



# BENTON-FRANKLIN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

1622 Terminal Dr. • Richland, WA 99354  
<http://bfcog.us>

Ph: (509)943-9185  
Fax: (509)943-6756

## TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

### TAC - Meeting Minutes for June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2018

#### 1. **CONVENE**

TAC Chair, Cary Roe, called the meeting to order at 11:00 a.m. at Ben Franklin Transit in Richland.

#### 2. **ROLL CALL**

Benton County	Robert Blain, Jason Froelich
Franklin County	Robert Mendez
Ben Franklin Transit	Tony Kalmbach, Bill Barlow
City of Kennewick	Cary Roe
City of Pasco	Steve Worley, Mary Heather Ames
City of Richland	Pete Rogalsky
City of West Richland	Roscoe Slade
Port of Pasco	
Port of Benton	Roger Wright
Port of Kennewick	
WSDOT - South Central	Paul Gonseth
City of Prosser	Marty Groom, Andrew Robinson
City of Connell	Larry Turner, Hallie Tuck
City of Mesa	
City of Benton City	
City of Kahlotus	
PNNL Battelle	
Mission Support Alliance	
Staff:	Brian Malley, Tanna Dole, Geoff Wagner, Jacob Gonzalez
Guests:	Skip Novakovich, PAC Chair, Port of Kennewick; Rick Dawson, Benton-Franklin Health District; Spencer Montgomery, JUB Engineers; Kerwin Jensen, City of Richland; Marie Mosley, City of Kennewick; Tim Arntzen, Port of Kennewick

#### 3. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Pete Rogalsky MOVED to approve the May meeting minutes. Larry Turner SECONDED the motion which PASSED UNANAMOUSLY.

#### 4. **ACTION ITEMS**

##### A. 2019 UPWP Approval

Pete Rogalsky MOVED to approve the 2019 UPWP. Roger Wright SECONDED the motion which PASSED UNANAMOUSLY.

##### B. 2018 – 2023 TIP Amendments (BFCG Amd.18-JUN)

Paul Gonseth MOVED to approve the June TIP Amendments. Pete Rogalsky SECONDED the motion which PASSED UNANAMOUSLY.

#### 5. **DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS**

##### A. North Horn Rapids Area Master Plan – Truck Evaluation Study

Roger Wright of RGW Enterprises, a consultant for the Port of Benton and Spencer Montgomery of JUB Engineers gave a presentation on the North Horn Rapids Area Master Plan Truck Evaluation Study. The purpose of the study was to evaluate the potential truck traffic from development in North Richland. This is specific to the 1,341 acres DOE transferred to the City of Richland and Port of Benton, but also included the area that could potentially include the Inland Seaport concept. The study evaluated truck movement at 28 locations throughout the Tri-Cities area. Eighteen months ago the Department of Energy transferred 1,341 acres north of Horn Rapids Road to the Port of Benton and the City of Richland. The Port of Benton and Richland got together and developed a master plan of that area and one of the elements of the plan was a traffic study. Interest developed in creating and Inland Seaport facility near Richland's loop track.

An Inland Port proposal has been discussed as part of the development in North Richland. How it would work is a product that is already getting trucked from the Tri-Cities area to the NW Seaport (Seattle and Tacoma) would get trucked to North Richland instead and a Unit Trail of containers would get railed from Richland to the Seaport. The returning train would bring empty containers. Trucks bringing product into Richland to ship to the Seaport would take empty containers back to their facilities.

Beneficial cargo owners became interested in the Inland Seaport concept because they could potentially ship local product to the seaport which is the Ports of Seattle and Tacoma and then load that product on ocean going carriers that mostly go to Asian ports. The product that's coming through the Tri-Cities now is coming from all over the northwest to Seattle. The tonnage that goes to the seaport breaks out to a third up I-5 a third I-90 and a third through Yakima from the Tri-Cities. So the idea is the product within 100 miles of the Tri-Cities (which is about 200,000 shipping containers a year) could come to the seaport get off loaded 7 days a week, 24 hours a day. Once a week a unit train would then take that product over to the west side. The benefit for the local shippers is better access/efficiency to the ports via rail and not having to wait to get a truck off loaded at Seattle or Tacoma which is only a 5 and a half hour window.

Since the Inland Seaport concept has some "traction" it was decided to have JUB Engineers determine the magnitude of truck traffic generated by the 1,341 acres which would also

include the proposed Inland Seaport . The Inland Seaport is still in the very early stages and a lot has to happen for it to move ahead because there are so many moving parts involved (rail, ocean carriers, ports, trucking companies etc...). It hasn't progressed much further since the tours from last October and there are no plans to run a pilot train at this time. If the Seaport were to become a reality there would be maybe one unit train a day coming through the Tri-Cities. There are currently 18 trains a day that travel through downtown Kennewick with many of those happening at night.

The North Horn Rapids Area Master Plan Truck study looked at overall congestion and percentage of trucks. The truck percentages were relatively low for most of the segments evaluated. Spencer explained some of the highlights from the study which includes how many trucks would be added to the road network, where would they go and how does that fit in with the current traffic patterns in the area. Using the BFCG traffic counts conducted in 2016 and using sites along the area's Freight and Goods Transportation System (FGTS) defined by WSDOT we tried to get a good cross section of 10 sites from each jurisdiction in the Tri-Cities with 8 sites on WSDOT sites with Automatic Traffic Recorders. At each of those sites data was show for the daily truck traffic and PM peak hour traffic and determined what percentage of the total traffic is singles, doubles and truck trains. The regional total of the 28 sample sites and added those up. For a six year period the total daily estimated traffic 4384 daily truck trips in the area of the 1,341 acres site. Of those 28 sites the highest truck percentage on a daily basis was 29.5% and the lowest being 3.6% and all of the sites combined came out to an 11% average. Comparing truck data from Spokane Valley which has a truck percentage of 20% this study went conservatively high with 30% trucks which would amount to 1,315 truck trips a day. Looking at the percentage of trucks on the road during the PM peak hour would be 5.9% which is less than the 11% total daily truck percentage. Taking 6% of the 1,315 daily trucks would add only 80 trucks to the PM peak hour. One of the concerns was additional truck traffic through downtown Kennewick heading to the Inland Seaport. It wouldn't be new truck traffic because those trucks are already heading to north Richland anyway, so there wouldn't be any new trips coming from that direction. It's very preliminary, we do not know what future businesses will be established at the 1,341 acre site.

**Paul Gonseth:** For clarification, what are the differences between scenario one and two?

**Spencer Montgomery:** Scenario two is anticipating where the trucks will be. Scenario one was an example of the trucks using the same distribution pattern for comparative purposes.

**Paul Gonseth:** From a WSDOT perspective the main focus is SR 240 and the current PM peak congestion. Once you add more trucks to that congestion they don't perform the same way as a car and equates to 1.5 to 3.5 passenger cars because of accelerating issues with trucks.

**Roger Wright:** The existing trucks are coming from the southeast going through town. It will be about a split whether they come through Pasco or from the west and head north through Richland but they all have to come up SR 240.

**Roger Wright:** Even if he Seaport doesn't happen there's 1,341 acres opened up in north Richland. If someone wanted to begin a project out there it would have to be 150 acres or bigger to be considered. A large infrastructure project of that size might have only 50 employees. It will be 3-5 years before anything would begin if someone was interested in the site today.

**Pete Rogalsky:** Obviously SR 240 and George Washington Way are concerns to Richland. When we updated our regional plan those popped out for things to work on. This study looks to me like drilling one layer more specific to what is in the regional plan. We have land use in our long range plan that says it's going to generate jobs in north Richland. Unless somebody were to redo the regional land use plan that is where the region has decided job growth and primary job growth should be focused. Industrial and primary jobs being located in north Richland and generating traffic in the region is entirely consistent with everything we have been planning for and it shouldn't be a surprise or terribly alarming to everyone if we were able to land a major job creator in the region.

**Roger Wright:** To answer Paul's question, If you look at the PM peak on SR 240 and then took all the trucks off of SR 240 between 4 and 6pm what would be the difference in traffic? It would still be very congested.

**Paul Gonseth:** If it's possible to convince the major employers in the area to stagger start work times because there is excess capacity aside from the PM peak.

**Brian Malley:** If Spencer could explain a little more the methodology behind the truck study and the assumptions that came about? Why the year 2022 time frame for example? Was the whole 1,341 acres and the Inland Seaport lumped together?

**Spencer Montgomery:** Most of you know the Department of Energy (DOE) transferred 1,341 acres to the Port of Benton plus the city and county. The intent was to use it for industrial purposes in large portions of 100-200 acres or more. We went through many comparisons of trip generation manuals. We sampled Areva because that's the type of site the area would geared toward. Areva has a pretty low trip generation rate so we didn't look at the trips like Areva so we used a combination of IT, office and something like Areva might generate. The year 2022 was for concurrency purposes, we did the study in 2016 which was a six year look in to the future which is what we typically do for UGA expansions.

**Roger Wright:** We did include numbers for the Inland Seaport but we would have to get back to you exactly what we used. (By way of example, if the Inland Port were successful at having 1 unit train of 100 rail cars a day into the Inland Port, and these trains average about 150 cans per train based on what the shipping companies report as average, this would generate 150 trucks per day or 300 truck trips, as a truck brings in a full container and takes an empty back. 300 truck trips per day based on a 24-hour day would only be 12.5 trucks per hour. Even just basing it off a 16 hour day would be a 18.75 truck per hour average. )

**Kerwin Jensen:** This all started with 1,641 acres with 300 given to Energy Northwest. There are plans to put solar panels out there for 20-25 years which would generate very little traffic. We just don't know at this point how all of these parcels are going to pan out. Some may have larger trip generation and some like the solar panels are going to have hardly any.

**Roger Wright:** For the 1,341 acres you won't see any planning on that for at least a year because someone has to come in with a specific project. On the Inland Seaport there are two things that would have to happen for activity to start up. First, the Seaport would have to get permission to operate in this area and then some planning and lease of land with the City of

Richland. Once that starts to occur we would gather more details and then update this report and present the findings.

**Cary Roe:** Are the numbers in the study combined with the Seaport and the larger area?

**Roger Wright:** That's correct, they are combined but we can clarify those numbers.

**Cary Roe:** Kennewick would be interested in what WSDOT's formal comments would be on this study. Has WSDOT reviewed and provided comments on this study?

**Paul Gonseth:** We have reviewed it but have yet to pass those comments along. We will pass those along to BFCG when they are ready.

**Cary Roe:** This study focuses on trucks and we are definitely concerned about trains but it doesn't address cars. There are some voids here with no operational analysis and is just projecting trips. There hasn't been any (and maybe for good reason at this point) "drilled down" analysis of truck volumes added with the trains and jobs coming in. How does that operate and function on SR 240 or other streets in the region? It's not just the percentage of trucks but how will they function and what's the impact on these intersections and the corridor and what improvements are necessary to service those. Any good study is going to make assumptions and at this point you don't know if it's solar panels or something else. Kennewick has written our concerns and we think it's a big enough deal there needs to be a comprehensive look, we've suggested EIS and don't think that's inappropriate. We think it needs to be drilled down in more detail.

**Roger Wright:** An Inland Port is 12-15 employees which isn't a big number. We have not done what I have hoped to do on the trains because I don't believe you can trust the railroad reporting their data. We have talked about some sort of monitoring in downtown Kennewick to see what the actual train traffic is. We know there's 20 existing trains today and at best and adding one more train seemed it wasn't an urgent item to study. We also have not been able come up with a good way to count the trains but we are trying to come up with something.

**Cary Roe:** Our concern obviously is about the trains in downtown Kennewick and it isn't just the unit trains that come through there are other trains loading and loading at local businesses. The tour you provided Roger was very helpful and insightful to me having not grown up in the area, thank you. This is an accumulative thing for us that's why Kennewick is concerned about the project as a whole and not just this project but it's been well stated it's the whole industrial area and looking at all aspects of modes of transportation.

**Tim Arntzen:** I appreciate the information today. From the Port side of things it's been somewhat confusing for us because this topic has been addressed at our state port association meeting occasionally and we know the folks at the Seaport Alliance. Part of my personal problem has been getting consistent information because it seems from the Seaport Alliance folks are almost seemingly backing away from the project so I do appreciate getting some information. Even locally it was confusing for a while if this was a project the City of Richland supports or is it a Port of Benton project and it became a problem in determining who the players were. With that in mind I would ask...Is there going to be a public process so the concept could be rolled out to others beside to twenty some odd people in the room? Does this ever get a chance to get in front of the public and maybe have a workshop or series

of workshops because as we've recognized this isn't just a north Richland situation it would potentially benefit and have some burdens to the entire area. So is there going to come a time when it's rolled out to the public to give them a chance to express their concerns? Having driven on SR 240 recently it is a problem now. When you add a couple hundred trucks to fill that train in round trips that is really going to be a problem to the extent that the gentleman from WSDOT mentioned regardless of the data in the report it's common knowledge that it's a problem now and will only get worse.

**Roger Wright:** I apologize Tim if it has been confusing because everything that has gone out has said it's a City of Richland lead on the Inland Seaport and Zach Ratkai at the City is the lead. If/When the Seaport actually comes here or they are the applicant or hire an operator here then you will see a different lead.

**Skip Novakovich:** Just a personal comment. Someone made the comment that most of the trains go through downtown Kennewick at night. I would take exception at that. Our business backs up to the tracks and there are a lot of trains that go through during the daytime to the point Fruitland traffic can be backed to the south to 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue and to the north to Columbia Drive clear around to the round-a-bout. So there are some real issues with train traffic as it exists in downtown Kennewick.

**Paul Gonseth:** You can do a 24 hour video capture and fast forward to catch trains coming through downtown to get an accurate number, type of train and time of day.

**Roger Wright:** We will come up with a way to capture the train traffic accurately. I apologize when I implied they all come at night. A lot of them do come at night but you're correct a lot do come during the day as well. The other important thing to discuss is the state rail division did a study and they're projecting the existing 18 trains coming over from the west side are going to more than double.

**Cary Roe:** That reinforces my comments from what I'm hearing from Skip, Tim and others that this is an accumulative effect. If you look at just this and look at what's there and what's going to grow in regards to background whether it's the freight you just talked about is that accumulative effect.

**Roger Wright:** One train a day can't carry the mitigation.

**Cary Roe:** I'm not suggesting it should but it shouldn't be not evaluated. It is part of the larger picture and it is going to contribute because Skip's comments are exactly right it isn't just during the night. I drive downtown Kennewick a fair amount and try to avoid certain times because I've seen what he described. It's a challenge for emergency vehicle response for us because a train of any length is going to block those important intersections and it makes a challenge to get around if there's a fire, medical or police response. We appreciate you continuing to provide information and as this rolls forward there will be more to come.

**Roger Wright:** Yep, absolutely

**Marie Mosley:** Cary, I just wanted to reinforce what you just said. It's not just a transportation issue. There is an emergency response issue. Also, our businesses (as Commissioner Novakovich stated he has a business down there) which goes back to what Tim

had brought up and that is...will there be more of a public process? Because it's not just us around the table here but the transportation impacts, emergency impacts and business impacts. So will there be a public process where others can provide input as well? I think it's important. I know the Historic Downtown Kennewick Partnership may have provided a letter as well and I know they're not represented in this group and they do have some concerns.

**Roger Wright:** We'll definitely follow up.

**Marie Mosley:** Thank You

**Bill Barlow:** There's a transit impact too because we try and stay on schedule. We actually route around as much as we can to avoid those crossings. I think there's a positive note here that we can build and that is we're not talking about some of the projects that are in the works. There are solutions to some of these potential problems of the future like looking at some of the intersection improvements, proper radius for the turning movements and some of the grade crossings. I would love to see what the railroad has planned for crossing improvements.

**Cary Roe:** Some of the concern for Kennewick and many of you who work in transportation like I do. If you have ever had to work with the railroads you'll know what I mean...they're not responsive and they'll do what they want to do when they want to do it. Our trust level with the railroad is minus five. It's not just because of this project or an eastern Washington issue it happens on the west side too. The way they operate is a big concern for Kennewick and they could do much better to help the process along.

#### B. Status – Regional Ozone Informational Workshop

Tanna gave a summary of the upcoming Ozone Informational Workshop. The date is set for July 19 and 'save the date' emails will be sent later today. The workshop will last from 8:30 am to 12:00 pm and will be held at the Benton PUD auditorium. Tanna has spoken with the Walla Walla Valley MPO and been provided a list of stakeholders from their area. The workshop is considered informational and the focus piece will be a presentation of the precursor study conducted by Ecology. Walla Walla Valley MPO and other stakeholders that may be affected have not seen the presentation. The workshop will be the presentation and then 30 minutes of the implications of being classified with a nonattainment designation with a panel of experts from the business, industry and transportation sectors in our region. The last agenda item will be a discussion of outcomes with stakeholders. Benton Clean Air would like to form two small working groups. One group would be representative from the business and industry sector and the other would be a health and transportation.

Brian suggested TAC members discuss this with their PAC members/Board members on Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) because he anticipates Ecology will ask us to do something in that regard. Our region has historically asked for exemption from that program. That exemption has carried over because there has been no funding for CTR at the state level. If our area did start a CTR program we would be taking money from the bucket that is divided to the areas of the state that have already established CTR programs. We could make pitch to the CTR board at any time if there was interest.

#### C. FFY 2018 Final Allocations for STBG and TAP

Tanna explained; typically in the spring BFCG receives notification of an estimated allocation for the year's STBG and TAP funds. And during the winter we receive the actual allocation. WSDOT notifies BFCG of both, the estimated and the actual allocations. The 2018 STBG allocation was \$55,000 more than what was estimated. **The 2018 ACTUAL allocation for STBG is \$4,147,969.**

Actual TAP allocation for 2018 is \$24,000 less than the estimated allocation. **The ACTUAL allocation for TAP is \$288,142.**

After a few years go by we typically look at what the estimates and actual allocations and make any necessary adjustments. This review was last completed in 2013. Walla Walla County separated from BFCG and became an MPO/SRTPO in 2013. At that time WSDOT Local Programs, Olympia worked with BFCG to separate the accounting for the projects and funding of STP and TA programs. BFCG staff will review years 2014-2018 and provide a report to the TAC/PAC. be doing that again and are not expecting any surprises.

Notification of additional federal funds from the Highway Infrastructure Program was received late in April and are a one-time apportionment with some stipulations. The BFCG region will receive is ~ \$739,000. Large Urban share to be \$567,000 split between Benton & Franklin Counties. Small Urban area (Prosser) is \$18,674 and the rural amount which has to be split between Benton & Franklin Counties is \$153,145. These funds cannot be used for TAP projects, planning projects or studies. They have to be used for design, right of way and construction. WSDOT is really suggesting it be used for preservation projects. They will not be part of our annual obligation target.

Cary Roe said we currently do not have a policy on additional funds but do on "turn-back" funds. The HIP funds are new to us. We had a call for projects and those submitted projects were rated and ranked and once those were selected the funding went so far and some lower on the list were short funds. I think that process was valid and I think those projects that were partially funded could be considered for these new funds. There should be a formal policy to address new funds. We can discuss further at the next or future TAC meeting.

#### D. Ben Franklin Transit Requests Ad Hoc Committee

Bill Barlow is looking for members to form an Ad hoc committee to discuss incorporating elements from the recent BFT Amenities Study. He is looking for a member from the Cities of: West Richland, Richland, Kennewick and Pasco. It makes more sense to meet with many jurisdictions together and discuss transit issues rather than individually at different times. BFCG will be sending out a reminder email to TAC members in the next few days.

## 6. STAFF REPORTS

### A. 2018 Obligation Report

Tanna updated the group on the latest obligation report through the end of May. At \$3.8 million we are way ahead of our target goal. There has been no advanced construction started yet so that's good news.

### B. Travel Demand Model Documentation

Jacob let the group know the Draft Travel Model documentation report from Caliper is available for consultants or jurisdictions or anybody else wants to look at the "nuts & bolts" of how the



algorithms and trip generation were used to produce the model. A lot of times consultants will call and ask what applications the model can be used for and now we have formal document that we can pass along to them as in the past we didn't. Provided is just the introduction but I can send the whole document if anyone is interested. We've processed 14 model requests since January, so we have been keeping very busy.

C. Human Services Transportation Plan (HSTP)

Tanna wanted to let the group know that Len Pavelka is developing the Human Services Transportation Plan (HSTP) and would like the TAC members to provide a social media/Facebook contact from their jurisdiction/agency so he can post a HSTP survey about attitudes toward public transportation. You can send that contact information directly to Len. We will send a reminder email on this as well.

7. **MEMBER COMMENTS**

Skip Novakovich – Port of Kennewick

I would make a comment going back to the rail issue and opening it up for public comments. Pete made a comment of taking advantage of economic development opportunities which it could provide. At what cost will it provide opportunity? The only way to find that out is to look at who it affects and how it affects them by reaching out to other jurisdictions so the open process makes a lot of sense.

Geoff Wagner - BFCG

Urban traffic counts are wrapping up this week and they will do any recounts when they come back to do the rural counts in September.

Roscoe Slade – West Richland

Bombing Rage Phase 8 did get obligated so it will show up at the end of May.

Bill Barlow – Ben Franklin Transit

We are submitting our Regional Mobility Grant July 18<sup>th</sup>, so we have projects coming.

Paul Gonseth – WSDOT SC

Kingsgate will start up here pretty soon with paving starting this month too.

Tanna Dole - BFCG

We would like a joint TAC/PAC meeting either on July 5<sup>th</sup> or the 12<sup>th</sup> because of the holiday.

Brian Malley - BFCG

The reason we really would like to have the July meeting is to update the group on Red Mountain. We met with WSDOT yesterday and stakeholders from the group to review some modeling we did in regard with Red Mountain. WSDOT is now asking us to take the Columbia River Crossing study alternatives and add it on top of our MTP to see what the results are. We think it's a prudent thing to do. Our MTP is a good document and is two iterations of modeling fresher than what the Columbia Crossing study was and we think it might spur some discussion amongst our members and set the table for regional corridors being discussed at this time. We usually cancel a summer meeting if there aren't any action items but we would like to approach this topic while it's still fresh.

*It was decided to have a TAC/PAC Joint meeting on July 12<sup>th</sup> and cancel the July 5<sup>th</sup> TAC meeting.*

8. **NEXT MEETING**

**July 12<sup>th</sup>, 2018 – Joint TAC/PAC Meeting Cousins', Pasco**

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Cary Roe adjourned the meeting at 12:50 pm  
Minutes submitted by Geoff Wagner