FMSIB Freight Policy and Project Advisory Committee (FPPAC)

Meeting #6
July 12, 2021

Mayor Ben Wick, FPPAC Chair
Brian J. Ziegler, FMSIB Director
Agenda

• Review “FMSIB Framework for Freight Investment Identification and Prioritization”
• Other aspects of the proviso:
  – Dimensions of Freight
  – Geographically Balanced
  – Planning Horizon (Readiness for Construction)
• Comparison of Freight Project Identification Approaches
• FPPAC Work Plan
• Next Steps
Other Proviso Aspects: Dimensions of Freight (1 of 2)

• “... across freight modes.”
• Mode
  – Marine (Coastal, Puget Sound, Inland Waterway)
  – Railroad (Class 1, Shortline, Switching)
  – Aviation (Hub, Commercial, Regional, Local)
  – Roadway (Interstate, Primary, Secondary, Local)
• Ownership / Sponsorship
  – Private
    • Railroad
    • Distribution/Intermodal/Transload Center
    • Marine Terminal
    • Roadways
  – Public (State/County/City/Port)
    • Roadways
    • Marine Facilities
    • Aviation Facilities
Other Proviso Aspects: Dimensions of Freight (2 of 2)

• Usage
  – Weight (T1-T5, R1-R5, W1-W5)
  – Volume (ADT, TEU’s, Railcars)
  – Value

• Supply Chains (2017 WSDOT Freight Plan)
  – Aerospace
  – Forest Products
  – Apples
  – Dairy
  – Potatoes

• Recommendation: “Freight” means all public modes meeting threshold criteria (TBD) and all private modes where public investment has proven public benefit.
Other Proviso Aspects: Geographic Balance

- FMSIB Statute (RCW 47.06A.050)
  - Highest priority projects: 55% of FMSIB revenues
  - Remaining 45% of revenues allocated equally:
    - Puget Sound Region
    - Other Western Washington
    - Eastern Washington
- WSDOT 2017 National Highway Freight Program (NHFP) funding awards (Appendix A, Freight Investment Plan, p.22)
  - Select projects in order of highest rank, but ...
  - Don’t allocate the federal funding all in one region
  - No more than one award per project sponsor
- Legislative Transportation Packages
  - Project Lists
  - 49/25/1
- Recommendation: Make the geographic balance determination after investment/project prioritization
Other Proviso Aspects:
Planning Horizon

• “... can proceed to construction in a timely manner.”

• “Proceeding to construction” requires:
  – Consensus on the scope (Planning and TIP processes)
  – Environmental documentation and permits
  – Final design and right-of-way
  – Full funding

• Various Planning Horizons (The Olive Chart)
• Road-Rail Conflicts Study Example
• Legislative Packages: 10 to 16 Year Duration
• Recommendation: Use a tiered approach that balances project priority with level of project development.
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State of Washington
Freight Mobility Strategic Investment Board
Road – Rail Conflict Study (2018)

• TIER 1: Projects that are in design and awaiting full construction funding (16 projects, 11 complete or in construction).

• TIER 2: Projects that are planned and/or scoped but have not proceeded to engineering or design of any substantial kind (18 projects, none in construction?, one FMSIB project).

• TIER 3: A road-rail conflict ranked in the Phase 1 Study, but for which no project has been studied, scoped, or identified in the regional plan for that location (24 projects, none in construction?).
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Other Proviso Aspects: Planning Horizon

• “... can proceed to construction in a timely manner.”
• “Proceeding to construction” requires:
  – Consensus on the scope (Planning and TIP processes)
  – Environmental documentation and permits
  – Final design and right-of-way
  – Full funding
• Various Planning Horizons (The Olive Chart)
• Road-Rail Conflicts Study Example
• Legislative Packages: 10 to 16 Year Duration
• Recommendation: Use a tiered approach that balances project priority with level of project development.
Comparison of Freight Project Identification Approaches

Switch to comparison table in Word document
FPPAC Work Plan

• Continue meeting over the summer with support from FMSIB and WSDOT staff.

• Meetings scheduled every two weeks (all invitations sent):
  – July 12 (today)
  – July 26
  – August 9
  – August 23
  – Sept. 7 (day after Labor Day)

• Prepare a draft legislative report outline for presentation at the Sept. 16 FMSIB workshop (Walla Walla). Potential Board action on Sept. 17.

• Incorporate Board input and prepare Final Report for presentation to the Board’s Nov. 19 meeting in Tacoma (Fabulich Center).
Next Steps

• Staff revisions to the recommendations for:
  – Dimensions of Freight
  – Geographically Balanced
  – Planning Horizon (Readiness for Construction)
• Staff revisions to “Comparison of Freight Project Identification Approaches.”
• Staff development of preliminary “freight investment eligibility and prioritization criteria.”
• Present above work products to July 26 FPPAC meeting.