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Agenda

• Review “FMSIB Framework for Freight Investment Identification and Prioritization”
• Review 7/12 FPPAC discussion on other aspects of the proviso:
  – Dimensions of Freight (Recommendation endorsed)
  – Geographically Balanced (Recommendation endorsed)
  – Readiness for Construction (Recommendation deferred)
• Draft Outline of 2021 Legislative Report
• 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. (Endorsed 7/12)
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 (Endorsed 7/12)
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 (Deferred to 7/26)
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• 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?).
Road-Rail Conflicts Study
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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 (Deferred to 7/26)
Draft Outline of 2021 Legislative Report

1) Introductory Letter from the Chair
2) Framework
   a) Proviso language
   b) Purpose Statement
   c) Guiding Principles
   d) Process Milestones (2021 and 2022)
3) Relevant FMSIB Statutes from 1998 Session Law (See Appendix)
   a) “Findings” (RCW 47.06A.001)
   b) “Allocation of Funds” (RCW 47.06A.050)
   c) “Freight Mobility Plan” (RCW 47.06.045)
4) 2021 Legislative Report Development Process
5) Options for Completing 2022 Legislative Report
   a) Scope
   b) Funding
6) FMSIB Recommendation
7) Next Steps
8) Appendices
Comparison of Freight Project Identification Approaches

Switch to comparison table in Word document
• Continue meeting over the summer with support from FMSIB and WSDOT staff.

• Meetings scheduled every two weeks (all invitations sent):
  – July 26 (today)
  – 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 the Draft Report Outline
• Staff revisions to “…Comparison of Freight Project Identification Approaches.””
• Staff development of preliminary “freight investment eligibility and prioritization criteria.”
• Present above work products to August 9 FPPAC meeting.