest Management, 1987

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:
Cascade Forest Management - Consulting forester, 2009 to present
Niemi Forestry - Consulting forester, 1990 to 2009
Northwest Management - Timber inventory, 1989-90
Idaho Department of Lands – resource aide, fire fighter and timber management – 1985-89

LEGISLATIVE ASSIGNMENTS:
Western Legislative Forestry Task Force
Natural Resources Committee, National Conference of State Legislatures
Joint Legislative Audit & Review Committee
Joint Transportation Committee
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES:
Transportation (Ranking Minority Member)
Finance (Asst Ranking Minority Member)
Agriculture & Natural Resources

LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES:
Tax relief
Economic development/jobs
Protect natural resource management and jobs
Property rights
Public safety
Second Amendment rights

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS:
Society of American Foresters, 1983 to 2009
Washington Farm Forestry Association, 1993 to present
Association of Consulting Foresters, 2003 to present

COMMUNITY SERVICE:
Board of Directors, Columbia Theatre for the Performing Arts, 2002-08
Cowlitz-Wahkiakum Career Development Consortium, 2006-present
Latah County Parks Board, 1988-90
Lions Club member since 1988; President of Kelso Lions Club, 1993-94
Volunteer statistician, Deary High School, 1987-90
Youth Bowling Coach, 1991-2004
Young Republicans of Cowlitz County, charter member, 1992-2004
Washington Young Republican Federation, 1983-2001; Man of the Year, 2000
Sen. Steve Hobbs Biography

Senator Steve Hobbs has been a member of the Washington State Senate since 2006. He serves as Chair of the Transportation Committee and serves on the Financial Institutions & Insurance Committee as well as the Agriculture, Water & Rural Economic Development Committee.

In addition to representing the people of the 44th district, he is a member of the Washington Army National Guard and proudly served in Kosovo and Iraq.

Based on strong input from his constituents, Senator Hobbs has adopted an expansive policy agenda which includes promoting local job creation through helping small businesses and improving our transportation infrastructure; promoting legislation that holds state government accountable for the dollars we spend; and working with the community to create new and innovative approaches to strengthening our education system. He is particularly focused on expanding programs in our high schools and colleges that will prepare our students for the growing demand in the high-tech industries both at home and globally.

Steve also continues to advocate for our service members and their families in Washington State by drafting policies that recognize the complex needs of the men and women serving in our military. Steve has worked with service members across our state to develop useful legislation to service members and their families ranging from help in education, finding good family wage jobs, and protecting veterans' rights since his time in the Senate.

Steve is a proud husband and father. He’s been married to his wife Pam since 1995 and together they are raising three boys: Gavin, Truman, and Winston all of whom attend public schools.

Raised in a working class family, Steve was taught to value education and hard work. In 2011, he received a Master’s of Public Administration from the University of Washington Evans School. In 1994 he earned a bachelor’s degree in political science at the University of Washington. He also holds an associate’s degree from Everett Community College.
Steve has been honored by numerous civic and community organizations for his legislative work and military service. His public service honors include:

- 2014 President’s Appreciation Award, Dairy Federation
- 2014 Certificate of Commendation, Washington Farm Bureau
- 2014 Power of Choice Award, NARAL Pro-Choice Washington
- 2014 Honorary Member of the Year, PSE
- 2013 Legislator of the Year, Washington Low Income Housing Alliance
- 2013 Proud Partner Award, Washington State Housing Finance Commission
- 2013 Department of Defense Certificate of Appreciation
- 2012 Housing Hero, Housing Consortium of Everett and Snohomish County
- 2012 Legislative Recognition Award, Public School Employees of Washington
- 2012 Bringing Washington Home Advocacy Award, Washington Low-Income Housing Alliance
- 2011 Legislator of the Year, The Aerospace Futures Alliance
- 2011 Matson Award, Association of Washington Business
- 2010 Pioneer Educator
- 2010 NAACP Distinguished Armed Services Award
- 2010 Farm Bureau, Friend of Farm Bureau Award
- 2010 WASA Region Certificate of Achievement
- 2009 Housing Hero, Snohomish County Camano Association of Realtors
- 2009 Certificate of Appreciation, American Legion 96 Snohomish County
- 2008-2010 Legislator of the Year, Washington Association for Career and Technical Education
- 2008 Legislator of the Year, Washington Council of Police and Sheriffs
- 2007 Super Star Award, Washington State Skills Center
- 2007-2008 Legislative Leadership Award, Statewide Poverty Action Network
- Commanders Award, Disabled American Veterans Dept. of Washington

During his free time Steve enjoys listening to music and reading. One of his favorite musicians is Huey Lewis.
About Curtis

Committees: Transportation (Ranking Minority Member), Labor and Commerce, Rules

Community Involvement: Curtis has volunteered countless hours in our community, including Rotary, United Way, the Chamber of Commerce and the American Red Cross, just to name a few. He is a past-president of the Central Washington State Fair Board and has been an active member for 14 years.

Professional Experience: Curtis worked for General Electric on the East Coast where he earned his MBA. When his father, Edward King, announced he was retiring from his cabinet shop in Union Gap in 1976, Curtis returned to Yakima to run the shop with his brother Gary. They worked for three memorable years with their dad before he passed away. Curtis and Gary turned the small business into a successful commercial cabinet company growing the business from four to forty employees.

Education: University of Washington, B.S. degree in physics and B.S. degree in math; Clemson-Furman Universities, MBA.

Personal: Born in Yakima, Curtis attended Union Gap Elementary Schools, Eisenhower High School and Yakima Valley Community College. Curtis and his wife, Lois, have two daughters: Jennifer, a graduate of the University of Washington and Michelle, a graduate of Washington State University. They have two grandsons, Jack and Henry. Curtis is an avid tennis player, loves to golf and enjoys hunting.